OCONEE COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
415 S. Pine St. Walhalla, SC 29691
864.638.4218
OconeeSC.com
planninginfo@oconeesc.com

COMMISSION MEMBERS

David Nix, District 2
Brit Adams, District 3
Mike Johnson, At-Large
Absent – Teresa Spicer, District 1
Mickey Haney, At- Large
Joe Fravel, District 4
Jake Marcengill, District 5

STAFF
DeAnn Hester

MINUTES

6:00 pm, Monday November 2nd, 2026
Oconee County Council Chambers

1. Call to Order – Chairman Nix called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
2. Invocation was led by Mr. Fravel
3. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Adams
4. Approval of minutes from, 2026 – Mr. Haney made a motion to approve the minutes; Seconded by Mr. Fravel; Approved unanimously.
5. Public Comment for *Non-Agenda Items* (4 minutes per person): Mr. Brent Little, President and CEO of Fountain Residential Partners, thanked County staff and partnering agencies for their assistance with the recently completed Treehouse Apartments development. He described the investment in sewer and water infrastructure and invited Commission members to tour the property.
6. Commission Member Comments: None
7. Staff Comments: Mrs. Hester stated that she had not had sufficient time to review the materials presented that evening and therefore was not prepared to discuss them as fully as she would like or identify all questions she might have. She also advised that, under an ordinance adopted by County Council recently, all Planning Commission members would need to be sworn in. She stated that she would include the swearing-in on the next regular meeting agenda.
8. Discussion regarding revisions to Chapters 26, Road & Bridges, Chapter 32, Unified Performance Standards & Chapter 38, Zoning
    a. Public Comment: Tom Markovitch raised concerns about proposed

road acceptance classifications and the effect on local subdivision roads. The speaker questioned changes to provisions addressing developer reimbursement for road improvements and expressed concern that associated requirements could constitute an improper impact fee. The speaker also questioned driveway connection charges, foundation landscaping requirements due to fire risk, and parking requirements for student housing, and stated that public hearings were required before the Planning Commission and County Council for subdivision regulation amendments.

b. Discussion / Vote: Chairman Nix explained that he had prepared an alternate draft of Chapters 26, 32, and 38 using the existing ordinances and some of the staff-prepared language. He stated that his draft omitted some editorial changes and that Commission members had difficulty identifying revisions from one version to the next. He acknowledged that the Commission had not clearly communicated expectations for full-chapter drafts, marked revisions, and descriptions of changes. Chairman Nix made a motion to hold a meeting on November 16, 2026, to review and reconcile the staff-prepared and alternate drafts, consider additional comments, and return for a vote. Seconded by Mr. Johnson.

   Mrs. Hester asked how the Commission intended to resolve differences between provisions previously voted on and language in the alternate draft. She stated that some comments received after earlier meetings did not match previous Commission decisions and that she had prepared a list of items needing clarification.

   Mr. Johnson expressed a preference for Commission members to submit proposed changes directly to Chairman Nix for incorporation rather than having staff manage the revisions. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Johnson why he wanted the changes routed through Chairman Nix instead of staff. Mr. Johnson explained that he was concerned about decisions and revisions not appearing consistently in successive drafts and believed Chairman Nix's approach would make it easier to identify and track individual changes.

   Mrs. Hester responded that the drafting process had been complicated by changes in direction during workshops and regular meetings, as well as changes requested by County Council. She cited repeated consideration of subdivision thresholds, lot size and density standards, and private roadway widths. She explained that changes to one

provision often affected other sections and that the staff draft reflected efforts to implement Commission direction, not a refusal to incorporate it. She also noted that previously voted-upon landscape and buffer provisions were not fully reflected in the alternate draft. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the Commission had not provided sufficiently clear directions about how changes should be presented. He discussed difficulty comparing drafts that omitted unchanged portions, used different page numbering, or marked entire paragraphs when only a few words had changed. He stated that Chairman Nix's proposed method would make revisions easier to review. Mrs. Hester explained that she had furnished redline and blueline versions in response to prior requests and that some editorial and cross-reference revisions were intended to correct unclear or inconsistent language in the existing ordinances. She identified differences in previously discussed private-access widths as an example of direction still needing clarification.

Chairman Nix reiterated that individual comments would be reviewed and either incorporated or addressed in a written response. He stated that each updated version would include a clean copy, a redline comparison, and a revised description of changes. He said the materials would be provided to staff for distribution to Commission members to avoid deliberation among a quorum outside a public meeting. Chairman Nix discussed the landscape and buffer requirements as one area needing further work. He explained that his alternate draft largely copied existing Appendix A language from Chapter 38 into Chapter 32, whereas the staff draft had reorganized those provisions for application to major subdivisions. He stated that he and Mrs. Hester would work to reconcile the language before the next meeting.

Mr. Johnson asked how conflicting comments would be handled, including whether proposals based on individual preferences would be identified for additional discussion. Chairman Nix stated that he would decide which suggestions to incorporate into the working version and explain the disposition of others. Members also questioned whether previously approved language would be retained.

After further discussion, Chairman Nix called for a vote on his motion to hold a November 16 meeting. Approved unanimously.
Following the vote, Chairman Nix opened the floor for further

discussion. He referred to Mr. Haney's request to hear staff's outstanding concerns about the drafts. Mrs. Hester stated that she had not been afforded adequate time to review the alternate draft and would provide additional comments after doing so. Chairman Nix and members discussed submitting those comments through the proposed revision process.

Chairman Nix further explained how updated documents would be numbered and circulated and how individual comments would be addressed. When a member asked how differing suggestions for the same provision would be handled, Chairman Nix stated that he would select language for the working draft and explain his decision. Questions were raised about whether this procedure would leave sufficient opportunity for full Commission discussion.

Mrs. Hester expressed her professional disagreement with the proposed process. She stated that it could set aside work already completed and reduce opportunities for Commission members to discuss proposed changes together. She advised that staff would proceed as directed but wished to have her concern reflected in the record.

The Commission also discussed the previously considered minor and major subdivision thresholds. Members expressed differing recollections of whether the ten-lot minor subdivision limit, with major subdivisions beginning at eleven lots, had been approved and whether the threshold should be revisited. No motion to change the threshold was made at this meeting.

Chairman Nix stated that the November 16 meeting was intended to allow the Commission to consider the revised materials and take an up-or-down vote. Neither the staff-prepared nor alternate ordinance draft was voted on at the November 2 meeting.

9. Adjourn – The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 6:52 PM.