

PLANNING COMMISSION

Workshop One

Consolidated Issue and Direction Report

Definitions, Development Classifications & Subdivision Review Framework

DOCUMENT STATUS

Working analysis — not formal minutes, adopted ordinance language, or Planning Commission action

PREPARED FOR	DeAnn Hester, Planning Director & Planning Commission
MEETING DATE	July 24, 2026
PREPARED	July 28, 2026

Prepared as a structured record of workshop discussion, direction, unresolved questions, and required validation.

Purpose and Use of This Report

Use Boundary

This report captures the workshop discussion and the direction expressed by participants. It is not formal minutes, legal advice, adopted ordinance language, a formal Planning Commission recommendation, or County Council action.

The report is a working register for the Planning Director. It separates matters that are sufficiently clear for drafting from matters that remain open, illustrative, or dependent on legal, engineering, utility, or agency validation.

Executive Direction Snapshot

DRAFTING DIRECTION Major/minor subdivision definitions; two-year parent-parcel reset; anti-circumvention; PDD impact studies; interim data-center special exception; sketch-plan enforcement; workshop summaries.	RESEARCH / VALIDATION Traffic-study thresholds; road/street terminology; appeal routing; vested rights; utility-capacity evidence; guest-house and dwelling-unit definitions.
POLICY DESIGN Graduated residential, commercial, and industrial standards; cumulative traffic; PDD minimums and incentives; General Use matrix and density.	DEFERRED / FOLLOW-ON Comprehensive data-center ordinance; post-adoption application checklists; reserved sections for standards that cannot be responsibly completed in the current rewrite.

1. Status and Confidence Framework

Status	Meaning
Agreed workshop direction	Participants expressly agreed on the concept.
Working definition or framework	Accepted for drafting and further review, but not formally adopted.
Tentative direction	General support exists, but details remain unresolved.
Research required	Additional legal, engineering, agency, utility, market, or technical information is required.
Open policy question	Discussed without a settled direction.
Existing procedure reaffirmed	Participants confirmed or emphasized an existing requirement.
Example only	A number or scenario was illustrative and was not selected as policy.

Confidence levels

- High — The issue, direction, and status were expressly stated or strongly confirmed by the discussion.
- Moderate — The discussion is clear, but the exact ordinance alignment, participant intent, or final status requires interpretation.
- Low — The transcript is ambiguous or incomplete. No Low-confidence findings were necessary in this report.

2. Definitions, Classifications, and Minor Subdivisions

Working register of definition, classification, family-transfer, parent-parcel, and administrative-consistency issues.

The workshop established a substantive working framework for major and minor subdivisions while reserving several definition questions for research and drafting validation.

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Inter-chapter consistency	Chs. 26, 32, and 38; primarily Ch. 32 definitions	Terms are defined or used differently among chapters, creating inconsistent application.	Coordinate definitions and usage across all three chapters before drafting substantive standards.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Organization of subdivision definitions	Ch. 32, §32-212	“Minor subdivision” is separated from the general subdivision definition, making the ordinance harder to navigate.	Place Subdivision, Major Subdivision, and Minor Subdivision together under one organized definition structure.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Major subdivision definition	Ch. 32, §32-212	The ordinance does not provide a sufficiently clear independent definition of a major subdivision.	Define a major subdivision as a subdivision that does not qualify as exempt or minor.	Working definition	High
Planning Commission consensus	Minor subdivision threshold	Ch. 32, §32-212	The existing ten-lot threshold does not clearly state whether the remainder parcel counts.	Define a minor subdivision as no more than ten total lots, including the remainder parcel.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Roads in minor subdivisions	Ch. 32, §§32-212–32-213; Ch. 26 definitions	Existing language may allow a minor subdivision to involve construction of a new public or private road.	A minor subdivision should not require construction of a new public or private road.	Agreed substantive direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Street, road, roadway, drive, and driveway	Ch. 26 definitions; Ch. 32, §32-212	Multiple transportation terms are used inconsistently and may describe different physical or legal conditions.	Research state and planning usage, preserve valid distinctions, define undefined terms, and use each term consistently.	Research required	High
Planning Commission consensus	Utility extensions in minor subdivisions	Ch. 32, Arts. I and VI	Proposed language could unintentionally prohibit utility extensions required to serve lots within the minor subdivision.	Clarify that a minor subdivision does not require utility extensions intended to serve lots outside the proposed minor subdivision.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Shared stormwater infrastructure	Ch. 32, Art. VI	A land division without mass grading could be subjected to infrastructure requirements designed for a major subdivision.	A minor subdivision should not require shared stormwater or drainage infrastructure serving more than one lot.	Working definition	High
Planning Commission consensus	Family-transfer exemption	Ch. 32, §32-213	The relationship among family transfers, minor subdivisions, and retained property requires clarification.	Retain the previously revised family-transfer language. The exemption applies when an eligible transfer actually occurs.	Existing language reaffirmed	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Retained property versus family transfer	Ch. 32, §32-213	An owner may divide property but retain the resulting parcel rather than transferring it to a qualifying relative.	Treat the division as a minor subdivision when no qualifying family conveyance occurs.	Existing ordinance clarification	High
Planning Commission participants	Driveway access for family transfers	Ch. 32, §32-213; transportation definitions	A prohibition on constructing a “road” should not unintentionally prevent an ordinary driveway or drive extension serving a family parcel.	Preserve the road restriction while ensuring that valid driveway or drive improvements do not automatically disqualify a family transfer.	Tentative drafting direction	Moderate
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Contiguous parcels	Ch. 32, §32-212–32-213	Without a contiguous-parcel rule, related property could be divided in stages to avoid major-subdivision requirements.	Add a clear definition of contiguous parcels and use it when determining subdivision classification.	Agreed workshop direction	High

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
Planning Commission consensus	Serial subdivision and circumvention	Ch. 32, §§32-212–32-213	An applicant could create up to ten lots repeatedly and avoid the higher standards applying to a major subdivision.	Aggregate qualifying divisions from the parent parcel. Reclassify an application when cumulative activity crosses the major-subdivision threshold.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Parent-parcel reset	Ch. 32 — new or revised provision	Counting all historic divisions indefinitely could unreasonably restrict farmers, heirs, and long-term property owners.	Establish a two-year reset period for the parent parcel. Tie the reset to the parcel, not the owner or LLC name.	Agreed workshop direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Administrative evidence	Ch. 32, §§32-7 and 32-213	Staff should not have to investigate an applicant's private intent or rely on unavailable information.	Base determinations on recorded plats, recording dates, assessor information, parcel history, and other accessible public records.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission consensus	Objective administration	Chs. 26, 32, and 38	Prior Planning Directors reportedly interpreted similar provisions differently.	Draft clear, objective standards that produce the same result regardless of the individual administrator.	Agreed governing principle	High
Planning Commission participants	Lot versus dwelling unit	Chs. 32 and 38 definitions and density provisions	A development may contain ten lots but more than ten dwelling units through duplexes, accessory residences, guest houses, or similar arrangements.	Review every use of “lot,” “residential lot,” “dwelling,” and “dwelling unit” to ensure the selected term produces the intended subdivision, access, and density result.	Research and drafting required	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Guest-house definition	Chs. 32 and 38 definitions	The ordinance apparently lacks a clear distinction among a guest house, accessory living area, rental dwelling, and separate residential unit.	Develop a defensible definition addressing kitchens, independent occupancy, rental use, density, and later separation from the parent parcel.	Open drafting issue	High

3. Graduated Standards and Impact Thresholds

Residential, commercial, industrial, infrastructure, traffic, and comprehensive-impact requirements.

Participants agreed that requirements should increase with development scale and impact. Numerical thresholds remain unresolved unless expressly identified as an agreed rule.

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Graduated residential standards	Ch. 32, Art. VI	The ordinance largely moves directly from ten or fewer lots to eleven or more, with little distinction between modest and very large development.	Create one or more additional performance tiers so requirements increase with development scale and impact.	Agreed concept; thresholds unresolved	High
Planning Commission consensus	Traffic-study threshold	Ch. 26, §26-5(b); Ch. 32, Art. VI	The existing threshold may impose an expensive study on relatively small projects, but a high threshold could leave material impacts unexamined.	Verify SCDOT standards and establish a County threshold above the minor-subdivision level. The County standard may be more restrictive for County roads.	Research required	High
Planning Commission participants	Numerical traffic thresholds	Ch. 26, §26-5(b)	Numbers between approximately 20 and 50 homes were discussed without verified technical support.	Do not treat any number discussed as selected policy. Obtain authoritative information before choosing the threshold.	Example only	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Cumulative traffic impacts	Ch. 26, §26-5(b); Ch. 32 development standards	Several developments may each remain below a threshold but collectively create substantial traffic and road-capacity impacts.	Develop a method that considers cumulative development, nearby intersections, road condition, sight distance, turning movements, and connected road segments.	Agreed concern; method unresolved	High
Planning Commission participants	Allocation of cumulative road costs	Ch. 26, §26-5(b)	A later applicant could be charged for an improvement necessitated partly by earlier development.	Preserve the issue for later development of a fair allocation method.	Open policy question	Moderate
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Developer-funded road improvements	Ch. 26, §26-5(b)	Development-generated traffic may require turn lanes, intersection changes, capacity improvements, or reconstruction.	Retain the principle that improvements attributable to a development should be funded by the developer rather than general taxpayers.	Existing policy reaffirmed	High
Planning Commission consensus	Commercial thresholds	Ch. 32 nonresidential provisions; Ch. 38 use standards	The ordinance lacks differentiated requirements for a small stand-alone business versus a large commercial center.	Develop multiple commercial performance tiers, likely considering square footage, use, traffic generation, shared facilities, and site impacts.	Research required	High
Planning Commission consensus	Industrial thresholds	Ch. 32 and Ch. 38 nonresidential provisions	Building area alone may not reflect truck activity, utility demand, noise, or operational intensity.	Develop separate industrial thresholds using scale and operational impacts, including truck traffic and infrastructure demand.	Research required	High
Planning Commission participants	Commercial and industrial example numbers	Chs. 32 and 38	Figures such as 6,000 square feet for commercial and 60,000 square feet for industrial were mentioned.	Treat those figures as examples only; no threshold was approved.	Example only	High
Planning Commission participants	Single-family versus multifamily	Chs. 32 and 38	Similar dwelling-unit counts may create different parking, infrastructure, density, and operational effects.	Examine whether residential thresholds should distinguish single-family, multifamily, and mixed-use development.	Open classification issue	Moderate
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Full impact studies	Chs. 26, 32, and 38	Very large developments may affect more than traffic, including utilities, schools, fire protection, emergency services, lighting, and surrounding uses.	Establish a higher threshold requiring a comprehensive impact study.	Agreed concept; threshold unresolved	High
Planning Commission consensus	Impact-study contents	Chs. 26, 32, and 38	“Impact study” is too general and could be interpreted differently by applicants and staff.	Define required components, potentially including traffic, sewer, water, electricity, emergency services, schools, lighting, noise, stormwater, and other use-specific effects.	Agreed drafting requirement	High

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
Planning Commission participants	Regulatory burden	Ch. 32 and Ch. 38 development requirements	Broad study requirements could materially increase costs for smaller or workforce-oriented projects.	Use a relatively high general threshold for full impact studies and avoid imposing disproportionate requirements on ordinary or workforce-housing development.	Agreed policy consideration	Moderate
Planning Commission consensus	PDD impact study	Ch. 38, §38-10.15	A PDD may combine uses, request additional density, and rely on flexible standards.	Require a full impact study for every PDD, regardless of project-size threshold.	Agreed workshop direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Commercial lighting	Ch. 38, Appendix A and applicable standards	Lighting from commercial development may adversely affect adjacent residential property.	Require photometric analysis when applicable and include lighting within the broader impact-study framework.	Agreed concept; applicability unresolved	High
Planning Commission participants	Noise analysis	Ch. 38 use and compatibility standards	Uses such as industrial facilities or data centers can create persistent noise impacts not captured by ordinary site-plan review.	Include noise analysis when the proposed use or development scale warrants it.	Tentative direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Utility-capacity evidence	Ch. 32 development review requirements	A general letter stating that utility service is “available” may not establish that capacity has been committed or secured.	Require stronger evidence at the appropriate review stage, potentially an executed agreement or contract with the utility provider.	Agreed concept; legal details unresolved	High
Planning Commission participants	Shared parking	Ch. 38, Appendix A parking provisions	Different uses may share parking because peak operating periods differ, but current standards may not adequately document the assumptions.	Establish clear shared-parking calculations and traffic-count standards.	Agreed drafting direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Change of use or occupancy	Ch. 38 administrative and parking provisions	A replacement tenant may generate materially different traffic or parking demand than the original approved use.	Require zoning review for a material change of use or occupancy and revalidate parking and traffic compliance.	Tentative direction; legal review appropriate	High

4. Planned Developments, Rezoning, and General Use

PDD minimums, public review, concept plans, General Use, and vested-rights questions.

The discussion favored objective minimum standards and documented impact review while preserving public and legislative review for rezonings and planned developments.

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Minimum PDD standards	Ch. 38, §38-10.15	A highly flexible PDD could allow an applicant to propose its own standards without a sufficient regulatory floor.	Establish non-negotiable minimum requirements for PDDs.	Agreed workshop direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	PDD open space	Ch. 38, §38-10.15	Additional density may be requested without an equivalent public or environmental benefit.	Consider higher open-space requirements and require qualifying open space to remain naturally undisturbed where appropriate.	Agreed concept; percentage unresolved	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	PDD incentive scale	Ch. 38, §38-10.15	A rigid standard may not encourage applicants to provide benefits beyond the minimum.	Consider a sliding scale that permits limited additional density in exchange for additional open space or other defined benefits.	Concept for later consideration	Moderate
Planning Commission consensus	PDD public review	Ch. 38 rezoning and PDD procedures	Concern existed that setting minimum standards might make PDD approval automatic.	Retain staff review, Planning Commission recommendation, County Council action, public notice, and public participation for PDD applications.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Commission participants	Objective standards versus discretionary voting	Ch. 38 administrative and rezoning provisions	Participants want clear, defensible standards and are concerned about decisions becoming solely political “thumbs-up or thumbs-down” judgments.	Make the baseline requirements objective and black-and-white while retaining required public and legislative review for rezonings and PDDs.	Agreed governing principle	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Binding rezoning concept plan	Ch. 38, Art. 8 — specific section to verify	An applicant may secure rezoning with one concept and later construct a materially different project that still fits the new zoning category.	Consider approving a rezoning subject to the submitted concept plan, with a defined minor-change allowance and renewed review for material changes.	Tentative policy direction	High
Planning Commission participants	Public participation and technical merit	Ch. 38 rezoning process	Public opposition may not always reflect comparative traffic, land-use, or infrastructure impacts.	Preserve legally required public participation but base staff and Commission analysis on stated standards and documented impacts.	Governing consideration	Moderate
DeAnn and Planning Commission	General Use District	Ch. 38 zoning matrix and General Use provisions	General Use reportedly permits a broad range of residential, commercial, and industrial activity and is not adequately represented in the use matrix.	Add General Use to the zoning matrix and determine which uses should be allowed, restricted, specially reviewed, or prohibited.	Open policy workstream	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	General Use density and rezoning	Ch. 38 dimensional and use standards	A potential reduction in General Use density could cause major residential development to require rezoning.	Evaluate implications for workload, public review, development rights, and consistency before selecting a density or rezoning rule.	Open policy question	High
Planning Commission participants	Vested rights	Chs. 32 and 38 administrative provisions; state law	Questions arose over whether prior discussion, filing, signatures, expenditure, or approval creates a protected right to proceed.	Clarify the documentation and approvals required to establish vested rights and distinguish informal activity from formal County approval.	Legal verification required	High

5. Data Centers

Interim protection and specialized follow-on ordinance work.

The participants separated an immediate zoning safeguard from the later development of a technically complete data-center ordinance.

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Interim data-center classification	Ch. 38 zoning matrix; §§38-7.2 and 38-10.16, analyst-aligned	The ordinance does not appear to contain a sufficiently specific data-center use or siting standard, particularly in General Use.	Add data centers to the zoning matrix and require a special-exception permit as an interim safeguard.	Agreed workshop direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Long-term data-center ordinance	Ch. 38 — new specialized provisions anticipated	A complete ordinance would need technical treatment of power, water, heat, noise, environmental effects, infrastructure, emergency response, and site retirement.	Defer the comprehensive ordinance until specialized expertise can be obtained. Revisit after the current rewrite.	Agreed deferred workstream	High
Planning Commission participants	Data-center impact components	Ch. 38; applicable utility and environmental provisions	Ordinary development review may not capture the full lifecycle and infrastructure effects of a data center.	Future standards should consider water and power demand, noise, environmental effects, infrastructure capacity, and decommissioning.	Future research scope	High
Planning Commission participants	Current utility availability	Outside direct ordinance control	Participants asserted that current electric or gas capacity may be insufficient for a large facility.	Do not rely on assumed current utility constraints as the County's long-term regulatory safeguard.	Analytical inference from discussion	Moderate

6. Review, Approval, and Administrative Governance

Plan review, quality control, checklists, interpretation authority, appeals, and workshop documentation.

The workshop emphasized consistent procedures, buildability review, a second set of eyes, clear appeal routing, and a documented record of workshop rationale.

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Sketch-plan review	Ch. 32 major-subdivision procedures	The ordinance contains a sketch-plan step, but it reportedly has not always been consistently required.	Enforce sketch-plan review for major subdivisions before the applicant incurs the expense of detailed engineering and studies.	Existing procedure reaffirmed	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Scaled sketch-plan detail	Ch. 32 procedural provisions	A small major subdivision and a large mixed-use development do not require the same level of conceptual detail.	Use a proportionate or sliding level of detail based on project scale and complexity.	Existing practice clarified	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Review sequence	Ch. 32 procedural provisions	Applicants need a clear sequence and clear deliverables.	Retain the general progression of sketch plan, preliminary plan or plat with supporting studies and construction drawings, and final plat.	Existing procedure reaffirmed	High
DeAnn	Detailed lot review	Ch. 32 subdivision review; Ch. 38 dimensional standards	A technically conforming lot may still lack a usable building area because of setbacks, septic placement, topography, or lake requirements.	Review each proposed lot for dimensions, setbacks, buildable area, access, and relevant septic or site constraints.	Existing review responsibility reaffirmed	High
Planning Commission participant	Buildability and consumer protection	Chs. 32 and 38	Prior developments allegedly included lots that could not accommodate a compliant residence.	Ensure subdivision review confirms that proposed lots have a viable building envelope under applicable standards.	Agreed administrative expectation	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Second-level review	Ch. 32 administrative provisions	A single reviewer creates quality-control and continuity risk.	Use a second qualified reviewer when possible, including Roads and Bridges, internal staff, SCDOT, DES, or another responsible agency.	Agreed operating principle	High
DeAnn	Staffing constraint	Administrative rather than ordinance-specific	The Planning Director is currently the only principal reviewer within the Planning office.	Continue cross-department review while building internal capacity for a reliable second set of eyes.	Operating condition noted	High
Planning Commission consensus	Application checklists	Ch. 32 procedural requirements	Current checklists are reportedly incomplete, outdated, inconsistent, or unavailable.	After ordinance adoption, produce public-facing and staff checklists for minor subdivisions, each major-development tier, commercial development, and industrial development.	Agreed post-adoption deliverable	High
Planning Commission consensus	Checklist alignment	Ch. 32 and Ch. 38	A single checklist will not fit every classification or threshold.	Align each checklist with the requirements triggered by the applicable classification and performance tier.	Agreed workshop direction	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Planning Commission interpretation role	Ch. 32 administrative and appeals provisions	Ambiguous provisions have reportedly been handled inconsistently or directed to the wrong body.	Clearly authorize unresolved development-standard interpretations to be placed before the Planning Commission when appropriate.	Agreed direction; legal wording required	High
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Planning Commission versus BZA	Chs. 32 and 38 appeals and variance provisions	The appropriate decision and appeal body depends on whether the matter involves development standards, zoning administration, variance authority, or a quasi-judicial appeal.	Clarify which matters go to the Planning Commission, BZA, County Council, or court. Keep development-design standards under Planning Commission authority where legally appropriate.	Research and legal review required	High
Planning Commission participants	Appeal pathway	Chs. 32 and 38	Sending a matter to the wrong body may change whether the next appeal is internal to the County or proceeds to court.	Make the initial forum and appeal route explicit for each type of decision.	Agreed drafting objective	High

Participant / Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Status	Confidence
Planning Commission consensus	Clerical and agency updates	Chs. 26, 32, and 38	Existing drafts contain outdated terminology, including former agency names and inconsistent technical terms.	Retain previously approved noncontroversial corrections, such as updating DHEC references to DES, unless a substantive issue is identified.	Existing revisions reaffirmed	High
Planning Commission participant	Reserved ordinance sections	Chs. 32 and 38	Some necessary subjects may not be sufficiently developed before the rewrite deadline.	Consider reserving clearly identified sections or line items for later specialized standards rather than forcing incomplete language into the current draft.	Tentative direction	Moderate
DeAnn and Planning Commission	Workshop documentation	Administrative governance	Participants need a defensible record of what was discussed and why directions were selected.	Produce a summary after each workshop documenting issues, rationale, agreements, and unresolved matters for participant validation.	Agreed recurring deliverable	High

7. Consolidated Decisions and Working Directions

The following matters were sufficiently clear to support continued drafting or administrative development, subject to normal legal and technical review:

- A coordinated major/minor subdivision definition structure.
- A ten-lot minor-subdivision limit that includes the remainder parcel.
- Exclusion of subdivisions requiring new public or private roads from minor status.
- Contiguous-parcel and anti-circumvention language.
- A two-year parent-parcel reset tied to the parcel rather than ownership.
- Public-record-based administrative determinations.
- Graduated residential, commercial, and industrial performance tiers.
- Mandatory comprehensive impact studies for PDDs.
- Minimum PDD standards with continued public and legislative review.
- Interim special-exception treatment for data centers.
- Formal enforcement of the major-subdivision sketch-plan process.
- Detailed lot-by-lot review for buildability.
- Classification-specific application checklists after ordinance adoption.
- Clear routing of interpretations, variances, and appeals.
- A written summary after each workshop.

8. Matters Not Yet Decided

These matters should not be represented as settled policy or incorporated as final numeric or legal standards without additional validation:

- The traffic-impact-study threshold.
- The number and boundaries of residential performance tiers.
- Commercial and industrial square-footage or impact thresholds.
- The general full-impact-study threshold and required study contents.
- The method for assigning cumulative road-improvement costs.
- Whether single-family and multifamily projects require separate threshold structures.
- PDD open-space percentages and density incentives.
- General Use density and permitted-use restrictions.
- The degree to which a rezoning should be tied to its concept plan.
- The definitions of guest house, accessory dwelling, dwelling unit, and related rental activity.
- The precise division of authority among the Planning Commission, BZA, County Council, and the courts.
- The final legal definitions of road, street, roadway, drive, and driveway.

9. Illustrative Numbers — Not Adopted

Control Note

The workshop used several numbers to test concepts. None of the figures below should enter draft ordinance language unless independently researched, justified, and affirmatively selected.

- Traffic-study possibilities between roughly 20 and 50 homes.
- A hypothetical 1,000-unit full-impact-study threshold.
- A 6,000-square-foot commercial threshold.
- A 60,000-square-foot industrial threshold.
- PDD examples involving 30% or 40% open space and density adjustments.
- A possible 10% concept-plan deviation allowance.

10. Status

CONTINUE — WITH BOUNDED USE

Use this consolidated matrix as the working register for the Planning Commission Workshop One. Proceed to drafting only for items marked Agreed workshop direction, Working definition or framework, or Existing procedure reaffirmed. Hold numerical thresholds, appeal-pathway changes, General Use restrictions, guest-house classifications, concept-plan controls, and comprehensive data-center standards until the identified research or legal validation is complete.

END OF WORKING REPORT

PLANNING COMMISSION

Workshop Two

Consolidated Issue and Direction Report

Roads, Access, and Infrastructure Responsibility

DOCUMENT STATUS

Working analysis — not formal minutes, adopted ordinance language or Planning Commission action

PREPARED FOR	DeAnn Hester, Planning Director, Planning Commission
MEETING DATE	July 24, 2026
PREPARED	July 28, 2026

Prepared as a structured record of workshop discussion, drafting direction, material qualifications, unresolved questions, and required validation.

Purpose and Use of This Report

USE BOUNDARY

This report is a working register for the Planning Director. It distinguishes matters that are sufficiently clear for continued drafting from matters that remain contested, illustrative, or dependent on legal, engineering, fire-service, ordinance-history, or agency validation.

The workshop was expressly conducted to establish direction for language. Nothing discussed in the session constitutes ordinance adoption, a formal Planning Commission recommendation, or County Council action.

Executive Direction Snapshot

DRAFTING CAN PROCEED

Move §26-2 private-road development standards to Chapter 32; retain §26-6 in Chapter 26; consolidate definitions; structure engineering certification; clarify private-road disclosure, maintenance, and general County acceptance posture.

QUALIFIED OR CONTESTED

Use of an SCDOT-based framework; project-specific right-of-way; proportional burden on smaller projects; the relationship between public-road practice and private subdivision standards; material dissent should remain visible.

VALIDATE BEFORE FINAL LANGUAGE

Road-classification values; exact meaning of the 20-foot minimum; SCDOT/AASHTO editions; verified grandfather date; fire-code requirements; legal authority and appeal implications; the continuing appropriateness of the 11-lot trigger.

ASSIGNED FOLLOW-UP

DeAnn and Kyle develop the road-classification and traffic-study package; verify ordinance history and technical citations; obtain fire-service and County counsel review; produce a validated workshop summary for the full Commission.

Decision Gate

WORKING GATE

Proceed with chapter relocation, coordinated definitions, private-road disclosure, engineering-certification structure, private-maintenance language, and the general road-acceptance posture. Hold final numerical and legal language until the identified technical, legal, fire-service, and ordinance-history validation is complete.

1. Status and Confidence Framework

Agreed workshop direction	Participants clearly concurred on the concept or drafting action.
Working direction with qualification	Drafting may proceed, but material concerns, dissent, or unresolved implementation issues remain.
Tentative drafting direction	The concept was supported, but detail, scope, or enforceability requires refinement.
Existing procedure reaffirmed	Participants retained or clarified an existing practice or policy.
Research required	Additional factual, technical, agency, or ordinance-history work is necessary.
Legal review required	Authority, liability, property rights, appeal routing, or enforceability requires County counsel.
Open policy question	The issue was discussed without a settled direction.
Example only	A number or project was used illustratively and was not adopted.

Confidence Levels

- High — The issue, direction, and status were expressly stated or strongly confirmed by the discussion.
- Moderate — The discussion is clear, but exact ordinance alignment, legal effect, participant intent, or final status requires interpretation.
- Low — The transcript is ambiguous or incomplete. No Low-confidence findings were necessary in this report.

2. Ordinance Structure and Regulatory Authority

Chapter placement, scope, enabling authority, coordinated definitions, and external-reference governance.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and working group	Relocation of private-road standards	Ch. 26, §26-2; Ch. 32 land-development and subdivision regulations	Private-road standards are housed in the Roads and Bridges chapter even though they principally apply when land is subdivided or developed.	Move §26-2 and related private-road development standards into Chapter 32 so subdivision requirements are consolidated in one location.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Director and working group	County road-acceptance provisions	Ch. 26, §26-6	Road acceptance concerns the County road system rather than ordinary subdivision design.	Keep the County road-acceptance provisions in Chapter 26.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Director	Scope of Chapter 32 road standards	Ch. 32 — new or relocated provisions	Existing language may be read to regulate any private access road, including a farm road unrelated to development.	Clarify that the relocated standards apply to roads created or materially altered in connection with land development or subdivision.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Authority over private-road standards	Ch. 26, §26-2; state enabling authority referenced but not identified precisely	A participant questioned whether state law prevents the County from regulating private roads. The Planning Director stated that other enabling provisions authorize private-road development standards.	Preserve County regulation of private subdivision roads, but confirm the specific statutory authority during legal review.	Legal review required	Moderate
Planning Director and working group	Definitions following chapter relocation	Ch. 32 definitions	Terms used in the relocated provisions may not currently be defined in Chapter 32 or may be defined differently in Chapter 38.	Add all necessary private-road, road-classification, drive, driveway, and related definitions to Chapter 32 and coordinate them across chapters.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	External technical references	Chs. 26 and 32	The ordinance refers to external manuals without always identifying the edition or whether future updates apply automatically.	State the controlling manual and edition clearly. Prefer an adopted edition rather than automatically incorporating every future revision unless the County intentionally chooses otherwise.	Tentative drafting direction	Moderate

3. Private-Road Design, Construction, and Right-of-Way

Engineering framework, dissent, dimensional clarity, project-specific right-of-way, certification, and prospective application.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director, Roads and Bridges representative, and working group	Private-road design standard	Ch. 26, §26-2(c), proposed relocation to Ch. 32	Earlier draft revisions removed references tying private-road design to public-road criteria, potentially leaving insufficient design guidance.	Require private subdivision roads to be engineered using the applicable SCDOT roadway-design framework, subject to County-defined minimums and classifications.	Working direction with qualification	High
Planning Commission participant	Material dissent regarding SCDOT framework	Ch. 26, §26-2(c)	A participant questioned applying public-road design principles to private property, particularly when prior Commission work had reduced right-of-way requirements.	Carry the proposed SCDOT-based approach forward for full Planning Commission consideration, while preserving the objection and rationale in the workshop record.	Material dissent recorded	High
Working group	Minimum width	Ch. 26, §26-2	The discussion repeatedly referred to a 20-foot minimum, but participants alternated among pavement width, drivable width, fire-access width, and right-of-way width.	Retain a 20-foot floor while using project-specific engineering for additional width.	Working direction; drafting ambiguity	High
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Project-specific right-of-way	Ch. 26, §26-2; proposed Ch. 32	A fixed right-of-way may not account for terrain, drainage, fills, cuts, clear zones, curves, sidewalks, or maintenance access.	Allow the engineer to establish the required right-of-way based on site and road design, subject to the County minimum and identified design standard.	Working direction with qualification	High
Planning Commission participant	Predictability of project-specific standards	Proposed Ch. 32	Applicants may not know the required right-of-way until an engineer completes the design, and different engineers may reach different conclusions.	Require the engineer to document and certify the design basis. Consider explanatory tables or guidance so applicants can understand likely requirements earlier.	Open implementation issue	High
Roads and Bridges representative	Purpose of right-of-way	Proposed Ch. 32	Some discussion treated right-of-way primarily as a utility easement.	Clarify that right-of-way also supports drainage, clear zones, slopes, shoulders, maintenance, sight distance, pedestrian facilities, and safe road operation.	Agreed technical clarification	High
Planning Director and working group	Road-design versus road-construction standards	Ch. 26, §26-2(c)(3)–(4)	The SCDOT roadway-design manual addresses geometry and design, while actual construction methods and materials require separate treatment.	Separate the design requirement from the construction requirement.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Construction certification	Proposed Ch. 32 private-road standards	The draft may specify pavement and base requirements without requiring a professional to certify that construction complied with the plans.	Require an appropriately qualified engineer to certify that the road was constructed according to the approved design and sound engineering principles.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Use of SCDOT construction specifications	Proposed Ch. 32	Full incorporation of the extensive SCDOT highway-construction specifications may be excessive for every private subdivision road.	Evaluate whether engineer certification and selected construction standards can provide adequate protection without incorporating the entire specification manual.	Open drafting question	Moderate
Planning Director	Professional certification responsibilities	Ch. 32 plan and plat procedures	Engineers and surveyors have different professional responsibilities; some certifications are currently placed on documents that the named professional may not appropriately sign.	Assign design and construction certifications to engineers and plat or boundary certifications to surveyors.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Working group	Existing private-road condition versus new construction	Proposed Ch. 32	Applying contemporary design requirements to existing roads could create disproportionate burdens or require acquisition of additional property.	Apply new design standards prospectively to new or materially expanded development, subject to a clearly drafted grandfathering provision.	Tentative direction	Moderate

4. Road Classifications and Development Thresholds

County classification structure, controlling thresholds, follow-up ownership, proportionality, and anti-circumvention concerns.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Road classifications	Ch. 26 road-classification provisions; proposed relocation to Ch. 32 for development roads	The ordinance and external manuals may use different thresholds for local-minor, local-major, collector, and other classifications.	Develop a definitive County classification table for subdivision roads and connect each classification to the applicable standards.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Director	Classification presentation	Proposed Ch. 32	Applicants cannot readily determine which road classification applies.	Present the classifications in a clear table or graphic showing traffic volume and applicable design obligations.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Roads and Bridges representative and Planning Director	County versus AASHTO thresholds	Ch. 26 and external design references	County language reportedly uses a lower traffic level for certain local roads than AASHTO-based classifications, creating conflict during review.	State expressly which County classification controls and avoid leaving reviewers to choose between conflicting thresholds.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Follow-up ownership	Proposed Ch. 32	The final road-classification values and language were not completed during the workshop.	DeAnn and Kyle will develop and package proposed classifications for further review.	Research and drafting assigned	High
Working group	Eleven-lot trigger for road standards	Chs. 26 and 32; relationship to major-subdivision definition	The current structure applies major-subdivision road requirements beginning with the eleventh lot. Participants disagreed over whether that remains proportionate under the proposed engineering standard.	No final decision. Evaluate whether 11 remains the appropriate trigger or whether a graduated road-standard structure is warranted.	Open policy question	High
Planning Director	Circumvention risk	Ch. 32 subdivision standards	A higher road-design threshold could allow a larger project to be divided into multiple smaller subdivisions, each using a lower road standard.	Any graduated standard must contain aggregation or anti-circumvention provisions so related phases and contiguous projects are evaluated together.	Agreed concern; method unresolved	High
Planning Commission participant	Small-project burden	Proposed Ch. 32	Requiring the same engineering approach for an 11-lot project and a major master-planned development may be disproportionate.	Examine an intermediate tier rather than assuming the current 11-lot distinction is sufficient for all road requirements.	Open policy question	High
Working group	Historical numerical examples	Chs. 26 and 32	The discussion included 400, 800, and approximately 1,200 daily trips, as well as a general estimate of ten trips per single-family residence.	Treat these numbers as analytical examples until the County confirms the controlling source and affirmatively adopts a classification table.	Example only	High

5. Traffic Studies, Capacity, and Developer Responsibility

Study scope, graduated requirements, cumulative effects, road improvements, and County review of professional submissions.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Traffic-impact studies	Ch. 26, §26-5; related Ch. 32 development standards	Existing requirements do not consistently define the study scope, road classification, or review standard.	Rewrite the traffic-study requirements to identify exactly what must be evaluated and which County standards control.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Graduated study requirements	Ch. 26, §26-5; proposed Ch. 32	A full study may be disproportionate for a modest development but insufficiently detailed for a large project.	Use graduated requirements based on project size, trip generation, affected roads, and likely impacts.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Planning Director	Study threshold	Ch. 26, §26-5	The current ordinance reportedly requires a study for developments exceeding ten units on affected County roads, while earlier workshop discussion contemplated a higher or graduated trigger.	Confirm and adopt the threshold during later drafting. No numerical threshold was finalized.	Open policy question	High
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	County-required study content	Chs. 26 and 32	SCDOT studies may focus principally on intersection level of service and state requirements rather than the full information the County needs.	Require County studies to address additional County concerns rather than relying solely on the minimum DOT scope.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Potential study components	Chs. 26 and 32	Basic trip counts may not capture the full impact.	Consider road condition, road classification, sight distance, intersections, turning movements, access design, cumulative traffic, distribution of trips, and required improvements.	Tentative drafting direction	High
Planning Director and working group	Cumulative impacts	Chs. 26 and 32	Several developments may individually remain below a threshold while collectively affecting the same road corridor.	Develop an approach for considering cumulative and phased development impacts.	Agreed concern; method unresolved	High
Working group	Allocation of traffic	Ch. 26, §26-5	A project with access to more than one road will not place every generated trip on each road.	Require the traffic analysis to document directional trip distribution rather than assigning all trips to every access road.	Existing technical practice reaffirmed	High
Working group	Developer-funded studies	Ch. 26, §26-5	The County requires technical information because the development creates the potential impact.	Continue requiring the developer to retain and pay the qualified traffic professional.	Existing procedure reaffirmed	High
Planning Director and working group	Developer-funded improvements	Ch. 26, §26-5	Development may require turn lanes, intersection improvements, road reconstruction, or other upgrades.	Retain the principle that improvements attributable to the development are the developer's responsibility rather than a general taxpayer burden.	Existing policy reaffirmed	High
Roads and Bridges representative	County review of stamped studies	Ch. 26, §26-5	County staff may receive an engineer-stamped study based on a classification or threshold inconsistent with the ordinance.	Clarify the controlling classifications so staff can evaluate the study against an express County standard.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Specific projects discussed	Not project-specific ordinance provisions	Large developments and existing corridors were used to test how the proposed standards might operate.	Do not treat workshop estimates, project sizes, traffic counts, or improvement assumptions as findings about any pending project.	Example only	High

6. Road Acceptance, Connectivity, and Recorded Responsibilities

County acceptance posture, public benefit, private-road disclosure, future acceptance, and access beyond the development.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and working group	General County acceptance posture	Ch. 26, §26-6	The County has expressed that it does not intend routinely to accept subdivision roads serving only the subdivision.	Preserve a presumption that ordinary internal subdivision roads remain private.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Exceptions for public benefit	Ch. 26, §26-6	Some development roads may provide regional connectivity, secondary access, or meaningful public transportation value.	Preserve an avenue for County acceptance when the road provides a demonstrated public benefit and County Council chooses to accept it.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Dead-end roads	Ch. 26, §26-6	A road ending within one subdivision generally serves a limited population and provides little network benefit.	Do not ordinarily accept dead-end internal subdivision roads. Give greater consideration to through routes or roads with multiple connections.	Tentative acceptance criterion	High
Planning Director	Prior proposed acceptance language	Ch. 26, §26-6	Kyle previously prepared road-acceptance language for Council, but it was not incorporated into the workshop copy.	Incorporate that prior language into the working draft for review.	Drafting follow-up assigned	High
Working group	Private-road status disclosure	Ch. 32 plat requirements	Purchasers have reportedly been told that a road would eventually become County-maintained when that status was uncertain.	Require plats and related development records to state clearly when roads are private and who is responsible for maintenance.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Roads intended for future acceptance	Chs. 26 and 32	Existing language may create a back door by implying that a private road will later be accepted without full design, testing, inspection, or Council action.	Distinguish clearly between roads that will remain private and roads specifically designed and documented for a future acceptance request.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Planning Director	Final-plat wording	Ch. 32 final-plat provisions	Language stating that roads “will be constructed” is inappropriate on a final plat if construction must already be complete.	Revise the certification language to reflect the actual stage of construction and approval.	Agreed drafting direction	High
Working group	Roads serving property outside the development	Ch. 26, §26-2; proposed Ch. 32	Prior language prohibited a private road from serving property outside the development, potentially preventing logical connectivity or future access.	Maintain the deletion of the categorical prohibition and address external access through the approved design.	Working direction	Moderate
Working group	Private right-of-way and public access	Private easement and property law; precise ordinance location unresolved	Participants questioned whether a private right-of-way automatically grants public access.	Do not characterize private right-of-way as public access. Any public-use, easement, or maintenance rights must be established through recorded instruments and legal authority.	Legal clarification required	Moderate

7. Drives, Driveways, Grandfathering, and Fire Access

Objective grandfathering, upgrade triggers, dimensional terminology, fire-service validation, and lot-versus-dwelling treatment.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Inconsistent grandfathering	Ch. 26, §26-2; proposed Ch. 32	Planning and Roads and Bridges have historically interpreted grandfathering differently.	Replace the broad grandfathering clause with an objective date and clearly stated triggering conditions.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Grandfathering date	Ch. 26, §26-2	Participants believed the relevant standard was adopted in 2008, possibly December 16, but did not verify the controlling enactment date.	Use the actual adoption date of the applicable drive and driveway standard after confirming the ordinance history.	Research required	High
Working group	Existing accesses	Ch. 26, §26-2	An access existing before the standards were adopted may not be capable of meeting modern width or fire-access requirements without substantial impact.	Treat qualifying accesses existing and in use before the verified adoption date as grandfathered.	Tentative drafting direction	High
Working group	Post-adoption changes	Ch. 26, §26-2	If grandfathered it is unclear when adding lots or dwellings causes a driveway to become a drive or a drive to become a road.	State when a change in use, lot count, or classification requires an upgrade.	Agreed drafting objective; trigger unresolved	High
Planning Director and working group	Reduced private-drive width	Ch. 26, §26-2	Prior Commission revisions reportedly reduced the private-drive right-of-way requirement from 50 feet to 20 feet.	Retain the previously proposed 20-foot minimum while clarifying whether it measures access width, fire lane, pavement, or right-of-way.	Working direction; ambiguity remains	High
Roads and Bridges representative	Long driveway and fire-service access	Ch. 26, §26-2; applicable fire code	A technical concern was raised about supplying fire protection along very long, narrow accesses, including an illustrative 1,000-foot distance.	Obtain direct input from the responsible fire chiefs and identify the controlling fire-code sections before setting a maximum distance or width standard.	Research required	High
Working group	Fire and insurance warning	Ch. 26, §26-2	A participant suggested notifying property owners that a substandard access might affect emergency response or insurance. Others noted that such a warning could affect uninvolved owners.	Do not adopt a warning provision without legal and fire-service review.	Legal and technical review required	High
Working group	Fire-code citation	Ch. 26, §26-2; proposed Ch. 32	Generic references to “current fire codes” do not tell an applicant which standard applies.	Cite the applicable adopted fire-code provisions specifically.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Working group	Lots versus dwellings	Ch. 26, §26-2; Ch. 32 definitions	Counting dwellings can cause a guest house, accessory residence, or apartment over a garage to alter the access classification even though the number of lots has not changed.	Use “lots” where lot count is the intended trigger and separately regulate actual occupancy or dwelling impacts where necessary.	Agreed workshop direction	High

8. Bridges, Culverts, Drainage, Signs, and Maintenance

Structural certification, signage, inspection allocation, stormwater references, encroachment permits, and private maintenance.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Private bridges and culverts	Ch. 26, §26-2; proposed Ch. 32	The ordinance may require a weight limit without a defined verification process.	Require engineered design and certification for bridges or major culverts, particularly where perennial streams or emergency-vehicle loading are involved.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Weight-limit signs	Proposed Ch. 32	The County has not routinely inspected whether required signs were installed.	Require the applicant to provide evidence that the appropriate load or warning signage has been installed.	Agreed workshop direction	High
Working group	Allocation of inspection responsibility	Proposed Ch. 32	A requirement without a named verification method could create an implied County inspection duty.	State whether compliance is verified through engineer certification, applicant documentation, County inspection, or another identified process.	Agreed drafting objective	High
Working group	Drainage from private access	Proposed Ch. 32	Private drives and roads must shed water without damaging the access or adjacent property.	Retain language requiring appropriate drainage features consistent with accepted road-construction practice.	Existing revision reaffirmed	High
Working group	Stormwater references	Proposed Ch. 32	A generic reference to “all applicable regulations” leaves applicants uncertain about the controlling standard.	Cite the specific applicable South Carolina DES stormwater-control manual or program. Verify the exact title and acronym before drafting.	Agreed direction; citation verification required	High
Working group	Traffic-control devices	Proposed Ch. 32	Road and warning signs require a recognized design and placement standard.	Reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and identify the adopted edition.	Tentative drafting direction	Moderate
Working group	Encroachment permits	Chs. 26 and 32	An access connecting to an existing public road may require a County or state encroachment permit.	State that the applicable encroachment permit is required when the project connects to a regulated public road.	Tentative drafting direction	High
Roads and Bridges representative	Private maintenance responsibility	Proposed Ch. 32	Wording may imply that the County verifies or performs ongoing maintenance.	State that maintenance responsibility rests with the private owner, association, or other recorded responsible party and does not create an ongoing County maintenance duty.	Agreed drafting objective	High

9. Secondary Issues Identified During the Workshop

Nonconforming structures, prior approvals, as-built verification, right-of-way records, and related Chapter 26 revisions.

Participant or Group	Topic	Current Ordinance Chapter / Section	Existing Condition or Issue	Workshop Direction	Workshop Status	Confidence
Planning Director	Structures affected by later right-of-way changes	Ch. 38 nonconforming-structure provisions	A lawfully permitted house may later fall within a setback because a right-of-way expands or is conveyed.	Clarify that a structure lawfully constructed under the standards applicable at the time is a lawful nonconforming structure rather than an ordinance violation.	Research and drafting required	High
Planning Director	Erroneously approved structures	Ch. 38 nonconforming provisions	A prior County approval may have been issued incorrectly, but the owner relied on it.	Develop language addressing good-faith reliance on a County-issued approval and distinguish it from construction without a permit.	Legal review required	Moderate
Planning Director	As-built surveys	Ch. 38 and permit-review procedures	A blanket as-built requirement for every addition or structure may impose unnecessary cost.	Evaluate targeted verification where construction is close to multiple setbacks, preferably before footings or vertical construction create substantial sunk cost.	Open policy question	Moderate
Planning Director and Roads and Bridges representative	Current right-of-way documentation	Chs. 26 and 38	Older plats may not reflect later right-of-way conveyances or changes.	Continue coordinating with Roads and Bridges when the current right-of-way cannot be established from the recorded plat alone.	Existing procedure reaffirmed	High
Planning Director	Public-road-standard revisions	Ch. 26	Kyle identified additional revisions to the public-road provisions that were not fully reviewed during the session.	Incorporate the proposed changes into a later draft for Commission review, provided they remain within the comprehensive Chapter 26 assignment.	Follow-up drafting required	Moderate

10. Consolidated Working Directions

The following matters were sufficiently clear to support continued drafting or structured follow-up, subject to normal legal and technical review:

- Move private subdivision-road standards from §26-2 to Chapter 32.
- Keep County road-acceptance provisions in Chapter 26.
- Consolidate and coordinate road, private road, drive, and driveway definitions.
- Use a recognized SCDOT-based roadway-design framework for new private subdivision roads, subject to the recorded qualification and later Commission review.
- Separate design requirements from construction requirements and require appropriate engineering certification.
- Establish an explicit County road-classification table and connect each classification to applicable design and study obligations.
- Expand and graduate traffic-study requirements while preserving developer responsibility for studies and attributable improvements.
- Preserve the general policy that internal subdivision roads remain private, with selective County acceptance only for demonstrated public benefit.
- Require clear recorded disclosure of private-road status and maintenance responsibility.
- Replace ambiguous grandfathering language with an objective date and trigger.
- Verify fire-access requirements before setting access-length or width rules.
- Require engineered bridge or culvert documentation and proof of required signage.
- Replace vague references to external standards with precise, edition-controlled citations.
- Clarify treatment of lawfully existing structures affected by later right-of-way changes.

11. Matters Not Yet Decided

CONTROL POINT

These items should not be represented as settled policy or incorporated as final numeric, technical, or legal standards until the identified validation is complete.

- Whether 11 lots remains the correct trigger for fully engineered private-road standards.
- Whether intermediate road-design tiers should be established.
- The final local-minor, local-major, and collector traffic thresholds.
- Whether 400, 800, or approximately 1,200 trips should control any classification.
- The precise traffic-study trigger and required contents at each tier.
- The method for considering and assigning cumulative road-improvement costs.
- Whether the 20-foot minimum refers to pavement, drivable surface, fire lane, clear width, or right-of-way.
- The applicable SCDOT roadway-design-manual edition and whether the full construction specifications should be incorporated.
- The verified grandfathering date and the trigger for upgrading an existing access.
- The maximum permissible length of a driveway or drive and the exact fire-code provisions.
- The detailed criteria for County acceptance of a development road.
- The complete treatment of access roads serving property outside the original development.
- The legal treatment of structures approved incorrectly by prior County staff.

12. Illustrative Numbers and Examples — Not Adopted

NOT ADOPTED

The workshop used numbers and projects to test the framework. Except where specifically described as a working floor, those examples are not approved thresholds, factual findings, or drafting instructions.

- 32-foot road-envelope example.
- 40-, 50-, 100-, or 120-home examples.
- 400-, 800-, and approximately 1,200-trip classification examples.
- Ten daily trips per single-family residence as a general planning assumption.
- A 1,000-foot fire-access concern.
- Specific development sizes, corridor traffic estimates, and road-expansion assumptions used to test the proposed framework.

13. Decision Gate

CONTINUE WITH CONTROLS

Use this assessment as the working issue-and-direction register for Planning Commission Workshop Two. Proceed with the chapter relocation, coordinated definitions, disclosure requirements, engineering-certification structure, private-maintenance language, and general acceptance posture. Pause final drafting of numerical thresholds, the 20-foot dimensional provision, grandfathering, fire-access requirements, road classifications, external-manual citations, and the 11-lot trigger until legal, engineering, fire-service, and ordinance-history validation is complete.