

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 19, 2002 5:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hal Hart, Acting Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Perry Fields
Ann McCormick
Gary Nevill
Jonathan Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Bedner, County Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: York Phillips, Planning Manager
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

It was noted that the first hour of tonight's meeting is to discuss and possibly take action on an advertised workshop item: *Proposed Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance (GC-2002-ZT11)*. The amendment was included in the packages and presented by Mr. Phillips as follows:

GC-2002ZT11

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions), Section 619 (Site Plan Approval), Subsection 619.2 (Requirements, Section 619.4 (Review and Approval of Site Plans), Section 619.7 (Maximum Water Limits), Section 619.8 (Enforcement) and Section 619.9 (Fee) provide additional requirements regarding water usage and review requirements for projects located within Limited Industrial, General Industrial and Basic Industrial Zoning Districts.

Mr. Phillips explained that this amendment was requested by the County Commission and prepared by the County Attorney. The Planning Commission held a workshop to discuss this proposal and asked that it be referred to the Water Resource Management Advisory Committee. The Water Resource Management Advisory Committee discussed the proposal but did not submit a written report; however, the following comments were given:

- 1) The committee feels that the language should track more closely to the language and standards for the State Water Withdrawal Permits.
- 2) The committee raised questions about the use of the term "no negative impact" and made several suggestions.
- 3) The committee's name needs to be corrected. The correct name is Brunswick-Glynn County Water Resource Management Advisory Committee.
- 4) The committee suggested that clarification be made on the identification of the various aquifers that are involved. The consensus was that the reference should not be the specific aquifers but any withdrawal permit.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff does not have a recommendation, but feels that the Planning Commission should review this amendment and make a recommendation. He stated that staff will assist by putting the final version into proper form for consideration by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Fields wanted to know why the Planning Commission is being asked to consider this proposal. He stated that there is no mission statement and he doesn't know what problems they are being asked to resolve. Mr. Phillips stated that staff did not receive anything specific. He stated that the section being proposed is the site plan review section, which is an administrative action, unlike a rezoning which is legislative and has more discretion.

Mr. Jonathan Williams expressed concerns about the Miocene. He stated that to the best of his knowledge, no one knows how much water exists in the Miocene. Until all of the facts are known perhaps an ordinance should not be established.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall stated that he doesn't know what the purpose of this amendment is, and the Planning Commission doesn't have enough information to reject anything at this point. He stated that if we are just going to gather information to be put on a site plan for someone else to deal with, we still don't have enough information regarding the distance between well sites, etc.

At this time, Chairman Hart stated that the Planning Commission would take comments from the public. He placed a 5-minute time limit on each speaker and asked that all comments be directed to the Board.

Mr. James Holland of 232 Buckswamp Road agreed with Mr. Williams regarding the Miocene. He stated that no one knows how much water exists in the Miocene but he does know that the Miocene, for all intentional pumping purposes, sits under Glynn County. Mr. Holland expressed concerns about the infrastructure in relation to natural resources and suggested that a moratorium be placed on all of this until clarification is given.

Mr. Dave Kyler of 103 St. Catherine Street stated that he is a member of the Glynn County Water Resources Management Advisory Committee and the Executive Director of the Center for a Sustainable Coast. He stated that this approach is a step in the right direction but it is incomplete. He pointed out that the State's standards are inadequate and this is one of the reasons the County Commission is recommending that the State give priority to public wells over private wells. He encouraged the Planning Commission to consider new criteria (outlined in written comments contained in the files) that would go beyond the language in the existing ordinance in such factors as the efficiency of the water user, long-term implications, and adaptability.

Mr. Kyler stated that the Water Resources Management Advisory Committee expressed concerns about the phrase contained in Section 619.4 i) "*no negative impact.*" How do you reach a consensus on what constitutes no negative impact? He suggested something that would be acceptable and subject to some sort of public interest. He further suggested that the proposed language be expanded to include zoning, and not just site plan review. He stated that if water use is not considered, and the attempt is to correlate land use with water use in ways that would accommodate a better projection of meeting the public interest, then it would have to be stopped prior to reaching site plan review level.

At this time, Ms. Kim Gollin of St. Simons relinquished her 5-minutes of speaking time to Mr. Kyler. Continuing with his thoughts, Mr. Kyler stated that essentially the purpose of this ordinance is to look at natural resources, which Mr. Holland alluded to, as a form of the infrastructure and a capital that the Planning Commission and elected officials have a responsibility for using wisely to support development that best serves the public interest over time. In conclusion, he suggested that a working committee be created to address various implications and perhaps adopt something provisionally to insure some type of coverage.

Mr. Dan Coty of 110 Riverway stated that he is speaking as a member of the RDC. He stated that he has been involved in an effort to form a regional water board made up of stakeholders. He stated that he attended a meeting a few months ago with expert officials and was informed that there might be two recharge areas in Georgia to the Miocene, one in Macon and one in Augusta. Those officials stated that "we have as

much water now as we did 2000 years ago, we just don't know where it is." One of the questions raised in that meeting a few months ago was "who owns the water." There is legal opinion that the property owner owns the water. The State's position is that it is for the public good. Mr. Coty stated that these questions will have to be answered. It appears to him that this is an attempt to adopt the State guidelines, which means creating another level of bureaucracy. He suggested putting this amendment on hold. He stated that there is a lot of pressure by environmentalists, legislators and stakeholders to do something about the water problems.

Mr. Fields pointed out sections of the ordinance with specific concerns. Under Section 619.2 i) he stated that there is no indication that the 100,000 gallons per day is referring to a single well, multiple well or combination of wells. Under Section 619.4 d) he stated that there is absolutely no standard as to what adequate provisions would be for water supply or fire protection. Also, there is no definition of "surrounding community," and if this is a water ordinance, he doesn't see the significance of sewage collection. Mr. Fields pointed out several other issues of concern and stated that Glynn County does not have the expertise on staff to assess any of these changes even if they were adopted. Finally, he stated that this ordinance has not been well thought through and he urged the Planning Commission to recommend that it not be adopted.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall agreed with Mr. Fields and stated that this proposal does not go far enough to protect Glynn County from excessive usage of water. He stated that the proposal is too vague, it cripples the people and it does not protect the county. It is not a good document. The other members also agreed and voiced some of the same concerns. On behalf of the members, Mr. Fields asked Acting Chairman Hal Hart to forward a letter to the Board of Commissioners urging them to contact the State Legislators and request that the funds be put back in the budget for the water supply study.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend to the County Commission that this ordinance, in its entirety, is written prematurely and that it is not time to consider this until more information is gathered. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

This concluded the 5:00 workshop. At this time, Chairman Hal Hart called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

CONSENT AGENDA

Extension of site plan approval for Windward Point (formerly called Sea Palms Grand) located adjacent to the Sea Palms Clubhouse. Original approval was given October 2, 2001. Staff recommends extension to October 2, 2003.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill the above referenced item listed under **Consent Agenda** was approved and unanimously adopted. It was noted that no opposition was present and there were no questions from the audience. (Additional information on this item is contained in the files located in the Planning & Zoning office.)

GC-2002-17

Application by Mark R. Wendel, agent for Larry E. Wendel, property owner, to rezone from R-20 Residential to GC General Commercial property located at 6241 Blythe Island Highway and consisting of .573 acres with 100 feet frontage on Blythe Island Highway.

Mr. Mark Wendel was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that this item was continued from the November 5th meeting with the following motion on the floor:

A motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued. Afterward, Mr. Fields recommended that the motion be amended to include the following conditions:

- 1) Site plan approval to be required.*
- 2) Hours of operation to be from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; Monday thru Friday; no weekends*
- 3) No operating on state recognized holidays.*

The amendment was accepted, but the vote was deferred for a written legal opinion from the County Attorney's office concerning enforceability of the above conditions.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff did not receive the written response from the County Attorney largely due to the two-week turnaround time period of the meetings.

For clarification, Mr. Phillips stated that although the staff's report, which was read into the record at the last meeting, indicated that the future land use map identifies the area as low-density residential there is commercial property in the vicinity.

It was noted that several people were in attendance to speak in opposition to this request; however, Mr. Hart explained that the motion is still on the floor and according to the ordinance, there could be no discussion from the floor at this time. Options would be to vote on the motion, continue the item until the next meeting pending the response from the County Attorney, or rescind the motion and put the item back on the floor for discussion. Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that without the response from the County Attorney he is not prepared to vote at this time, therefore he rescinded the original motion. Ms. Ann McCormick rescinded the second. The floor was open for discussion and the public was advised to address all comments to the Board.

Mr. Danny Harvey of 129 Cherry Lane was present to oppose this request. He pointed out that the residents of Blythe Island have clearly stated since 1960 that they do not want commercial development on Blythe Island. He wanted to know how many people listed on the applicant's petition are property owners on Blythe Island. Also, the sign advertising this request was not posted in clear view for the residents to see. Mr. Harvey stated that he personally placed the sign on the right-of-way for the residents to see, but the next day it was moved further out of sight. He stated that he has spoken to at least 20 residents on Blythe Island who are definitely opposed to this request. He stated that they are all concerned about the value of their property and he is asking that this request be denied.

Ms. McCormick wanted to know the location of Mr. Harvey's residence in relation to the applicant's property. Mr. Harvey stated that Cherry Lane is 1-½ miles down Blythe Island Drive. He stated that two residents who live within 200 ft. of the applicant's property did not receive the proper notification, but they are opposed to this request. (There was a brief discussion and questions about the number of property owners located within the triangle and whether or not they were notified of this request. Mrs. Segers was asked to check the files for verification.)

Mr. Mark Wendel explained that he is requesting to have a daytime trade school. He stated that he has done extensive work around the neighborhood and with the people who live on Blythe Island. He also has over 60 signatures of residents in favor of his request and he has obtained additional signatures. Mr. Wendel stated that he has owned his property for a very long time and what he is proposing will be good for the community. He stressed that it will not be associated with the Brunswick Job Corp. He is proposing to have a school for children in Glynn County who need help and he doesn't see a problem with this.

Mr. Wendel stated that the area where he is proposing to locate the school is on a major highway. He then pinpointed the areas that he concentrated on in obtaining the signatures on the petition, including Midway Circle. He stated that other than the people sitting in the audience tonight, no one has approached him to oppose his request. He elaborated on the travels to and from the proposed school in relation to traffic on Blythe Island. Again, he stated that the school will be located on Highway 303 and he does not foresee a problem.

Mr. Fields stated that in looking at the zoning map he noticed that there is Highway Commercial property about 400 ft. to the east of the proposed site and across the street. He asked staff if these areas had been rezoned to Highway Commercial or if they were originally zoned Highway Commercial. Mr. Phillips did not know. He stated that he would have to do a background check of the area.

Mr. Wendel stated that regarding the previous motion; he is willing to accept the conditions placed on the motion. He stated that he spoke to his attorney about the stipulations and was advised that he could accept the conditions. He stressed that he is willing to work with the School Board, the Planning Commission and the neighbors to make this work. Regarding the zoning history of the surrounding properties, Mr. Wendel stated that to the best of his knowledge three of the six are grandfathered in.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall commented that what Mr. Wendel is doing is very admirable and he endorses what he is trying to do, but when people purchase a piece of land there is some expectation that the zoning around them would remain constant. He stated that two weeks ago Mr. Wendel presented a petition containing a number of signatures of people endorsing his plan; however, it is clear tonight that a number of the neighbors are opposed to this plan. Mr. Aspinwall reminded Mr. Wendel of their conversation about re-thinking his position if the neighbors were in favor of the request. However, it is apparent tonight that this is truly not the case.

Mr. Wendel stated that the neighbors in attendance tonight are not within 200 ft. of his property. But as he pointed out before, he went beyond the 200 ft. when canvassing the area with his petition and he concentrated on his immediate neighbors around the triangle.

Mr. Wayne Stewart of 136 Midway Circle stated that to the best of his knowledge all of the commercial property on Blythe Island was grandfathered in. He does not remember any rezonings taking place. He stated that one of things that the Planning Commission is charged with is traffic. A traffic study is currently underway which was initiated by the Glynn County Commissioners because of the large number of accidents. The State of Georgia and Glynn County Traffic Safety Engineering are looking into what needs to be done on Blythe Island due to traffic. Mr. Stewart stated that he owns a piece of property within about 500 ft. of the applicant's property, but the simple fact is "there is one way on Blythe Island and one way off." Anything that is done on that particular strip affects the traffic and the neighbors, whether they live on Midway Circle or Cherry Lane.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know the maximum number of students expected to attend the proposed school. Mr. Wendel replied 10 to 15 students, five days a week and out of that number, he estimated that 7 would be driving to and from the school.

Regarding notification of adjacent property owners, Mrs. Segers reported that the records reflect that staff mailed letters to every property owner within the triangle and additional property owners within 200 ft. She pointed out that Highway 303 is within 200 ft. and two of those property owners were included. She proceeded to read the surnames of the property owners reflected in the files as being notified of the request. She also referenced the map numbers and parcel numbers.

Mr. Gary Nevill applauded Mr. Wendel for what he is trying to do, but he feels that this should not take place in a residential area. Mr. Fields reminded everyone that SR 303 is a highway and not a residential area.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick and seconded by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Site plan approval to be required.
- 2) Hours of operation to be from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.;
Monday thru Friday; no weekends.
- 3) No operating on state recognized holidays.

Discussion continued regarding the legal enforceability of the conditions. Afterward, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer voting on the motion until a written legal opinion is received from the County Attorney. Again, this item will be continued at the December 3rd meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m.

GC-2002-18

Application by E. G. Goodwin and Bertha Winell Charnock, owners, to rezone from R-9 One Family Residential to General Commercial property located on the northwest side of Scranton Road, approximately 400 ft. northeast of its intersection with Scranton Connector, and consisting of approximately 1.163 acres with 199.42 ft. of frontage on Scranton Road.

Ms. Bertha Charnock and Mr. Goodwin were present for discussion.

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

This is an area consisting of larger single-family lots and homes that existed prior to the development of the Glynn Place Mall on the opposite side of Scranton Road. A number of parcels to the southwest of this site were rezoned to commercial, but the area to the north and west remains a viable single-family area.

The subject property has R-9 zoning to the northeast and northwest, GC General Commercial to the southwest, and PD-S Planned Development Shopping to the southeast.

The Glynn County Future Land Use Map identifies this area as low density residential. The map also identifies the area at the intersection of the Golden Isles Parkway and Scranton Road as commercial. In previous rezonings, a number of properties along the northwest side of Scranton Road have been rezoned from R-9 Residential to GC General Commercial. The parcel immediately to the southwest was rezoned in 1997 to PD for an assisted care facility, but was later changed to GC and a portion back to R-9.

It would be appropriate for a transitional area to be established and that retail commercial zoning not be allowed to extend all along Scranton Road. Such a transitional area might use non-retail zoning, such as OC Office Commercial to avoid the implication that retail uses are appropriate as an intrusion into a residential area.

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.

No. While this area is becoming increasingly commercial in character, there is an established, viable residential area that should be protected. A transitional area of non-retail uses might be considered more in keeping with the existing character of the residential uses.

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

A significant shift to retail uses will create additional traffic and the character of development will not be in keeping with the existing residential area. This in turn will create more pressure for the existing residential area to be converted to commercial

- 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.

If the area converts to retail commercial uses, development will be piecemeal due to the existing arrangement of lot ownership. This will create pressure for multiple entrances along Scranton Road, which will in turn result in increased traffic congestion.

- 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 low density residential.

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

None.

The future land use map identifies this area as low density residential, and recognizes commercial farther to the southwest toward Spur 25. Some of the area to the southwest has been changed to GC in recent years, although there is no clear demarcation of where this should change back to residential to protect the existing residential community. The area immediately to the southwest was changed to PD for an assisted care facility, which would have been an appropriate transition. Office zoning would also be an appropriate transition. Staff recommends denial of the GC General Commercial zoning and recommends consideration of OC Office Commercial.

During the course of discussion, the applicant agreed to request a rezoning to OC Office Commercial rather than GC General Commercial. However, it was unclear as to whether or not action could be taken on a less intense use without re-advertising the request. Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item

until the December 3rd meeting for further clarification. Staff will confer with the County Attorney and the applicant and report back at the next meeting. In the meantime, Ms. McCormick suggested that the applicant contact the surrounding neighbors to possibly obtain support for this request.

GC-2002-19

Application by Glynn County Airport Commission, owner, to rezone from G Government to PD-G Planned Development General property located on the west side of Harry Driggers Boulevard, approximately 300 feet north of its intersection with Glynco Parkway, and consisting of approximately 67.587 acres with 3,505 feet of frontage on Harry Driggers Boulevard.

Mr. Steve Brian and Mr. Pete Garlington were present for discussion.

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

Properties to the north and south are zoned PD-G and part of the Golden Isles Gateway Tract. Smaller tracts to the south are zoned FA Forest Agricultural and GC General Commercial. Property to the west is R-20 Residential and is fully developed. Property to the east is zoned G and is developed either as the Glynco Airport or the National Guard facility.

The Glynn County Airport Commission is working in cooperation with Landscape Supply, Inc. to develop a 30-acre plant nursery on the 68-acre tract. The operation is planned to have limited traffic volume, and would not be a retail operation. The operation would be in a wooded area and not highly visible from the Glynco Parkway. A 75 ft. wide natural wooded buffer along the development's western perimeter would protect the adjacent subdivisions. Further, the property is located under the flight path of the Glynco Jetport and is extremely limited in suitable uses.

The Glynn County future land use map identifies this area as Transportation/Communications/Utilities. It is adjacent to commercial, residential and industrial areas. As submitted, the proposed text is sound in concept, however staff requests additional discussions to improve the clarity of the text and to address water supply and use. The general layout plan does not provide significant detail, however much of this information will be clarified through the site plan approval process as required for PD districts.

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.

Yes. The property is managed by the Glynn County Airport Commission in a manner consistent with Federal Aviation Administration regulations.

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

Unlikely. Proposed perimeter buffer will separate proposed plant nursery operation from existing residential development.

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

Yes, although the property is owned by Glynn County and managed by Glynn County Airport Commission.

- 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.

No. The proposed use will have limited traffic, and will not impact school populations.

- 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 Transportation Communications/Utilities. It is adjacent to commercial, residential and industrial areas.

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

None.

The proposed text and General Layout Map provides for appropriate uses for this location, and the site is supported by facilities and utilities. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Hart had questions about the contradiction of language in the text and the staff's report regarding retail operation. Mrs. Segers explained that this error took place during the editing stages of the report. Mr. Steve Brian of the Airport Commission pointed out that there would be no retail. The term "retail" was part of the text and it will be removed. He stated that the operation is strictly wholesale.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if there would be any threat to safety with regard to the approach of jets, etc. Mr. Brian stated that this is the ideal use of the property because it is very low-density with very limited height potential. He stated that there would be no threat to safety.

Mr. Pete Garlington explained that Landscape Supply is a wholesale nursery, which caters to landscapers, architects, developers, builders, cities, etc. He stated that their territory would be from the Florida line to Hilton Head Island. He stated that the company is 95% wholesale with no retail. The secret to their success is service. He elaborated on the delivery service and their vehicles.

Mr. Terry Driggers of 3805 Community Road concurs with Mr. Brian that this is an ideal zoning, but as an adjacent property owner and developer he is concerned that it borders Nottinghill Subdivision and Southern Landing Subdivision. He stated that he did not see the PD Text but he would like an assurance that the zoning will not allow for a higher intense use that would affect the adjoining property owners. At this time, Mrs. Segers provided a copy of the PD Text for review.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about deleting special uses and conditional uses from the text, and he suggested scaling the acreage back from 68 to 30. Mr. Brian stated that he would not have a problem with making those changes. Mr. Garlington agreed and added that 30 acres is adequate. Mr. Fields also suggested adding "No Camping" under Subsection 2 f) of the text. There was a question about lighting; however, staff advised that lighting would be addressed in the site plan.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick, seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted to recommend approval of this request subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Decrease acreage from 68 to 30
- 2) Delete “*retail*” from Permitted Uses
- 3) Delete “*Conditional Uses*” and “*Special Uses*” from Text
- 4) Add “*No Camping*” under Subsection 2 f)

GC-2002-20

Application by Larry Drury, owner, to rezone from Forest Agriculture to General Commercial property located on the east side of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25) and south of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad (Glynco Spur Railroad) right-of-way and consisting of approximately .80 acres with approximately 129.91 ft. of frontage on Spur 25.

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

The staff’s report was included in the packages and was presented by Mrs. Segers as follows:

The subject parcel is a portion of a triangular area bounded by Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25) to the west, Atlantic Coastline Railroad right-of-way to the north, and Canal Road to the southeast. This triangle is adjacent to the Golden Isles Gateway Tract Parcel CR 1. Zoning in the area is a mixture of LC Local Commercial and HC Highway Commercial to the south, PDG Planned Development General to the north, and FA Forest Agriculture to the east. Adjacent property to the south is currently zoned FA Forest Agriculture, however, this property is the subject of rezoning application GC-2002-14, which is a request to rezone from FA Forest Agriculture to GC General Commercial. This request received a recommendation of approval from the Glynn County Planning Commission October 1, 2002, and is scheduled for consideration by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners November 7, 2002.

The Glynn County future land use map identifies the subject property as low density residential, while the nearby HC and LC zoned property is shown as commercial. The location of this property, in close proximity to good transportation facilities (particularly the Spur) and separated from residential (the property is bounded by the railroad right of way, beyond which is a commercial area within the Golden Isles Gateway Tract, suggests that some commercial development is appropriate. Consideration needs to be given to the development of a coordinated commercial area and more likely for non-retail or mixed retail and non-retail uses. This suggests that a coordinated development plan be developed with the participation of the other landowners, if possible.

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 zoning would allow uses that are compatible, although some permitted uses would be less suitable to the area than others. The proposed use, as an office building would be compatible.

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

Not likely.

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

Yes, although single family residential use would be of limited benefit.

- 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.

No.

- 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 low density residential and commercial. It is also in close proximity to the multi-use node at the intersection of I-95 and Spur 25.

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

No.

Commercial development of this site would be appropriate, but should be coordinated with the development of other land in this immediate vicinity, if possible. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-21

Application by Paula F. Livingston and Pamela R. Soileau, owners, to rezone from M-6 One Family Residential to Highway Commercial property located on the south side of Crispen Boulevard west of its intersection with Lucian Street, and consisting of approximately 0.298 acres and having approximately 130 feet of frontage on Crispen Boulevard.

Ms. Paula Livingston was present for discussion.

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

The subject property is located near a commercially developed area in proximity to Interstate 95 and U.S. Highway 341 interchange. Commercial properties are located across Lucian Street and Crispen Boulevard from the subject property. A Best Western motel is located adjacent to the south of the subject property. Properties to the northeast and southeast are zoned FC Freeway Commercial. Property located to the northwest across Crispen Boulevard is zoned HC Highway Commercial, and property to the southwest is zoned R-6. Subject property is currently developed as single-family residential.

The Glynn County future land use map identifies this area as low density residential. Adjacent property to the east, located across Lucian Street, is identified as commercial. On the north side of Crispen Boulevard, previous rezonings from residential to HC Highway Commercial have increased the commercial character of the area.

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.

Yes.

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

No.

- 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.

Unlikely.

- 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 low density residential.

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

None.

Rezoning to HC Highway Commercial is appropriate for the area. Due to adjacency of residential areas, future commercial development will require conformance with Section 613 Landscaped Buffer Strips. Staff's recommendation is for approval, including provision of a landscaped buffer per Section 613, with an additional requirement of a minimum width of 15 feet.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request with a 7 ft. setback and a planted buffer (as opposed to 15 ft. as stated by staff). The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-22

Application by Nancy Armstrong, agent for Noreen Dart Page, owner, to rezone from General Residential to Highway Commercial property located on the west side of Altama Avenue north of its intersection with Fifth Street, and consisting of approximately .325 acres and having approximately 110 feet of frontage on Altama Avenue.

Ms. Nancy Armstrong was present for discussion.

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

This parcel is located on the west side of Altama Avenue. The area is characterized by commercial uses fronting on Altama Avenue, with residential to the west. The east side of Altama Avenue is occupied by the Coastal Georgia Community College. The property along the west side of Altama Avenue is zoned commercial (mostly HC), with the exception of this parcel, while the area to the west is primarily General Residential.

The County's Comprehensive Plan shows this area for a mix of residential and commercial uses, largely reflecting the existing zoning and use pattern.

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.

This site is suitable for commercial use consistent with the existing pattern of commercial use along the west side of Altama Avenue.

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

The proposed zoning would be consistent with the existing zoning and use pattern in the area and would not adversely affect this existing pattern.

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

Yes, although the likelihood of this use remaining economically viable in the future is not strong.

- 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.

No.

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

The future land use map generally reflects the existing pattern of mixed commercial and residential uses.

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

No.

This proposal is consistent with the existing pattern of development in the area, with commercial uses fronting Altama Avenue and residential uses to the west. The proposal is also generally consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Discussion continued. Mr. Hart wanted to know if a general layout plan was submitted. Mr. Phillips replied no, but staff did receive a survey that shows the existing building, the dimensions, etc. Mr. Fields asked if this rezoning includes the area marked as the "old road." Ms. Armstrong replied yes, according to the survey.

After discussion, the motion recommending approval was unanimously adopted.

Under **Chairman Items**, Mr. Hart stated that the "Site Coverage" portion of the ordinance would be addressed (with no action) at the next workshop scheduled for Tuesday, December 3rd at 5:00 p.m.

Under **Staff Items**, Mr. Phillips included in the packages a memorandum and updated text reflecting action taken at the November 5th meeting on the "Building Height" amendment. A general discussion followed. Mr. Hart stated that he is having second thoughts about the action taken at the November 5th meeting. In his opinion, he is not sure if this is what the Planning Commission intended to do, especially the definition and how this will affect the Building Official. Mr. Nevill disagreed. He thinks that it is clearer. Mr. Fields stated that he doesn't think the definition of building height changes the intent of anything. It is much easier to understand in his opinion. Mr. Hart stated that he would just like to give everyone an opportunity to be certain of the Planning Commission's intent and recommendations to the Board of Commissioners.

During the course of discussion, the Planning Commission included additional revisions to the amendment to be incorporated by staff. Staff was also asked to consult with the Building Official for his input on the proposed changes.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.