

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

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Wayne Stewart, Chairman  
Hal Hart, Vice Chairman  
Mike Aspinwall  
Perry Fields  
Ann McCormick  
Gary Nevill  
Jonathan Williams

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

-----

Chairman Stewart explained that the first hour of tonight's meeting would be a workshop for discussion purposes only with no required action from the Planning Commission. The items for discussion are *GC-2002-ZT10 (Building Heights) and GC-2002-ZT11 (Water Supply Impact/Site Plan Review)*. However, during the course of discussion, it was determined that these items were advertised as Public Hearing items and therefore the Planning Commission could take action.

Chairman Stewart emphasized that "we are not here to debate each other." He stated that discussion would be limited to 15 minutes, pros and cons, with each speaker being allowed 2 to 3 minutes. The first item was presented as follows:

GC-2002ZT10

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article III, Section 302 Definitions "Building Height," Article V (Application of Regulations), Section 502 (Height of Building), to clarify height of building and number of habitable stories; Article VII, Section 705.4 to reduce the building height and habitable stories in Resort Residential Zoning District; and Section 709.5 (SSVPD General Provisions) to reduce building height.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. York Phillips. In a memo addressed to the Planning Commission, Mr. Phillips explained that the problem to be addressed in this amendment is the fact that height limits for residential uses (particularly in the coastal areas affected by storm surge regulations, FEMA "V" zones) are squeezed by the need to elevate living spaces. Simply increasing the height limits may solve the problem in some instances, but allows unnecessarily tall residential buildings in other areas.

Staff recommends that height limits not be changed, but that the definition of "height" be modified to measure from the average grade of the lot at the building site OR the elevation of the storm surge (i.e.: the FEMA "V" elevation), whichever is higher.

A report from Ms. Ann McCormick, who was appointed to review this particular section of the ordinance, was included in the packages for review. She also distributed the following recommended changes:

## Definition

### **Building Height**

*The vertical distance of a building shall be measured, prior to any development, from the minimum base flood elevation as required by FEMA, to the highest point of the roof (exclusive of chimneys or other building accessories or ornamental features). Building height shall not exceed height specified in Zoning Ordinance of zoning district.*

Chairman Stewart reminded everyone of the 2½-minute time limit per speaker. The first person to speak in opposition to this amendment was Attorney Jim Gilbert.

Mr. Gilbert, representing Sea Island Company, stated that “the existing 45 ft. height in the RR District is what we have to work with, and many of us have planned to utilize this in a very expensive series of planning processes. The proposed ordinance change to a limit of 2 habitable floors and 35 ft. height would literally put Sea Island Company out of business. Many of us would like to have a reasonable beginning point, whether it’s a 100-year flood elevation or existing grade, and accommodations to avoid building flat roofs.” Mr. Gilbert asked the Planning Commission to make it clear to the County Commissioners that the consensus is not to change the height requirement in the RR Zoning District.

Ms. Kim Gollin, representing RUPA, stated that the first area that has to be clarified in Section 502 is the definition of building height. “The current definition is cloudy with ambiguous wording that allows for varied interpretation and is cluttered with procedural language on obtaining special exemptions. She suggested that the definition of building height be reworded so that it simply lays out a definition of the term. Any language that references a special exemption should be placed in Section 502 and shown in the same manner that the exemptions to height regulations are shown.”

Ms. Gollin further stated that “problems arise with the use of the clause *prior to development* as used in the current definition of building height. The term *development* as defined in the Zoning Ordinance is inappropriate in this section. Development, as defined in the Ordinance is the performance of any building or mining operation, the making of any material change in the use of any structure or land, or the division of land into two or more parcels, lots, building site or units. The clause *prior to development* fails to serve its purpose in that it does not address the activity it was intended to address. By utilizing the inappropriate term *development* the average elevation and natural grade can be altered in such a manner that any building erected on the altered site would surpass the 35 or 45 ft. limit when measured from street level or from the existing grade of any undisturbed neighboring lot. This practice essentially negates the intent of the ordinance. This is especially true in the older sections on St. Simons where the older homes are being demolished and new structures are being erected. It is a common complaint that new construction in and around the older neighborhoods is causing the neighborhood to have a disproportionate appearance, which affects the property value of the older existing structures.”

Ms. Gollin stated that they are pleased to see the building height reduction of 35 ft. in the Resort Residential District; however, the same height restriction needs to be placed on Medium Residential Districts on the Island.

Mr. Terry Driggers stated that “changing the building height as proposed would not have any net affect on maintaining or guaranteeing a certain level of architectural keeping with the past. Instead, it would devalue property by requiring some property owners to retain a smaller scaled structure than their neighbor’s. The proposal does not better define building height; it just further restricts it. It does not encourage business, tourism or new residents. It goes against the intent and principal of the RR Zoning District, which is to better accommodate seasonal and part-time residents. Staff’s assessment of the problem being that of structural designs squeezed by the need to elevate floors due to FEMA regulations and their recommendation to measure from the FEMA required elevation is on target.”

Mr. Driggers stated that he would recommend one minor change. “All flood zones result from the need to elevate floors and the height limit should be established from the base flood elevation as determined by the National Flood Program, as shown on the flood insurance rate maps. This would be a fair and equitable way to determine maximum height for all property owners. It is based on an existing requirement.”

Mr. Royce Hobbs, president of the Brunswick-Golden Isles Home Builders Association, representing 200 member companies with over 1500 employees, stated that they are all opposed to the proposed amendment for many of the same reasons already pointed out. He stated that “it is a bad amendment and needs to be reworked.”

Mr. Dan Coty stated that he is representing Citizens for Property Rights, a new organization with over 100 members consisting of business owners and individuals from approximately 8 counties in Coastal Georgia. He stated that they have reviewed the proposal and are opposed to it. They believe that it deters property owners’ right to use their property. He stated that they would like to recommend that the height be measured to the eave and not to the top of the roof, which would allow for some architectural design on the roof to prevent having flat roofs. They would also like to recommend that the term *habitable floors* be removed.

Mr. Larry Bryson, architect, stated that he is representing himself and clients with tracts of land in the Resort Residential District. He stated that since the mid 60’s when zoning was brought into existence in Glynn County, people who owned property in the Resort Residential District were allowed to enjoy the use of at least 3 habitable floors and a 45 ft. building height. If this is reduced to 35 ft. and 2 habitable floors it would in essence eliminate 33% of the usability of the property, which in his opinion is a devaluation of the property. He stated that in discussing this issue with appraisers, they were also of the opinion that this proposal would reduce the value of property, which translates in reduction of tax collectable dollars and the use of property in the future.

Mr. Bobby Shupe stated that he is in support of using the base flood elevation requirement with regard to measuring the building height, but he does not support the other changes in the amendment.

Mr. Jim Sutton stated that he is opposed to the proposed changes. He wanted to know that when this proposal goes to the County Commission, could the Planning Commission ask for a grace period of several months, especially with the changes to the 45 ft. height requirement. Chairman Stewart explained that the consultants (Duncan & Associates) would review the proposal before it becomes an ordinance, which would allow for additional time.

At this time, Chairman Stewart stated that this concludes this portion of the public hearing. He stated that perhaps after the second public hearing item, they will adjourn and the Planning Commission would discuss a recommendation to be forwarded on to the County Commissioners. However, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to continue discussion and take action on this item. They also decided to not take one action on the entire amendment, but to make a recommendation on each section as follows:

**Section 502 Height of Building**

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend to the County Commission that all sections of the building height be left as it currently exists. However, during the course of discussion, Mr. Fields withdrew his motion.

**Section 705 RR Resort Residential District**

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend to the County Commission that there be no changes to RR Resort Residential District. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill. Voting Aye: Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Gary Nevill, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Mike Aspinwall and Ms. Ann McCormick.

**Section 502 Height of Building**

Chairman Stewart passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Hal Hart and made a motion recommending to the County Commission to leave the maximum height of a building on St. Simons Island at 45 ft. and to strike all references to habitable stories, and leave in “for exceptions to height regulations, see Article VI, Section 617.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted.

-----

This concluded the workshop. At this time, Chairman Stewart called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Afterward, discussion continued with the Definition of Building Height.

**Section 302 Definition of Building Height**

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend to the County Commission, the following definition: The vertical height shall be measured from the BFE or the average natural grade of the building footprint to the roof, whichever is greater. Building height shall not exceed the height specified in the Zoning Ordinance of the Zoning District. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

**Section 709 St. Simons Village Preservation District**

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this section until the next Planning Commission meeting. Also, Chairman Stewart recommended that the County Commission not take action on this item until after the Planning Commission’s review at its November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Fields suggested that Chairman Stewart review with staff all of the language and recommendations proposed by the Planning Commission for accuracy before forwarding the proposal to the County Commission. However, Chairman Stewart suggested that Mr. Fields and Mr. Hart confer with staff to review the changes.

-----

**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.

The amendment was included in the packages for review. However, in the essence of time Chairman Stewart suggested that this item be deferred until the next Planning Commission meeting. Thereupon, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to defer this amendment until the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting beginning at 5:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

-----

Chairman Stewart announced that Agenda Items 5 (*GC-2002-18*); 6 (*GC-2002-19*); 7 (*GC-2002-20*); 8 (*GC-2002-21*); and 9 (*GC-2002-22*) would be reviewed at the November 19<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. (These items were pulled from the agenda due to the adjacent property owners not being notified in accordance with Section 1105.1 d of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance)

-----

SUP-2002-05

Application by Yewone Shirley Hendricks, owner, for a medical hardship Special Use Permit for 101 Hendricks Lane, Brunswick, GA, a 1.3 acre tract located west of the intersection of Hendricks Lane and Frazier Road.

Mr. Hendricks was present for discussion.

This request was deferred from the November 5<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant to provide written documentation from a medical doctor verifying that 24-hour constant care is needed in this instance. The physician's letter has been provided at this time, along with the applicant's statement as to the needs of her son. The following staff's report was also included in the packages for review:

The purpose of the application is to receive permission under medical hardship to locate a manufactured home at 101 Hendricks Lane as an additional dwelling on the parcel to serve as a residence for Samuel Hendricks, son of the applicant.

The property is zoned R-12 and consists of 1.3 acres. A dwelling and manufactured home are both located on the tract. This application would provide for locating a third residence on the tract. The applicant proposes to use an existing well and septic tank established on the property in the past. As to the location of two residences on the parcel, Mrs. Brenda Pittman of the Code Enforcement Division states that her investigation determined that the existing manufactured home is grandfathered, and the use is allowed to continue. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Chairman Stewart stated that the Environmental Health Inspector has not been able to get on the property to inspect the septic tank. Therefore, if there is a motion for approval, it should be stipulated that approval is based upon Environmental Health's acceptance of the septic tank.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this request subject to Environmental Health's acceptance of the septic tank. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill. Discussion continued. Mr. Fields asked that if the septic tank is unacceptable, what would be the applicant's option at that point. Mr. Jimmy Partin, Environmental Health Specialist, explained that the applicant has a sufficient amount of square footage to repair or replace the septic tank if it is found to be unacceptable. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted.

-----

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.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that this item was continued from the last meeting. Since that time, the applicant submitted a revised layout plan, which is a considerable improvement from the last submittal. However, as noted, there are still some issues that need to be addressed: 1) the access drive serving the rear portion of the site is only 10 ft. in width; 2) the use of the well for the front and rear portions and the existing septic tank could be problematic and will require approval from the Health Department; and 3) the parking calculation is not shown but it appears that the proposed parking is not adequate.

Mr. Phillips stated that the plan reflects a fairly intensive use of the site and could present a problem. He then read the following findings:

**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 higher intensity use as a welding school/body shop would be an encroachment into the residential character of the area. The majority of adjacent and nearby property is established residences.**

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

**It is likely that the proposed use would present adverse effects due to increased traffic and intermittent noise.**

- 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.

**The proposed use would require improvement of the access drive to the subject property.**

- 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 site is not appropriate for the use requested and therefore staff's recommendation is for denial.

Mr. Mark Wendel gave a brief presentation. He stated that the size of the building is negotiable for the property and parking is also negotiable. He stated that downsizing the structure would be acceptable to him and he feels that he could come to an agreement about the septic system.

Mr. Wendel stated that he approached the adjacent neighbors and no one objected. He presented a petition consisting of 34 signatures of adjacent property owners. He stated that he is willing to work with the Planning Commission in any way possible.

Mr. Wendel stated that he is trying to do a small trade auto body school and a welding school. He feels that the community needs this and he is willing to give up his body shop business to teach other children.

It was noted that no one was present to speak for or against this request. At this time, Chairman Stewart passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Hal Hart and made a motion recommending denial of this request based upon traffic and the staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill. Discussion continued.

Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that in the past when a rezoning affected a neighborhood, the neighbors would come to the meeting to voice their opinion either for or against the request, but in this case no one is present to oppose this application.

Ms. Ann McCormick had questions about the number of students who would be driving to the school. Mr. Wendel explained that public transportation is available but some students will be driving their own vehicle, which is why he is willing to work with the Planning Commission. He then pointed out other commercial properties in the area.

Ms. McCormick stated that her point is that if students are coming from Brunswick Job Corp and other locations this would perhaps mean one vehicle, thus eliminating numerous vehicles coming into the area. Mr. Wendel agreed that the traffic is terrible. He elaborated on the travels to and from the proposed school in relation to traffic on Blythe Island. He further stated that the school would be very well maintained and landscaped, with no big flashing signs. Mr. Wendel stressed that this is not a profitable business; it is something for the community and it will be a non-profit school.

Ms. McCormick had questions about parking. Mr. Phillips explained that automobile repair establishments require one space for each 400 sq. ft. of total floor area. For schools, the standard parking is one space for each staff member plus one space for each five seats in an auditorium, which applies to a traditional school. What is being proposed is a 9600 sq. ft. building plus the existing building. The number of spaces is approximately 16 and the standard, based on the 9600 sq. ft., would be over 20. Mr. Phillips wanted to know if the applicant is proposing service bays. Mr. Wendel replied no. He stated that this would be an open area similar to the welding school on Highway 341, which is located between two residential houses.

Chairman Stewart stated that there are other buildings in Glynn County that are not in residential areas that this proposed school could be located in. He stated that there is already a traffic problem on Blythe Island and this would add to the problem.

After discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for denial: Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Gary Nevill and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. The motion failed to carry. Discussion continued.

Mr. Jonathan Williams reiterated that none of the residents from Blythe Island are present to oppose this request. He stated that Mr. Wendel is attempting to do something that is needed in the community, and he would not want to deny anyone who is attempting to help our youth. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued. Mr. Perry Fields stated that once the property is rezoned, it could open up "Pandora's Box." Therefore, he amended the motion 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 discussion continued regarding the legal enforceability of the conditions. Therefore, 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. This item will be continued at the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m.

-----

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: October 1<sup>st</sup>  
Regular Meeting: October 15<sup>th</sup>

A motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the Minutes of the October 1, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Gary Nevill. (Mr. Stewart and Mr. Williams were not in attendance at the October 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and therefore abstained.)

Upon a motion made by Mr. Gary Nevill and seconded by Mr. Perry Fields, the Minutes of the October 15, 2002 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10-minute recess. The meeting resumed at 7:20 p.m.

-----

***Proposed Amendment to the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan to incorporate references to the Brunswick/Glynn County Community Greenspace Program and to revise Objectives and Policies to support the program***

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission’s review. In presenting the staff’s report, Mr. Phillips explained that in 2000, the Legislature created the Community Greenspace Program. Eligible counties (including Glynn County) adopted local Greenspace Plans in order to qualify for available funding. After approval, local comprehensive plans were to be amended to reflect this new program.

Glynn County submitted its Greenspace Plan in November 2000, and thereby received funds. In 2001, the county submitted its required annual report and received additional funds. The proposed amendment describes the program, meeting the requirement for consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the county’s Greenspace Program.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the proposed amendments. Before final action by the Board of Commissioners, the proposed amendment will be submitted to the Coastal GA Regional Development Center and to the Department of Community Affairs for review.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

-----

SP-2002.1016.11:45 FLETC Hotel-Type Dormitory, Phase III

Request by H & P Investment Partners, Inc. for approval of a site plan for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Hotel-Type Facility, Phase III on property consisting of 11.00 acres, located on Vogel Road and Golf Course Road near Glynco Parkway and Spur 25.

Mr. Fleming Martin and Ms. Christy Lawrence of Thomas & Hutton Engineers were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Tyler Frazier explained that the proposed dormitory is located on property that is zoned General Industrial. Staff has reviewed the plans and had a number of questions about the applicability of the Training Center within the General Industrial District and concluded that the ordinance would probably have to be amended to incorporate the Training Center into Section 720 of the Zoning Ordinance. There were questions about the appropriateness of the parking standards for dormitories, and staff concluded that Section 611.6 of the ordinance would also have to be amended to include a new land use type. Finally, staff had an opportunity to work with the developer to consider a 10 to 25% reduction of parking space and perhaps put some of the land into open space or conserve it in perpetuity for other reasons. The developer has indicated a willingness to work with staff on this issue.

Apart from the above issues, Mr. Frazier stated that staff is recommending approval of this site plan.

Mr. Hart had questions about staff's comments on amending the ordinance with regard to this request. Mr. Frazier explained that according to the ordinance, this is a government owned facility and the fact that the proposal is a dormitory it would be a different type of building than that of a school.

Mr. Fleming Martin explained that this is the third phase of a project. The first building is occupied, the second building is under construction and they want to start on the third building. He stated that they have a letter from Mr. Lee Sutton, former Planning Official, that quotes the section of the ordinance referred to by staff.

Mr. Martin stated that the owner of the fee is Glynn County. The property was originally leased to H & P Investments, which is a private firm out of South Carolina. They will release each phase from their lease as the matter proceeds. As each building is constructed, it is owned by the county, it is leased to the Development Authority, which is a government subsidiary, and it is sublet to the United States of America. Therefore, the owner and both lessees are government entities. The facility is no more a school than Fort Stewart or the Infantry School at Fort Benning. Mr. Martin stated that the applicability of the Zoning Ordinance is clear in his opinion. The exception was crafted for schools such as elementary and high schools. He stated that he does not understand why staff is not following the same course set by Mr. Lee Sutton two years ago.

Mr. Frazier stated that with all due respect to Mr. Sutton's interpretation, this proposal is a new phase of the project. Phase I and Phase II were permitted under the assumption stated by Mr. Martin. Phase III needs to be considered in light of the GI and the use. Mr. Frazier feels that FLETC is a type of school. Chairman Stewart agreed but stated that it is obviously owned by the government.

Mr. Phillips stated that FLETC is on a separate parcel of land, which is zoned G. This particular use is on a separate parcel of land so it is really not an accessory use to the school because it is not on the same parcel of land, although it is associated with it. The proposal is on land that is owned by the Development Authority, it is zoned GI and it is a separate parcel of land. The GI District permits a facility that is operated by the government. Mr. Phillips elaborated on future issues concerning parking, etc. but stated that it is safe to proceed with this request as it is proposed.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted. (Mr. Fields was no longer in attendance. He excused himself at 7:30 p.m.)

-----

PP2002.0910.1023 Somersby Pointe

Request by Terry Carter for re-approval of a preliminary plat for Somersby Pointe Subdivision on property consisting of 85.17 acres located on Southport Parkway near the intersection of Buck Swamp Road and Highway 17.

The applicant's representative was in attendance.

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

In April of 2000 the Planning Commission approved a preliminary plat that proposed a 238 lot subdivision. In the Spring of 2001 the County Commission approved the final plat for Somersby Pointe, Phase I, a 39 lot subdivision. At its October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting the Planning Commission approved a preliminary plat for Somersby Pointe, Phase II.

The applicant is requesting approval of the reconfigured 238 lot subdivision for Somersby Pointe. The item under consideration is a revision to the preliminary plat approved by the Planning Commission in April of 2000.

A number of issues were raised during the review of this proposal and the developer has resolved all of staff's concerns. This subdivision establishes procedural compliance in accordance with Article VII of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

-----

PP2002.0918.14:45 Royal Oaks, Phase IV

Request by Royal Oaks Development for approval of a preliminary plat for Royal Oaks Subdivision, Phase IV on property consisting of 14.382 acres located in the R-20 Zoning District on the south side of U. S. Highway 17.

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

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

Royal Oaks is an older subdivision that has been developed in a number of phases since mid 1990s. The Planning commission considered a request for approval of Phase IV at its October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting and approved a variance for the length of the dead-end street. The preliminary plat was continued due to a number of associated issues.

At the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting two primary issues remained unresolved: whether the Tree Board had reviewed the plat, and whether the developer had provided an easement in order to loop the water line to Regal Road.

During its October 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Glynn County Tree Board considered approving the preliminary plat for Royal Oaks, Phase IV. The Board motioned to accept the plat but to withhold action until construction plans could be received.

On October 21<sup>st</sup> staff met with the owner and agent for Royal Oaks and discussed the issue of looping the water line back to Phase I. The revised plat indicates a 15 ft. easement across private property, and would resolve the issue when deeds are provided.

Drainage maintenance has added an additional comment regarding a low area where water remains trapped between Phase IV and Dunkirk. Staff acknowledges that this comment can be resolved at the construction plan phase of review.

The submission establishes procedural compliance in accordance with Article VI of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

-----

#### Chairman Items

##### a) **Scheduling of Workshops**

Chairman Stewart reminded everyone that a workshop is scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup> beginning at 5:00 p.m. to continue review of the Proposed Amendment to Section 709.5 (SSVPD General Provisions) to reduce Building Height. Also, the Water Supply Impact with regard to Site Plans will be reviewed at that time. These are advertised items; therefore the Planning Commission could take action at that time. (Staff will submit a courtesy ad to appear in the Brunswick News.)

Chairman Stewart appointed Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams to the nominating committee for selection of Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2003. Elections will take place at the December 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

##### b) **Planning Commission Items**

Mr. Hart wanted to know the status of the amendment adding *Industrial Uses* to Site Plan Approval. Mr. Phillips stated that the amendment was approved by the County Commission in March 2002.

#### Staff Items

##### a) **Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment concerning Parking Standards For Vehicle Sales and Servicing Uses**

Mr. Phillips explained that this proposal is included in the packages for informational purposes only. It is a result of discussions relating to Camden Motor Sports and possibly automobile dealerships. The standards contained in the proposal are examples from other ordinances. Mr. Phillips stated that staff is recommending that an amendment be pursued in the future to make adjustments. Chairman Stewart concurred.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.