

OUR VIEW

Tabling Cane Creek II works

The Oconee County Planning Commission may have done every county resident a favor this week by deciding it needed more time to review citizen comments regarding the latest Cane Creek rezoning request.

Almost certainly, Advocates for Quality Development president Jim Codner, who is running point on the request, would disagree. So may many of the lake area residents who signed the 980-parcel petition. In their opinion this is probably just more foot-dragging by an uncooperative Planning Commission.

We don't agree with those planners who oppose zoning in principle and have said that before. The county has a zoning ordinance and they should fulfill their statutory responsibility under that act.

However, we happen to think that's exactly what they were doing this week when they put Cane Creek II on hold.

First, there are people opposed to the petition and they should be heard to the extent that the Commission wants to

listen. Secondly, that opposition should be considered in the context of the unresolved lawsuit inspired by the first Cane Creek petition. The issues in that lawsuit could, if found to have merit, impact subsequent petitions involving the same property owners, as Cane Creek II does.

Tabling the issue is given further credence by the mere suggestion by Codner that those opposed be zoned "agricultural residential," the very category of zoning at the heart of the current lawsuit; the very category whose language county emails would suggest was practically written by Codner, who also ran point on Cane Creek I.

In fact, the Planning Commission may want to consider recommending to County Council that they wait on final reading of Cane Creek II until the current legal issues are resolved. Why approve another rezoning that may be tainted and could give rise to even more litigation — the costs of which would be paid by all county taxpayers.