

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2002 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Wayne Stewart, Chairman
Lamar Cole, Vice Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Perry Fields (Arrived at 11 a.m.)
Hal Hart
Ann McCormick
Jonathan Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Commissioner Henri Woodman
County Attorney Gary Moore

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
Lee Sutton, Planning Official
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Wayne Stewart called the meeting to order. He welcomed everyone to the first Planning Commission meeting of the New Year and briefly reviewed the rules and regulations. Chairman Stewart strongly emphasized that if an application is incomplete, it will not be heard by the Planning Commission. Also, if a representative is not in attendance when an item is called, the item will be placed toward the end of the agenda and recalled pending arrival of a representative. If no one appears, the item will not be heard by the Planning Commission.

At this time, Chairman Stewart asked if there were any requests for deferral or withdrawal of agenda items. Mr. Tyler Frazier stated that the agent for the Preliminary Plat of Talaxe Lake Subdivision (*Item #9*) requested a deferral until the February 5th Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Sammy Tostensen stated that he would like to defer *Items 4, 5 and 6 (GC-2001-35; GC-2001-36; GC-2001-37)* for 30 days in order to consult with the neighbors and staff before proceeding. Mr. Frazier stated that Parcel CR-3 was inadvertently omitted from Agenda Item 19 (Golden Isles Gateway Tract). He requested to add Parcel CR-3 as item *19 b*) at this time. Request was granted.

SUP-01-09

Request for special use permit for a medical hardship, property located at 311 N. Goodbread Road. Property owned by Mamie Bowers.

Ms. Mamie Bowers was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages as follows:

When the medical hardship no longer exists, the special use expires and the mobile home is to be removed from the property. The rental of the mobile home shall be prohibited. Renewal may be obtained for additional two (2) year periods at the discretion of the County Commission if the same hardship continues to exist. Staff's recommendation is for approval. A copy of a letter from Dr. Benjamin E. Moore confirming Ms. Bowers' medical problems was included in the packages for review.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

SUP-01-10

Request for Special Use Permit for a restaurant, property located at 410 Mallory Street. Property owned by Wells Investments, L.L.C.

Mr. Wesley Carroll was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Carolynn Segers as follows:

The applicant is requesting a special use permit in a GC-Core/VP District for a restaurant as required by Article VII, Section 715.3 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. In accordance with Article VI, Section 619.5, site plan approval is required. Additional detail is needed in the Village Preservation application (VP01-19) in regards to signage, parking, color scheme and lighting.

Mrs. Segers stated that staff's recommendation is for denial until the application is resubmitted with a completed Village Preservation and Site Plan application.

At this time, Mr. Wesley Carroll requested that this application be deferred until the February 5th Planning Commission meeting. Agenda Item 21 (VP01-19) was also deferred in that it coincides with the applicant's special use permit application.

GC-2001-33

Request to rezone from LC Limited Commercial to GC General Commercial, 0.961 acres, described as the northeast corner of Altama Avenue and Baybridge Drive; the parcel having 155.69 feet of frontage on Altama Avenue. Property owned by Jack E. Cauley.

Mr. Jack Cauley was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Segers as follows: Staff's recommendation is for approval.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Proposed use as a beauty school includes a limit on number of students, and size of parcel effectively limits many higher intensity uses.

- Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property;

No, provided required buffers between residential and commercial land uses are put in place. Buffers required as part of 1975 rezoning (GC-24-75).

- Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned;

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools;

Intensity of development is limited by size of the parcel.

- Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan;

Yes.

- Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for approval or disapproval;

Buffer requirement is part of the rezoning to Local Commercial (GC-24-75) and need for buffer continues to be appropriate between residential and commercial land use classifications.

Mr. Cauley gave a brief presentation. He stated that this type of beauty school can only have 20 students and is governed more by state rules and regulations rather than by the county. He pointed out that according to state rules, he is required to have at least 50 parking spaces. Mr. Cauley stated that he is soliciting approval of his request.

Mr. George Metz of 111 Baybridge Drive was present to oppose this request. He stated that the area is residential and should remain as such. He expressed concerns about traffic and excessive parking for only 20 students. He stated that he is concerned about juveniles loitering in the parking lot once the school is closed.

Mr. Jack Hutchinson of 113 Baybridge Drive expressed concerns about the buffer. He stated that his home is his major investment and he doesn't want to see it depreciated. He further stated that in this case, one individual would benefit while others are negatively impacted.

For clarification, Chairman Stewart reminded the property owners that the property in question is already zoned commercial. The applicant is trying to change the zoning from Local Commercial to General Commercial and he has every right to request a zoning change of his property.

Mrs.Carolynn Segers stated that there was a degree of confusion regarding the correct zoning of this property; which is why the property was first posted and advertised with a residential designation. When staff realized this mistake, the application was pulled from the December 4, 2001 Planning Commission meeting and re-advertised with the correct zoning designation of Local Commercial. She explained that very close records check revealed that a number of lots fronting on Altama were zoned to Local Commercial in 1975. There was also action taken to zone a middle section of the area back to residential. However, the applicant's property retained its Local Commercial status. In an effort to clarify concerns about the buffer, Mrs. Segers read the definition of a buffer as outlined in Article III, Section 302 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Deloris Miller, adjacent property owner was present to oppose this request. She is against having a commercial development encroach into a residential neighborhood. She also complained that as an adjacent property owner, she did not receive a written notice about this request. Mr. Sutton stated that an advertisement was placed in the Brunswick News 15 days prior to the meeting and a sign was posted on the property in accordance with guidelines of the ordinance. He also referenced Section 1105.1 d), which states that “the Zoning Administrator, shall in the case of a proposed amendment...use his or her *best efforts* to mail notice of public hearing to all property owners of record within 200 feet of the property sought to be rezoned, as their names appear on the records of the Glynn County Board of Tax Assessors.” Attorney Gary Moore agreed with staff and added that all legal requirements were met.

For the benefit of the residents, Chairman Stewart read the list of permitted uses allowed under the Local Commercial Zoning District. Mr. Sutton explained that before obtaining a building permit for any of the permitted uses, a site plan would have to be reviewed. Staff has just been made aware that Mr. Cauley is proposing 50 parking spaces, etc. and staff questions how much can go in to the .9 acres and still meet all of the requirements prior to a building permit being issued.

Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Cauley if the state law requires him to have 50 parking spaces. Mr. Cauley replied that the state infers that it is an ideal situation to have 50 parking spaces. Chairman Stewart asked if there is a site plan for this application. Mrs. Segers replied yes, but it was inadvertently omitted from the packages. She then presented the site plan for review.

Mr. Roy Miller of 100 Kensington Drive and Mr. Charles Norman of 106 Kensington Drive were also present to speak in opposition of this request. They expressed concerns about the buffer and how this rezoning would negatively impact the value of their property.

Mr. Hal Hart stated that when the Board of Commissioners passed the motion in 1975, they stated that all site plans of each potential Local Commercial use or a portion of the subject property shall be subject to review by the Glynn County Joint Planning Commission and approved by the Glynn County Commission prior to issuance of a building permit. Mr. Hart stated that General Commercial does not require a site plan. However, since Local Commercial does require a site plan, he would like an opportunity to review a site plan that shows provisions for a buffer, etc.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to defer this request in order to review a site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.) It was noted that this item is being deferred until the February 5th Planning Commission meeting.

GC-2001-39

Request to amend the text of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development District (GC-34-99) Parcels R-6, R-8, and R-9 to include surface mining for extraction of mineral sands and reclamation of the parcels for residential community development, 1522 acres located west of Interstate 95 north of Brunswick. Property having frontage along portions of I-95, State Route 99, Cate Road and Canal Road. Property owned by TE Consolidated, L.L.C.

Attorney Mark Johnson and Mr. Elliot Mallard were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Segers as follows: Staff's recommendation is for approval.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

The proposed permitted use, as defined in the application narrative, includes reclamation of the land to a level suitable for residential development. This final, long-term land use is considered suitable in view of the use and development of the adjacent and nearby property. Mineral sands extraction procedure represents a short-term use.

- Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property;

The proposed permitted use, as defined in the application narrative, is performed in a manner which greatly limits adverse effects. This is accomplished by provision of several visual and noise buffers in proximity to the active extraction cells, a 25 ft. buffer between jurisdiction wetlands and the limits of disturbance, storm water run-off control and minimum 100 ft. buffers along all property lines.

- Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned;

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools;

Proposed change does not increase impact to these systems beyond that which was approved under Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development District (GC-34-99).

- Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan;

The future land use map identifies this area as Forest Agricultural.

- Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for approval or disapproval;

The proposed text amendment also indicates a maximum height of 60 ft. for the mobile separator. This is a modular unit that will be installed for short-term use during the sand extraction process. Following completion of the sand extraction process, the mobile separator will be removed from site.

Attorney Mark Johnson, representing TE Consolidated, gave a brief presentation. He explained that the applicants have been meeting with local officials and citizens in an effort to educate them on the mining process. He stated that they have been emphasizing what the mining operation will and will not do. Mr. Johnson stressed that TE Consolidated has an excellent track record and they are proposing a good, clean, environmentally friendly, community minded industry for Glynn County. He then introduced Mr. Elliott Mallard, Operations Manager for Iluka Resources, who proceeded with a “power point” presentation.

During his presentation, Mr. Mallard pointed out photographs taken under a microscope showing the sand grains, etc. He explained that the mining method does not involve dredging or any type of chemicals. It is a temporary land use, utilizing a mobile separator that would run on water alone. The average depth of the excavation that they are proposing is 10 to 12 ft. with conventional equipment.

Mr. Mallard stated that Branigar has reserved some buffers around the edge of the property. The normal process is to remove 9 inches of topsoil and place it in berms. In addition to a tree buffer, there will be a topsoil buffer 8 to 10 ft. tall around any area that they are active in. Basically the process involves preparation, excavation, reclamation, and the final reclamation when the topsoil is placed back on the site. Again, he stated that the only thing used in the separation process is water. The soil is excavated in 15 acre cells and the minerals that they remove make up 3% of the soil. 97% is returned to the mining site and the topsoil is replaced. The principal materials excavated are ilmenite, leucosene, rutile and zircon. Mineral sands-derived products, particularly those containing titanium dioxide and zirconium are high worldwide demand in the pigment, aerospace and other industrial fields. Titanium dioxide is nontoxic and has replaced lead as the predominant pigment in paints and coatings.

Mr. Mallard stated that the company has looked at recent ways to build subdivisions. One way is to build up the foundations with dirt, leave lagoons and build residential structures on the lagoons. He explained that the lagoon system is created by using the reclamation technique. At the end of the extraction and processing of lands, the

area will be returned to mimic pre-extraction contours and planted with a cover crop in anticipation of a residential development.

In conclusion, Mr. Mallard stated he realizes that TE Consolidated has to be embraced by the community. He stressed that they want to do what is right and that they are looking forward to working with Glynn County.

Attorney Mark Johnson stated that Mr. Mallard pointed out the temporary land use status, however, the long-term plan is for a residential development.

Ms. Meredith Trawick of RUPA wanted to know if the mining operation would disturb the wetlands. Attorney Johnson stated that TE Consolidated has no intention of going into the marshes. Mr. Lee Sutton explained that there are two types of wetlands: jurisdictional wetlands and the isolated wetlands, which are non-jurisdictional. Anyone coming in with isolated wetlands can obtain a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers to fill those wetlands. Attorney Johnson stated that TE Consolidated is not mining in jurisdictional wetlands.

Chairman Stewart stated that TE Consolidated has “some of the nicest people that he has met in a long time.” They were gracious enough to take staff and members of the Planning Commission on a tour of their operation in Florida. They were honest about the operation and answered questions very openly and freely. Chairman Stewart stated that his main concern is that this is still a mining operation. The area where the operation is being proposed is Glynn County’s top growth area, especially with the proposed development of the wildlife animal park. He stated that millions of dollars have been invested in the area in subdivisions, schools and the new public safety complex. His question is “do we need mining in Glynn County?” Also, “what does it bring to our community, and do we want a mining operation for 50 jobs?” Chairman Stewart stated he feels that this is something elected officials should determine and decide on. He stated that he has spoken with several developers and asked if they would consider building a house on land that had been reclaimed after being mined. Their response was that they would build one to sell, but not to live in.

Mr. Sutton pointed out that although staff’s recommendation is for approval, there are still a number of other hurdles that the applicants would have to overcome, such as the concerns about water and the impact on wetlands.

Regarding the water withdrawal, Attorney Mark Johnson stated that the company has three or four holding ponds for water used in the process. To charge the ponds they would use slightly under one million gallons of water per day for about three months. After the initial charge they would need about 300,000 gallons a day, depending on rainfall.

Mr. Jonathan Williams expressed concerns about the water usage. He asked Attorney Johnson if they were planning to use the existing water or if they were going to drill for water. Attorney Johnson stated that they are working toward finalizing the water

usage plans; however, the Miocene Aquifer is one alternative that they're exploring. He stated that the area has already been approved for up to two million gallons of water per day for the future residential use.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall stated that the word "mining" has a negative connotation, which seems to scare people. However, he sees this process as a short-term land use. Judging by today's lack of opposition, he feels that this company has done everything above board. He further stated that after the process of bringing the sands back in, the land could be shaped and this could very well be a viable high quality development for Glynn County. Mr. Aspinwall stated that he endorses this company and the proposal.

Chairman Stewart wanted to know the number of years the company is expecting to be on the tract of land in question. Mr. Mallard replied four years.

Mr. Hart stated that no one is questioning the integrity of this company, but this is an amendment to the PD Text and there is no site plan or lay out of the operation. Also, Mr. Mallard has stated that this is a four-year project, but the Text indicates that it is a seven-year project, so there is a discrepancy. Mr. Hart stated that he would like to see the site plan. Mrs. Segers stated that a large site plan and several documents were submitted but they were too numerous to include in the packages. She presented a copy of the applicant's site plan and apologized for this omission. Attorney Johnson stated that the Text indicates that the TE Consolidated would not begin mining until a detailed site plan is submitted. Mr. Hart explained that according to the ordinance, the site plan is required before the amendment is granted. He pointed out that he has no problem with the project, but he does have a problem with how to administer the project. For clarification, Mr. Sutton stated that a site plan is required in accordance with Article VI, Section 619 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. In addition, Mr. Frazier stated that staff would recommend having more specific information about water withdrawal.

Chairman Stewart suggested having a joint meeting with the Board of Commissioners, City Commissioners, Planning Commission and the general public. At that time the site plan and all other pertinent information could be presented in detail for discussion. On behalf of the applicants, Attorney Johnson concurred. Items to be presented and addressed at the joint meeting are topographical maps, full site plan, water usage and DNR issues regarding wetlands.

Following discussion, Chairman Stewart stated that this request is deferred until the March 5, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. (The joint meeting will take place before the March 5th public hearing.)

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:10 a.m.

(It was noted that Mr. Perry Fields arrived during the 10 minute break.)

GC-2001-40

Re-adoption of the Official Zoning Map of Glynn County in an electronic format compatible with the Glynn County Geographic Information System.

Mr. Ed Halbig, Senior GIS Analyst, was present for discussion and to answer questions.

The staff's report was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review as follows:

The Glynn County GIS has developed a draft digital zoning layer for all of Glynn County including the City of Brunswick.

In 1966 the Joint Planning Commission adopted a set of maps that illustrated the zoning lines within Glynn County. The maps adopted covered only a portion of Glynn County; the remainder was designated as Forest Agricultural, except where indicated otherwise on the Zoning Map Index (see attachment #1).

Since that time additional maps plates have been added for the Sterling area and northern St. Simons Island, and "half" plates have been added for areas around Thalmann, Everett City and western US 82.

The intent of the digital zoning layer is to furnish a zoning layer of the whole county that can be combined with other GIS data, such as parcels, roads and digital ortho aerial photography. With this tool, county staff, the development community and the general public will have easier access to zoning data as it applies to the geography of the county; county staff will have a tool which allows for faster and more accurate updating of that zoning data.

The digital zoning layer was originally based on the county parcel layer, and each parcel was assigned its appropriate zoning, as recorded on the zoning mylars. Where the mylars indicated that a zoning change had occurred, the pertinent files were researched to determine if the rezoning request, commission action and subsequent map change were in agreement. In the rare case of discrepancy, the commission action was used to determine the rezoning description.

In 1966, the Joint Planning Commission approved zoning lines across parcels that extended into the marshes, resulting in multiple zonings on a single parcel. In those instances, GIS staff compared the marsh line and the CP boundary shown on the mylars with the marsh line in the GIS database. The marsh line of the existing GIS layer was highly accurate when compared to the marsh line of the mylars. Sections 403.2 and 403.4 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance were used as the basis for determining these zoning lines.

No zoning of property is intended to change with the conversion to the digital zoning layer. Any errors found in the data can be compared with the existing mylars in Glynn County GIS and the rezoning application files that are on file in the Community Development offices. As the original maps had scrivener's errors that were corrected in the months following their adoption, so too can the digital zoning layer be likewise corrected.

County staff has been reviewing the county portion of the zoning layer and corrections have been made as discovered. The Brunswick portion of the zoning layer has been reviewed by city staff and corrections were made as requested. As per the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance:

Section 1108. Changes to the Zoning Map

Following final action by the County Commission, all necessary changes shall be made on the zoning map by the Glynn County Mapping Department. A written record of the type and date of such change shall be maintained by the County Clerk and Mapping Department. Until such change is made, no action by the County Commission on amendments to the Zoning Ordinance shall be official.

There should be no conflict with the current requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. In the near future, however, maintenance of the data (such as updates resulting from rezoning) should become a function of the Community Development Department, and an amendment to the existing section 1108 would need to be drafted to express such a change.

Upon approval of the digital zoning layer by both commissions, the benefits are as follows:

1. Zoning information can be updated more efficiently.
2. Survey information can be used to accurately depict the extents of a rezoning.
3. Zoning file information can be linked to the digital data. File numbers were entered into the original zoning database and will become a separate layer. This will allow users to query a parcel and see its zoning history.

Zoning data can be published on the Internet.

Following a brief presentation by Mr. Ed Halbig, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of the above referenced request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

At this time, Chairman Stewart acknowledged that Mr. Lee Sutton has submitted his letter of resignation as Planning Official for Glynn County. On behalf of staff and the Glynn County Planning Commission, Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Sutton for his diligence and accomplishments during his two-year tenure, and wished him continued success in his future endeavors.

Hampton Plantation, Phase VIII (PP200112100958)

6.2 Acre Tract, Located off Rice Mill near Butler Lake
Drive, Zoned Planned Development
Montrose Group, LLC, Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Bill Kirby were present for discussion.

Mr. Tyler Frazier stated that initially, staff's recommendation of this application was for denial due to a number of outstanding issues (included in the packages for review). However, those issues have since been resolved with the exception of the dead end street as outlined in Section 602.2 L) with regard to Lot 10 and Lot 21. Therefore, staff's recommendation at this time is for approval contingent upon resolution of the dead end street issue. Mr. Sutton added that there is an existing dead end street serving more than two lots, and as a result, should have a cul-de-sac that meets the minimum design standards.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Robert Ussery explained that the property in question has an unusual shape and was initially zoned to allow 30 townhouses. This development entertains 22 patio homes, which is much less than the maximum allowed. He stated that it is his interpretation that since this is a planned development and the fact that patio homes are really not defined in the Zoning Ordinance, that certain latitudes are allowed as to how to do a lot layout. The intent of the shortened dead end street to only allow two lots is to ensure that there is not a particularly long dead end street. In this case, the two "stubs" in question are actually short of 100 ft. long. Mr. Ussery stated he feels that this layout is preferable than to try to locate a very large cul-de-sac at the end of each one of those "stubs." He then presented information from the Planned Development Text indicating that the Zoning Ordinance does not adequately define what patio homes are used for.

Mr. Sutton pointed out that although he agrees with Mr. Ussery regarding the Zoning Ordinance not being clear on patio homes, the Subdivision Regulations clearly define design standards for streets in Article VI, Section 602. There is also a variance process from those standards; however, there has been no request at this time to vary from those standards. Mr. Sutton stated that it is his interpretation that the proposed design does not meet the minimum design standards outlined in Article VI, Section 602

of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Again, he stated that the applicant did not submit a request for a variance. Mr. Ussery felt that the appeal to the Planning Commission regarding the PD Text would be sufficient because of the nature of the development. Chairman Stewart stated that in his opinion it would have been a lot easier to ask for the variance based on the information provided.

Mr. Perry Fields wanted to know the minimum road width. Mr. Sutton stated that this varies. Mr. Fields stated that according to what has been provided for review, the road is listed as being 25 ft. wide. He then asked if this was in compliance with the design standards. Mr. Sutton replied no. He stated that this would have to be addressed at the construction plan phase. When the preliminary plat is ultimately approved, during construction plan review process the applicant would have to present construction plans to be approved by engineering certifying that the plans meet the minimum design standards. Mr. Fields stated that the minimum road width is 40 ft. Mr. Sutton stated that with curb and gutter, the County Engineer could approve 40 ft. Mr. Fields then pointed out that regardless of the cul-de-sac, the applicant still has the 40 ft. width to deal with.

Mr. Bill Kirby stated that the problem as he sees it is that we are trying to apply subdivision standards to a patio home site, which is a Planned Development.

For clarification, Mr. Frazier pointed out that earlier in the meeting when he stated staff's recommendation was for approval with the exception of the dead end street he was not inferring that the application was completely compliant. What he meant was that some of the issues had been resolved. However, the issue of the dead end street has not been resolved. He agrees with the Chairman that the variance process needs to be initiated. The Planning Commission concurred. Therefore, on behalf of the applicant, Mr. Robert Ussery requested a deferral for 30 days.

Wingfield Commons (PP200112101033)

14.6 Acre Tract, Located on Cate Road near Perry Lane and Canal Road, Zoned Planned Development
Connie M. Carter, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ray Richard and Mr. Gary Nevill were present for discussion. Connie and John Carter were also present.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that staff is concerned about the proximity of Wingfield Commons Road, Old Cate Road and Cate Road with regard to maximum distance in accordance with Section 602.2 d). Staff is also concerned that a 15 ft. easement has overlapped onto the applicant's property. Staff's third concern is the impact that the subdivision will have on the road with regard to traffic. Mr. Frazier stated

that Old Cate Road is a minor street and the maximum ADT is 580 trips. The ADT for Wingfield Commons is 480 trips. This amount does not include the other homes located up to the landfill. He stated that staff's main concern is safety. Traffic data in this area indicates an increase in the average daily trips from the year 1989 to 1999. Mr. Frazier also provided information on the number of accidents in the area reported by the County Police and the City Police from January 2001 to June 2001.

Mr. Sutton explained that the Mr. Ray Richard submitted construction plans for review concurrent with consideration of the preliminary plat. This request was presented several months ago as a rezoning application. Staff was adamant at that time that additional information was needed with regard to the intersection. The applicant was agreeable, which is why the preliminary plat and the construction plans are being reviewed concurrently. Mr. Sutton stated that the intersection alignment at Cate Road and Old Cate Road does not meet the minimum design standards of the Subdivision Regulations. The angle of the intersection does not meet the minimum requirements, and to compound the problem, another intersection is being added that does not meet the minimum design standards of the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Sutton stressed that staff is not anti-development, we are trying to do this safely.

Mr. Ray Richard gave a brief update on the history of the rezoning portion of this property. He stated that during the rezoning process there was an issue concerning the intersection. As indicated by staff, the intersection does exist and has been that way for a long time. Mr. Richard felt that it was unfair to have the developer solve an existing problem off-site from the development. However, he met with the developer and they all agreed to participate in solving the problem. At the conclusion of the rezoning issue, the Planning Commission approved the rezoning and specifically stated that the intersection issue had to be resolved at the preliminary plat stage.

Mr. Richard stated that subsequent to the recommendation from the Planning Commission, which ultimately received approval from the Board of Commissioners, he met with Mr. Glenn Bollinger, Traffic Safety Engineer, and proposed a solution to the traffic problems. Mr. Richard presented this proposed solution to the Planning Commission in detail and a general discussion followed. During the course of discussion, Mr. Richard addressed the easement issue and proposed an agreeable solution. Also during discussion, Mr. Frazier noted that the only outstanding issue is traffic safety. In addition, it was noted that the staff's report indicates that Traffic Engineering reviewed this application as compliant, which Mr. Sutton adamantly disagreed with.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Discussion continued regarding the new design of the intersection with regard to surrounding neighbors. Mr. John Carter stated that he has a petition containing signatures from the neighbors in favor of the subdivision, but not specifically the intersection.

After discussion, Mr. Hart amended his motion to approve this request subject to approval of the intersection. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

The Village At Glynn Place, Phase III, Tract 1 (PP200110100956)

2.746 Acres, Located at Altama Connector and Altama Avenue

Zoned Planned Development-Shopping

Partridge Green, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Tom Wheeler was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Sutton explained that this application was reviewed at the December 4th Planning Commission meeting, which ended in a tie vote and ultimately deemed denied. As a result of the preliminary plat process not having a time-certain for re-submission, the applicant has re-submitted his request for today's meeting.

Mr. Sutton stated that Mr. Wheeler is here to reassure the Planning Commission that his only reason for submitting the preliminary plat is to get confirmation of the county's approval of the 50 ft. right-of-way width. Chairman Stewart asked for further clarification. Mr. Sutton explained that Mr. Wheeler previously presented the application and requested that the right-of-way width be reduced to 50 ft. Staff and the County Engineer agreed. There was an issue regarding whether or not the Wal-Mart property would impact the right-of-way width. Mr. Wheeler obtained the services of Pruitt & Purcell to prove that there is adequate right-of-way to the ditch of 50 ft.

Mr. Wheeler gave a brief presentation. He agreed with Mr. Sutton's explanation and stated that the existing right-of-way in the record is 85 ft. He stated that there has been a lot of discussion about the road and the right-of-way over the last 6 or 7 years.

Mr. Wheeler stated that the Planning Commission and staff's position is that he would not be able to expand the shopping center without building the road from where it terminates at Payless all the way over to Altama Storage, and he has resisted. He stated he feels that the only part he should have to do is from Payless to the ditch. Mr. Wheeler stated that he worked with Commissioner Cap Fendig during the summer in an effort to solve this problem for everyone. At that time, he suggested to Commissioner Fendig that he would still expand the shopping center with a 50 ft. right-of-way, he would build to the ditch, but he would build the rest when he developed the area behind Wal-Mart or in 8 years, whichever comes first.

Mr. Wheeler stated that during this entire process, the only thing that no one has had a problem with is that this could be a 50 ft. right-of-way. He stressed that he has conceded to the fact that he would never be able to get a permit or the approvals needed from Glynn County to expand the shopping center unless he builds the road all the way through. "He is surrendering."

Mr. Wheeler stated that his next step would be to find tenants for his expansion. In doing so, he does not want to approach a tenant with a site plan showing a 50 ft. right-of-way without confirmation of approval. Again, he stated that all he is trying to do is establish the one thing that everyone has agreed on and that is that the 50 ft. right-of-way is okay.

Mr. Wheeler pointed out that he and the owners of Altama Storage (who have been his opponents) have reached an agreement that he has signed stating that he would do what the Planning Commission wants him to do when he expands the shopping center, which is to build the road. He also stated that even if he does not expand the shopping center, he would still build the road within 8 years and that this was subject to his being able to get it permitted his way (which is the relief on the rear yard setback, 10 ft. off).

Mr. Perry Fields stated that he does not have a problem with the 50 ft. right-of-way. He stressed that the Planning Commission is tasked with providing adequate ingress/egress of transportation in and around the county for citizens. He stated that he has no problem with Mr. Wheeler developing his property and improving the economic conditions of Glynn County, but he does have problem with creating more traffic than the road can handle. "What if Mr. Wheeler is out of business in 8 years." Mr. Wheeler stated he thinks that the requirement to build the road would travel with the land. He pointed out that the road that he is suggesting is exactly the same amount of access that Sea Island has. Also, the county has a traffic study that says the two-lane road is adequate. Mr. Fields was adamant about his concerns for traffic safety.

Mr. Bill Kirby, owner of Altama Storage, was present to speak in favor of this request.

Mr. Daniel Parshley of 274 Parland Road was present to oppose this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the change from an 85 ft. right-of-way to a 50 ft. right-of-way on the Scranton Connector between Goody's and Wal-Mart. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Perry Fields. For clarification, it was noted that the Planning Commission's approval was for the reduction of the right-of-way only. They did not approve the preliminary plat.

Bristol Efficiencies (SP00-32)

.8 Acre Tract, Located at end of Cornwall Street

Zoned Medium Residential

Chris Hutchinson, Owner/Developer

Mrs. Kerri Hutchinson was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Sutton as follows:

This is a request to extend a previously approved site plan. This plan proposes the construction of two multi-family units. Total area equals 34,848 sq. ft. Impervious surface equals 20,419 sq. ft. or 58.6%. Twenty-six parking spaces are required and have been provided. Access is being proposed from Cornwall Street. A court ruling previously has affected the possibility of accessing the Hutchinson property via Cornwall Street.

Building Inspections, Planning & Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department have all reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions.

- 1) The applicant provides resolution to the problem if access from Cornwall Street prior to being issued a building permit.
- 2) No access be granted or assumed from Bristol Lane (a private access easement) because it currently exceeds private access easement requirements in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations.
- 3) The construction of two additional units beyond the scope of this site plan will require ADA minimum standards to be achieved in not only the next phase but retrofitted into this phase as well.
- 4) Must meet City of Brunswick development standards for water and sewer.
- 5) Must meet the minimum design standards of the Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance prior to issuance of a building permit.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the extension subject to the conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

King & Prince Hotel Remodeling (SP01-03)

159,847 Sq. Ft., Located at Arnold Road and Downing Street

Zoned Resort Residential

Inn of Lake City, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Sutton as follows:

This is a request for an extension of a previously approved site plan. The applicant proposes to renovate the interior of the "Historic" rooms' section of the 124 room hotel. The construction of the 18 room hotel, which is presented as a separate site plan, is also being suggested. Minor modifications are suggested to the exterior of the main hotel, with 69 rooms being reconfigured to provide 55 rooms with larger areas. Also, 168 parking spaces are required and 211 are suggested. Site coverage tabulations indicate 71% coverage with building and impervious surface.

Modifications are being suggested to Arnold Road and Downing Street. Areas of paving will be removed to create more green space. Sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks will be designated to provide for a greater degree of pedestrian safety. According to the applicant, these changes to Arnold Road and Downing Street should provide a calming effect on the vehicular traffic making the area safer for pedestrians. There are no changes suggested to the public parking on Neptune Drive.

Building Inspections, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, as well as, Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project. Engineering and Environmental Engineering have requested additional Construction Plan information that will be reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Building Inspections has indicated all construction will comply with FEMA requirements and the project requires an LDA application be approved and issued prior to receiving a Building Permit.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff is recommending approval of this extension subject to the minimum design standards of the Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance being met prior to issuance of a building permit.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to grant a 12-month extension of this site plan as currently approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 15 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 1:10 p.m. (*It was noted that Ms. Ann McCormick left the meeting during the break.*)

Eagle Point Apartments (SP200112120839)

14.3 Acre Tract, Located on Crispen Boulevard near
Old Jesup Highway, Zoned Medium Residential
Robert Boone, Owner; Glynn County Partner, Ltd., Developer

Ms. Pam Drury and Mr. Glynn Taylor were present for discussion.

A copy of the applicant's development summary was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that staff has some concerns about site distance and the total number of parking spaces on this tract of land. According to the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance, there are different ways to classify streets; however, staff is not sure that in this case if this is a street, alley or driveway in connection with this particular development. The site distance is 25 ft. and according to the site plan, the development would generate approximately 1,680 daily trips. Mr. Frazier stated that there is an internal traffic problem. Also, staff would recommend a re-design so that the developer could more efficiently use the space allocated on the site.

Mr. Frazier presented the zoning map and stated that only a portion of the property is zoned Medium Residential. He pointed out the surrounding zoning designations, including an area zoned Highway Commercial which is the location of a GA Power easement. He stated that the development does meet the density requirements in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff is largely concerned about the interaction of the site and the surrounding area with regard to potential traffic problems. He stated that there was a 20% increase in traffic between 1995 and 1999. Mr. Frazier provided accident data from January 2001 through June 2001 and again stressed that staff's major concern is traffic safety. Staff's recommendation at this time is for denial.

Mr. Glynn Taylor of Taylor & White Engineers was present to speak in favor of this request. In addressing staff's concerns about traffic, he explained that Mr. Glenn Bollinger had suggested that a traffic study be provided in order to complete the construction plans. Mr. Taylor had hoped to make Mr. Bollinger's comments part of the condition for approval. He stated that the traffic study would address the intersection of

the proposed development, Old Jesup Road and Crispin Boulevard. Mr. Taylor stated that he sees no internal traffic hazards and is seeking approval of this request.

Ms. Pam Drury, Taylor & White Engineers, gave a brief presentation. She expressed concerns about staff's continuous comments that the application has to comply with the Subdivision Regulations. She stated it is her understanding that an apartment complex is not a subdivision and therefore would not be required to be platted as such. For clarification, Mr. Frazier referred to the definition of a "Subdivision" in accordance with Article V, Section 501 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations as follows: ***"All divisions of a tract or parcel of land into two or more lots, building sites, or other divisions for the purpose of immediate or future sale, legacy, gift, or building development; all divisions of land involving a new street or a change in existing streets. The term includes the re-subdivision of land and when appropriate to the context relates to the process of subdividing or to the land subdivided."***

Ms. Drury stated that the buildings on the site are all under one ownership and would not involve sales. They would remain under the same ownership and would be rented. The area that staff is questioning the classification of is not considered a street or an alley. It is a parking lot. She stated that the question of whether it should be classified as an alley or a street came about because the developer provided 24 ft. from the back of the parking lot to allow for two-way traffic.

Regarding density, Ms. Drury stated that in her calculations, she did not take into consideration the 2 acres of the GA Power easement. Therefore, the density is actually lower. Density was calculated on the 12.1 acres versus the entire site. She was advised that she could not calculate the density on the overall boundary of the property. Ms. Drury stated that the development is a gated community with one entrance and one exit to ensure the residents' safety. She pointed out that in all of her years of planning, she had never heard of an apartment complex having a roadway classification or right-of-way.

For clarification, Mr. Sutton referred to Article VI, Section 601 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance as follows: ***Except as herein provided, no building shall be erected, constructed, moved or relocated on a lot not abutting on a publicly dedicated, accepted and maintained street, or on a lot not having an officially approved permanent record easement to such a street, or on a private street which does not meet the minimum design standards; and from the time of enactment of this ordinance that no new street having a right-of-way less than 50 ft. shall be publicly dedicated...***

As an observation, Mr. Robert Ussery stated that this development looks like any other apartment complex that he has ever seen or that he has ever designed.

Chairman Stewart stated that he is concerned about putting 168 apartments on Crispin Boulevard, which is considered to be a small road. Perhaps the developers could explore another way to route traffic back to Highway 341. Ms. Drury stated that for this reason, she agreed to a traffic study in order to see what type of improvements could be

recommended along Crispin Boulevard. Chairman Stewart explained that the Planning Commission needs to see the traffic study before making a recommendation.

Mr. Perry Fields also expressed concerns about traffic on Crispin Boulevard and agreed with Chairman Stewart about the need for a traffic study. He further stated that the area is expected to grow but Glynn County is behind in doing any type of traffic improvements. In fact, Mr. Fields stated that Glynn County has not built very many roads in the last 20 years (except for what developers have built and deeded). The last major arterial road he remembers is Altama Boulevard, which was actually built, widened and designed to carry heavy traffic.

Chairman Stewart stated that perhaps the applicants would like to defer this request until a traffic study is submitted. Mr. Taylor agreed to submit a traffic study and requested a deferral at this time. The request for deferral was granted.

St. Simons Beach Villa Inn (SP200112120851)

20,500 Sq. Ft. Tract, Located at the corner of Beachview Drive and 3rd Street, Zoned Resort Residential
Joe McDonough, Owner/Developer

Mr. Joe McDonough was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. Mr. Frazier stated that additional information was submitted after the packages had been delivered. This information addressed a number of the outstanding comments. Staff's primary concern is in reference to Section 604 of the Zoning Ordinance, the regulated portion of the lot fronting on the street of lesser importance. The site frontage is shown as Third Street. Beachview Drive has a 75 ft. right-of-way versus a 50 ft. right-of-way, therefore, the building should front on Beachview Drive in accordance with staff's interpretation of the ordinance. Mr. Frazier stated that the building needs to be moved back 10 ft. to meet the setback requirements. It was noted that Mr. McDonough was in agreement with staff.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request subject to the building being moved back 10 ft. to meet the setback requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Ms. Ann McCormick was no longer in attendance.)

Lot 302, King City (SP200112101528)

1200 Sq. Ft. Addition, Located on west side of Mallory Street
Between Butler & Lord Ave., Zoned General Commercial Core
Peter Nermoe, Owner/Developer

Mr. Peter Nermoe and Mr. Robert Ussery were present for discussion.

It was noted that a Village Preservation Application for Lot 302 King City was also included in the packages. Chairman Stewart advised that the Planning Commission would consider the Site Plan Application and the Village Preservation Application at the same time, but would vote on each item separately.

Mr. Frazier proceeded with the staff's report. He stated that staff had questions about how the parking was calculated and whether the parking is permanently dedicated to the restaurant. A letter provided to staff indicates that Coastal Bank is providing parking for the applicant; however, there is no permanent agreement. Mr. Frazier stated that staff needs clarification on the status of the parking agreement. Chairman Stewart asked if the applicant could clarify the additional parking status for staff. Mr. Ussery stated that he assumed the letter cleared up the parking issue. Mr. Sutton explained that staff reviewed the letter, and it is his interpretation that in accordance with Article VI, Section 611.3 of the Zoning Ordinance, staff would like for Coastal Bank to relinquish the development rights of the property that the bank is allowing the restaurant to use until there is no more restaurant. In addition, staff would like signs placed indicating that those spaces are parking designated for the restaurant. Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Ussery if the signs were a problem. Mr. Ussery replied no. Mr. Frazier distributed copies of the letter from Coastal Bank for the Planning Commission's review.

For further clarification about the parking, Mr. Sutton stated that according to the GC Core District, the number of parking spaces could be reduced by half. In this instance, if this lot were treated like any other district, it would require 16 spaces. The GC Core District states that it could be reduced by half, which is what staff is proposing.

Before proceeding with a vote on the Site Plan Application, the staff's report for the Village Preservation Application was presented by Mrs. Segers as follows:

Lot 302, King City (VP01-18)

3600 Sq. Ft., Located on Mallory Street between
Butler & Lord Ave., Zoned General Commercial-Core
Peter Nermoe, Applicant

This project consists of the demolition of existing wooden structures located at the rear of the property, and the replacement with an addition to the main structure extending it to the property line, in-line with the adjoining buildings. The existing main structure consists of 2,396 sq. ft., with 462 sq. ft. of wooden structures to be removed. The proposed addition to the main structure is 1,013 sq. ft. for a new total of 3,409 sq. ft.

The renovation is intended for storage space and not for additional patron space. Flood zone substantial improvement limits apply. No additional signage or lighting is suggested with this application.

Staff's recommendation for approval was conditioned on several items; however, those items have been addressed with the exception of the parking issue.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the **Site Plan Application** for Lot 302 King City subject to parking being reduced to 8 spaces. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams.

A motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve the **Village Preservation Application** for Lot 302 King City. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams.

Liberty Construction, Inc., 6 Unit Condo (SP200112101159)
32,150 Sq. Ft. Tract, Located on the corner of Mallory Street
& Harbor Oaks Drive, Zoned General Residential
John Jones, Owner/Developer

Mr. John Jones was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that this is a request for an extension of a previous site plan application. He stated that staff's recommendation is for approval contingent on the fact that when the request is made for a building permit, all current requirements of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations at that time must be met.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request subject to the condition stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams.

**Golden Isles Gateway Tract, Parcel CR-2 (MP200111061541)
(CP200111291044) (SP200111071303)**

9 Acre Tract, Located on Glynco Parkway, adjacent to Spur 25
Zoned Planned Development
Ricky Mitchell, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

The minor plat application for Parcels CR-2 & CR-3, site plan application and construction plans were included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. The two voting issues are the minor plat applications for CR-2 & CR-3. These plats have not been certified by the Community Development Director based on Section 602.5 a) of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, which states that "private streets shall meet the procedural requirements of the ordinance regarding preliminary and final plat."

Mr. Bobby Shupe advised that the owner of Parcel CR-3 requested a deferral until he is available to attend the meeting.

The minor plat application for Parcel CR-2 was discussed at this time. The applicant is asking for approval of the minor plat to allow development of five lots. Staff's recommendation is for denial in that the application was reviewed as being non-compliant with the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance. Much of the debate on this item was determining whether the proposal is considered a private access easement or a private street.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the minor plat application for Parcel CR-2 with the condition that there is no access to CR-3 or to Lot 5 using the private easement identified as Gateway Center Boulevard unless and until it is built to county standards and approved by the county. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the December 4, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Mr. Jonathan Williams was not in attendance at the December 4th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

During the course of discussion, Mr. Lee Sutton requested corrections to Page 15, Paragraph 3 of the December 4th Minutes to delete the last sentence and specifically add the following: **"Mr. Sutton stated that in accordance with Article 602.5 a) private**

streets shall meet the procedural requirements of this ordinance regarding preliminary and final plat.” Mrs. Loving was advised to review the tape for accuracy. (The audio tape was reviewed on 1-10-02 and revealed that Mr. Sutton did not state the above referenced sentence in his comments.)

PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

a) Handout from Commissioner Fendig

Chairman Stewart presented the handout from Commissioner Fendig consisting of the current version of recommendations from the Ordinance Review Committee on the ordinance amendments. He stated that during his meeting with Commissioner Fendig, they discussed the 60-day time period and they both had different interpretations. He stated that he advised Commissioner Fendig that the Planning Commission would work diligently and expediently on the amendments. He also asked for an extension to report back to the Board of Commissioners at their first meeting in March.

b) Chairman Items

Chairman Stewart advised that his recommendation would be to have two work sessions and two public meetings. The work sessions would be for one hour (12:00 to 1:00) and are scheduled for Monday (14th) and Thursday (17th) in Room 234 of the Office Park Building. He asked each member to review the document for changes, additions, deletions, etc. The public meetings would be for two hours (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.) and are scheduled for Tuesday (15th) and Wednesday (16th) at the SSI Casino and the New Courthouse.

Chairman Stewart stated that the purpose of the public meetings is to obtain input from the general public, citizens and developers. There will be no debating or general discussion. The Planning Commission and staff will listen to all comments and answer questions. After the public meetings and the work sessions, the item will be advertised for the February 5th Planning Commission meeting.

Also included in the packages for review was a memorandum from Mr. Peterson regarding the Planning Commission By-Laws and a list of suggestions for Improving Citizen Participation and Consistent Decisions. The members were asked to take these suggestions into consideration and be prepared to discuss them further at a later date.

STAFF ITEMS

- a) Review & Update Glynn County Planning Commission By-Laws; Establishment, Text of Code of Ethics for Local Government Services.
- b) Amend Article VIII of Subdivision Regulations; such that minor plats are used exclusively for residential land use classifications.
- c) Amend Article VI, 602.6 of Subdivision Regulations; using private access easements for exclusive use by residential land uses.

The above referenced items (**a, b, c**) were included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. Following a general discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to discuss these items in depth at a work session.

- d) Amend Article VII, 720 of Zoning Ordinance; requiring all development in General Industrial Districts to submit site plan applications for Planning Commission's approval.
- e) Traffic Safety - Comprehensive Planning Initiative; Coordinated effort by Traffic Engineering and Planning & Zoning.
- f) Water Use - Coordinated effort by Planning & Zoning, Finance, Utilities Management and City of Brunswick Water & Sewer: Capital Improvements Coordinating Committee.

The above referenced items (**d, e, f**) were included in the packages for informational purposes and will be included for public hearing at a later date.

g) **Request to Amend Final Plat - Robert Strickland**

Mr. Robert Strickland was no longer in attendance; however, Mr. Frazier stated that staff needs direction from the Planning Commission regarding procedure. He explained that when Mr. Strickland purchased the lots in River Ridge Subdivision they were not buildable lots due to the GA Power lines being outside of the easement. Mr. Frazier stated that staff needs approval from the Planning Commission to do an 803 (Vacation of Plats). Mr. Strickland's argument is that this is not his responsibility and he should be allowed to go back and amend the final plat. Staff feels that the 803 would be the proper procedure in that Mr. Strickland actually purchased the lots as they were. During the course of discussion, Chairman Stewart stated that he would confer with Mr. Strickland on this issue.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.