

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
September 3, 2002 6:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Mike Aspinwall

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

Chairman Wayne Stewart called the meeting to order 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.

Adoption of Agenda

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jonathan Williams and seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick, the September 3rd Planning Commission Agenda was unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: August 6th
Regular Meeting: August 20th

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Minutes of the August 6, 2002 Planning Commission meeting with minor corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the Minutes of the August 20, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Gary Nevill, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Hal Hart was absent for the August 20th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

CHAIRMAN ITEMS

a) Scheduling of Workshops

Chairman Stewart stated that he is waiting for a response from the written request forwarded to County Commission Chairman Cap Fendig regarding the joint meeting to discuss the proposed ordinance changes. This meeting will be for discussion purposes only and no formal action is expected. The topics for discussion will be trees, building

height, site coverage and buffers. He will inform the members and staff once this meeting is scheduled.

b) Committee Reports

Buffers: Mr. Fields stated that after much public input, there seemed to be no support for a 50 ft. buffer being placed all the way around property. What we currently have now is a 25 ft. undisturbed buffer, which is basically nothing. As a result of discussing this with several people, he stated that he has been leaning toward having a 25 ft. buffer described as layers. The rear layer would be designed to hold a certain type of tree with a height of 6 to 8 ft. and growing to a height of up to 25 ft. The front layer would be more of a hedge type consisting of rapidly growing plants. Another layer would be a planted landscape for ground cover. Mr. Fields stated that the object is to have the higher level of trees to block light and sound, the hedges would block sight and sound, and the lower level would be for a visual affect. He stated that it is cheaper to do plantings than it is to build fences.

Regarding enforcement problems, Mr. Fields suggested amending the site plan approval process so that planted buffers are shown for all site plan approval and made part of the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) indicating that until the buffer is in place, no CO would be issued. He also suggested some type of periodic review to ensure that the requirements are adhered to.

Mr. Fields stated he is not completely ruling out fences in that there are certain areas, such as in the Village, where there is a zero lot line rather than 25 ft. In these areas he would suggest some type of masonry fence or stucco fence to include construction standards.

Mr. Williams stated that undisturbed buffer would have to be better defined in the ordinance, and if a fence is used as a buffer, perhaps it should be decorative or a certain type as Mr. Fields alluded to, so as not to block the wind, breeze, etc. from residential property. He then gave an example of a residence located on St. Simons where an extremely high wooden fence has blocked the wind from the residential property.

Ms. Ann McCormick wanted to know if the periodic review would be for maintenance purposes and to replace dead shrubbery, etc. Mr. Fields replied yes. The problem now is that the Code Enforcement Division only responds on a complaint basis and this will probably continue, but we need some type of enforcement mechanism.

Site Coverage: Mr. Hart stated that he and Mrs. Touw met several times to discuss this section and determined that the definition of site coverage is everywhere in the ordinance. In some places it is spelled out completely but in other places it is very vague. For instance, there is a 25 ft. DNR setback, but is this considered site coverage or non-developable area. Mr. Hart stated that his report is starting to resemble an outline of where and how we approach site coverage. Although it is better defined in the Resort Residential District, this seems to be the area with the most problems. He stated that he would continue with the outline approach of this section and provide of summary of his findings.

c) Planning Commission Items

Mr. Perry Fields reminded staff that at the last meeting he requested a status report on the grass-ring paving project. Mrs. Segers stated that a meeting needs to be scheduled with Code Enforcement to address this issue as to how we should proceed. Mr. Fields stated that his specific concern is that when this was approved, the idea was to see how it would work to control drainage and run-off, as opposed to asphalt paving. He would like to know if it is working in that regard. Mrs. Segers stated that one of the shortcomings observed so far is that the area where the grass-ring paving is being used gets too many cars. The system is breaking down because of this frequency. Another problem is that

the area where this is being used has a lot of shade and is not conducive for sunlight for the grass to grow, which then causes problems with the root system.

Chairman Stewart pointed out that Mr. Lee Sutton (former Planning Official) approached him and advised that the grass-ring paving was not working like they thought it would be, and that he would be willing to give an extensive presentation on this issue. Chairman Stewart stated that the thought process is to do away with paving and to seek other alternatives, but if this alternative is not working, we need to find another alternative. He feels that it would be beneficial to have Mr. Sutton give a presentation perhaps at a work session to discuss this issue at length.

STAFF ITEMS

a) **Proposed Amendment - Consideration of Water Supply in certain Site Plan Review**

The above referenced amendment was prepared by the County Attorney and was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. The following changes were suggested:

619.2 Requirements

- *...If the site is within zoning districts, Limited Industrial, Basic Industrial or General Industrial, and if daily water use is expected to exceed 99,000 gallons, or, at the request of the Planning Commission, identification of all planned water sources...*

Mr. Hart pointed out that the new section left out two zoning classifications that should be included: Forest Agricultural and Planned Development. He stated that golf courses are probably the third largest users of water and could be built in either of these classifications. He suggested changing the wording to "of any use or uses that would require ground water use of over 99,000 gallons per day."

Mr. Fields stated that the word "or" is the trigger word. It changes the entire definition. He stated that the phrase "or at the request of the Planning Commission" means that the Planning Commission could do this at anytime. He stated that the Planning Commission could stop a development at one gallon per day, and that would be arbitrary and capricious. Mr. Fields suggested removing that entire phrase.

- *For any water usage within zoning districts...that is in excess of 100,000 gallons per day from the miocene or floridan aquifers...the applicant shall provide a copy of the...groundwater withdrawal permit...*

Mr. Hart expressed concerns about the term "miocene." He stated the term refers to a geological age in history and should not be used in this capacity. He pointed out that the Water Resource Advisory Committee refers to this as the "Upper and Lower Brunswick Aquifer." Mr. Fields suggested including "surface water" in this particular section (if there is an excess of 100,000 gallons per day).

Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that currently, there is a group of people studying the water issues. Their charge is to uncover the owners of water, marsh and marsh hammocks, etc. and to come up with a recommendation for the State and subsequently write some type of legislation. He stated that there is really not enough knowledge about the "miocene."

After discussing other changes in the amendment, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to have Mr. Phillips refine the suggested changes and send the document back to the County Attorney for further review.

b) Report on Committee Review of Excavation and Filling Regulations

Mr. Phillips stated that there are no changes with respect to the above issue.

c) Georgia Planning Association - Annual Conference

Information and registration forms on the above referenced conference were distributed to the Planning Commission. Members interested in attending were asked to advise Mr. Phillips no later than Monday, September 9th.

At this time, Mr. Phillips introduced Mr. Paul Andrews as the new Assistant County Engineer. On behalf of the Glynn County Planning Commission, Chairman Stewart extended a hearty welcome to Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Tyler Frazier distributed, for informational purposes only, issues and minor changes pertaining to requirements for final plat applications and a general discussion ensued.

Mr. Fields inquired about the status of the proposed Wildlife Park. He wanted to know if the developers were working under the guidelines of the original site plan approved two years ago. Mr. Phillips stated that there were three site plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission:

- 1) East 1 - the parking area
- 2) East 2 - the original version of the theme park
- 3) West 1- area near the golf course

All three site plans came back to the Planning Commission in December 2001 for extensions. Mr. Phillips stated that the record is very unclear as to exactly what was extended and for what period of time, but it is probably safe to say that the extensions are good until December 2002. He stated that East 1 (parking area) is likely to come in before December with a final building permit version.

Mr. Phillips stated that he has been in contact with Mr. Jeff Halliburton who has indicated that he would like to do some preliminary descriptions with regard to the commercial area. He stated that Mr. Halliburton would present an update of the design issues, etc. perhaps at a work session so that everyone is up to speed on the project. The Planning Commission concurred.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.