

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 4, 2002 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Wayne Stewart, Chairman
Lamar Cole, Vice Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Perry Fields
Hal Hart
Ann McCormick
Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: York Phillips, Planning Manager
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Jim Bruner, County Engineer
Glenn Bollinger, Traffic Safety
Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement
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.

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to adopt the June 4th Planning Commission Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. 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.)

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- Regular Meeting - May 7, 2002
- Regular Meeting - April 2, 2002
- Work Session - November 15, 2001
- Work Session - January 14, 2002
- Work Session - February 19, 2002

May 7th Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Minutes of May 7th Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields had not arrived yet.)

April 2nd Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the Minutes of the April 2nd Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields had not arrived yet.)

November 15th Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Minutes of the November 15th Work Session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Mike Aspinwall and Mr. Wayne Stewart were not present at that time and therefore abstained from voting. (Mr. Perry Fields had not arrived yet.)

January 14th Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Minutes of the January 14th Work Session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Mike Aspinwall was not present at that time and therefore abstained from voting. (Mr. Perry Fields had not arrived yet.)

February 19th Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve the Minutes of the February 19th Work Session. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Mr. Jonathan Williams was not present at that time and therefore abstained from voting. (Mr. Perry Fields had not arrived yet.)

(It was noted that Mr. Fields arrived at 9:08 a.m.)

Live Oak Power Plant (SP200205061641)

90 Acres, Located East of New Jesup Highway in Sterling

Zoned General Industrial

Bob Brown & Reginald Hancock, Property Owners

Attorney Mark Johnson was present for discussion.

Chairman Stewart explained that this application was voted on and approved by the Planning Commission at its December 2001 meeting; however, due to changes in the ordinances with regard to site plans it had to be re-submitted for approval. He stated that this is the same site plan that the Planning Commission approved last year. Chairman Stewart placed a 10 minute time limit on those speaking in favor of and those speaking against this request.

For the record, Mr. Tyler Frazier presented letters from two organizations expressing concerns about this application; “Georgians for Clean Energy” and “The Center for Sustainable Coasts.” (These letters will be placed in the file for future reference.) Mr. Frazier then proceeded with the background history of this request, which was included in the staff’s report as follows:

In the Fall of 2001, Live Oak LLC and Golder Associates Inc. made inquiry with the Community Development Department regarding a proposed power producing facility to be located in Sterling. The following is a time line of the events that occurred from their initial meeting to the present.

- **Novemeber 8, 2001:** Former Planning Official, Leroy Sutton, instructed Golder and Associates to submit a request for exception to the maximum building height with the planning commission and a development of regional impact (DRI) application with Mr. York Phillips of the Coastal Georgia Regional Development Center. Subsequently it was determined that the project will not qualify as a DRI.
- **December 4, 2001:** The Planning Commission approved the request for maximum building height.
- **December 12, 2001:** Golder Associates submitted a site plan to Leroy Sutton for consideration by the Planning Commission January 8th, 2002.
- Week prior to January 8th Planning Commission meeting: Applicant verbally requests to be pulled from agenda.
- **February 5th, 2002:** The Glynn County Planning Commission forwarded to the County Commission with a recommendation of approval GC-2002-ZT1, an amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance to require site plan approval for

developments in Limited Industrial, Basic Industrial, and General Industrial Zoning Districts.

- **March 7th, 2002:** The Glynn County Board of Commissioners unanimously approves amendment as #O-2002-06 per #R-06-98.
- **March 27th, 2002:** Mr. Richard A. Zwolak of Golder Associates seeks letter confirming appropriateness of zoning through Mr. Roy (Burt) Wallace of Live Oak, LLC. Tyler Frazier, Planner II, informs Mr. Wallace of the new requirement for Site Plan review and approval by the Planning Commission prior to building permit application.
- **May 3, 2002:** Mr. Roy B. Wallace submits Site Plan application with the Glynn County Community Development Department to be heard by the Planning Commission during its June 4th meeting.

On June 6, 1972 the subject property was rezoned from BI (Basic Industrial) to GI (General Industrial) by the Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Planning Commission.

The proposed development presents Glynn County with a number of economic benefits; the most notable is the ad valorem taxes expected to be collected on an annual basis. Based on initial contract estimates similar construction projects fees could range upwards from \$1,000,000.00 for the building permit. The independent power producing facility is also negotiating a contract with the City of Brunswick to purchase treated effluent from the Academy Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant and pipe it approximately 10 miles to Sterling. There have been preliminary discussions about running a sewer line back from the proposed Live Oaks facility through a Georgia Power Easement to the east of New Jesup Highway.

The independent power producing facility is also required to obtain permits from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers. These permits include the following:

- Clean Air Act Title IV and Title V (operations) Permits (USEPA and GA EPD)
- Air Permit for Construction Activities (GA EPD)
- Consumptive Water Withdrawal Permit (GA EPD)
- Section 404 Wetland Permit (COE)
- NPDES Stormwater Permit for Construction (GA EPD)
- NPDES Stormwater Permit for Operations (GA EPD)
- Permits required to connect the project to reclaimed water sources and sanitary sewer lines.

Due to the technical nature of state and federal requirements and the construction drawings for the power producing facility, it is difficult to determine what impacts the proposed development will have on Glynn County. The county may wish to monitor the permitting processes to ensure that county issues are adequately reflected. Typically, local governments that permit power producing facilities of this size and nature hire an independent engineering firm capable of performing independent assessments in the County's best interest.

The proposal meets the general requirements of the ordinances. The level of detail leaves general questions to be resolved with the Building Permit review. The details of the treated effluent have not been resolved, but discussions are in the process. Staff recommends approval of the site plan subject to:

- 1) Staff review and approval of detailed plans in connection with specific building permits; and
- 2) Execution of an agreement for use of treated wastewater.

In addition, the county should monitor the process of other permits, in particular the public comment period of the Clean Air Act Title IV and Title V Permit through Georgia EPD.

Attorney Mark Johnson, representing the applicant, explained that nothing has changed in this project since December 2001. He stated that this project would have a positive impact on the city as well as the county and he is hoping for a successful start.

Mr. George Skarpalezos stated that he owns approximately 400 acres adjacent to this project and he thinks that it would be good for Glynn County. Mr. Richard McKinna was also present to speak in favor of this request.

Mr. James Holland, Altamaha Riverkeeper, stated that there is a misconception throughout the community about this project and he feels that it would be bad for the county. He is strongly opposed to this request. Also present to speak in opposition were Ms. Sara Barczak, Mr. Frank Quinby, Mr. Daniel Parshley and Ms. Meredith Trawick. Those speaking in opposition expressed concerns about environmental issues, zoning issues, water usage and wetlands protection.

Chairman Stewart explained that the Planning Commission is only approving the site plan. Environmental issues would have to be addressed by EPD. He stated that the zoning for this particular property is already in place. Mr. Jim Bruner stated that the drainage issues would be reviewed at the construction stage of the proposal.

Mr. Daniel Parshley pointed out that this is the 4th site plan submitted by the applicants and he's concerned about which site plan is being approved at this time. He further stated that this project is not in the best interest of Glynn County and would only serve the applicant's purpose. Chairman Stewart explained that it is not unusual to have

more than one site plan. Mr. Fields expounded on the process for reviewing site plans and echoed the Chairman's comments about the zoning being in place. Chairman Stewart emphasized that the site plan before the Planning Commission at this time is the same one that was submitted in December of last year and is available for the public's review.

It was noted that the following section was referenced for the record:

Section 617 Exceptions to Height Limits

The height limitations in this ordinance shall not apply to chimneys, which can be constructed no greater than 5 ft. above the highest point of the roof. Spires, belfries, cupolas, domes, monuments, roof signs, water towers, observation towers, electrical transmission towers, silos, chimneys, smokestacks, elevators, conveyors, flag poles, mast, steeples, and windmills that exceed the height limitations for the district in which they are located, as outlined in the ordinance, require approval from the Glynn County Planning Commission. When considering an exception, the Planning Commission must consider the following factors:

- 1. Maintenance of aesthetic appeal...*
- 2. Safety of any structure...*
- 3. The specific need of the property owner...*
- 4. Availability of alternative means...*
- 5. Impact on property value...*
- 6. Any other adverse impacts...*

All structures, including radio transmission towers, which exceed a height of 150 ft. MSL shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to the issuance of a building permit. Structures in excess of 250 ft. MSL shall be approved by the Planning Commission prior to submitting the "Notice of Proposed Construction of Alteration." The Planning Commission, before hearing the request, shall afford the Glynn County Airport Manager an opportunity to comment in writing as to the effect such structures may have on airport approach zones and flight patterns. Further, it may also be necessary to obtain approval of the structures from the Federal Aviation Administration, which shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request as submitted with the recommended conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Jonathan Williams.

GC-2002-06

Request to rezone from R-9 (One Family Residential) to FC (Freeway Commercial) property located on the northeast side of New Jesup Highway (US 341) approximately 1200 feet southeast of the Yellow Bluff Creek Bridge (4834 New Jesup Highway), and consisting of approximately 3.912 acres, with approximately 48.34 ft. of frontage on New Jesup Highway. Property owned by Yellow Bluff Investments, LLC.

Mr. Butch Wilder was present for discussion.

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

This proposal involves an area of just under 4 acres located near New Jesup Highway (US 341). This property lies behind an area of Freeway Commercial zoning that abuts the highway. This land and the commercially zoned land in front of it (to the west) would become a commercial development site. This site is currently wooded and contains an access drive serving a parcel that is not included in the request. To the northwest is marsh along Yellow Bluff Creek. To the southwest is a commercially zoned site that is wooded and undeveloped, and is not part of this proposal. To the south is a commercial parcel with frontage along New Jesup highway, occupied by the Sapp well drilling establishment. To the east and northeast are residential properties with access from Yellow Bluff Creek Road.

The Future Land Use Map in the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan shows this property for commercial use, with "undeveloped" (marsh) to the west and residential to the east. The property abuts a marsh, which is regulated under the Marsh Protection Act. No formal marsh delineation has been submitted. Before reviewing any specific plans for development, the marsh delineation should be verified. It appears; however, that the line is not likely to change as the topographical information submitted shows a small bluff along the northwest line. The site appears to generally be two to three feet above the marsh. A marsh buffer of 25 feet will also have to be provided.

Access to the site would be from New Jesup Highway. There should be some coordination of access with the undeveloped parcel to the south. The development of the site should include consideration of adequate buffers along the northeast line abutting the existing residential development.

The site is not currently served by utilities, although City of Brunswick Water and Sewer serves the area along US 341 just north of the Yellow Bluff Creek. The development of this site should be considered an opportunity to extend service to support commercial development in 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. The area to the southwest and south has frontage along US 341 and is commercial in character. The area to the east and southeast is residential, but has access from a different road and an adequate buffer can be provided.

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

No. The existing residential area to the east can be buffered.

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

Yes, although residential development would present problems of access and would be somewhat undesirable considering the contiguous non-residential development.

- 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 for commercial development.

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

Conditions have not changed appreciably since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

The overall site appears to be sufficient in size to support a commercial development with necessary parking, buffers, and with adequate stormwater management facilities. Access will need to be coordinated with the undeveloped commercial parcel along US 341. Adequate buffers will have to be provided along the east line, and proper consideration will need to be given to the marsh and marsh buffer. Finally, consideration should be given to provision of water and sewer to this site.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Carlton Gibson was present to represent Mr. James Gerock, adjacent property owner, who is opposed to this request for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Hal Hart expressed concerns about the surrounding R-9 sites and the buffers.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Discussion continued.

Mr. Hart wanted to know the width of the easement. Mr. Ernest Stephens, adjoining property owner, stated that the easement is 30 ft. wide. Mr. Jim Bruner stated that 30 ft. is marginal but it is adequate. Chairman Stewart stated that if they were to leave the easement within the R-9 zoning perhaps that would solve the problem; however, Mr. Fields stated that the easement is not the problem. He then asked that the motion be amended to include approval subject to a 50 ft. undisturbed buffer on the eastern boundary, and subject to site plan approval. The amendment was accepted and the following vote was taken. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Ms. Ann McCormick. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Hal Hart.

GC-2002-07

Request to rezone from General Industrial to Forest Agricultural, property located on the south side of East Glynn Avenue southeast of its intersection with GA Hwy 32, and east of the right of way of the former Seaboard Airline Railroad in the Thalman community, and consisting of approximately 8.092 acres, with approximately 252.39 ft. of frontage on GA 32 and East Glynn Avenue (combined). Property owned by Arlene H. Hanson.

Ms. Arlene Hanson was present for discussion.

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

This is a request to reduce the zoning to permit the construction of a single-family dwelling. The site was probably zoned industrial because it was adjacent to the main line railroad. The railroad (formerly located to the west of this site) was subsequently relocated as the result of a merger. The main line now goes through Jesup and Ludowici. There are some sheds and other buildings on the site. The area consists of sparsely developed rural uses including farms and scattered housing.

The Comprehensive Plan shows this area for low-density residential development. The size of this site is such that it would not present any issues of density. The site is rural and receives limited county services.

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 proposed use is consistent with the existing use and development of adjacent land.

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

No. The proposed use is consistent with the existing use and development of adjacent land.

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

Yes, although there is not a high demand for industrial uses in this area due to lack of services, access and workers.

- 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 would not create a high demand for services.

- 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.

There have been no significant changes since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, but the industrial zoning probably pre-dates the removal of the railroad.

Mr. Phillips stated that the site is appropriate for the use requested and staff recommends approval of the proposed zoning.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-08

Request to rezone from R-12 (One Family Residential) to R-6 (One Family Residential), property located east of McLane Street, and lying between Stewart Street and McIntosh Avenue, east of the Oglethorpe Park development on Frederica Road. The property consists of approximately 66,585 sq. ft. (approximately 1.53 acres) and has combined frontage of approximately 592.4 ft. on Stewart Ave., McLane St., and McIntosh Ave. Property owned by Beach Contractors, Inc., & Stewart Strother LLC.

Mr. Jim Fucetola was present for discussion.

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

This is a request to change the residential zoning of the property to allow a re-division that creates more lots. The property is currently platted with five lots, one of which contains a house under construction. The applicant has submitted a lot layout with eight lots, but this sketch does not constitute a formal request for re-subdivision. It is possible that meeting all requirements for lot size and width may yield fewer than eight lots.

The area is residential with homes on smaller lots. The area to the west is zoned R-6, but individual lot sizes may exceed the 6,000 square foot minimum lot size of the R-6 district. Zoning to the east is R-12.

The Glynn County Comprehensive Plan shows this area for low-density residential use.

The area is served by public water and sewer and by other urban infrastructure. While there are some limitations in capacity, the small size of the proposed development should not present a specific problem. On the other hand, a trend toward increasing densities in already established areas could present significant difficulties with respect to adequate services.

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 use is consistent with the use of the surrounding area and with the uses that would be permitted under the existing zoning. The difference is with the size of lots permitted. The number of lots with the requested zoning might be eight, while the existing zoning permits five lots.

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

The proposed use will not adversely affect the surrounding area per se, but the reduction in lot sizes may have an impact.

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

Yes. The existing zoning permits five lots. Single family residential lots on St. Simons Island constitute a reasonable economic use.

- 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 increase in the number of units will not individually burden the infrastructure serving the area. A trend toward increasing densities in already established areas may, however, exacerbate problems associated with infrastructure that is already at or near capacity in many respects.

- 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 for low-density residential use.

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

There have been no changes in conditions in the subject area that would support an increase in density above the density of the surrounding area.

There is considerable new and infill development on St. Simons Island. New development generally occurs in areas where there is adequate land to properly provide buffers and open space, and where new infrastructure facilities can be constructed by the developer to support the new development. Infill development, on the other hand, may be proposed in areas where facilities are inadequate or where it is difficult to establish adequate buffers or transitions between different uses or densities.

The level of infrastructure in a developed area is usually driven by the type and density of the existing development it serves. Where limited infill development occurs, it can usually be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. On the other hand, where there is a widespread trend toward more intense infill development or where substantially different uses are introduced, the existing infrastructure may quickly become inadequate.

There has been little support for reducing lots sizes for new development to as little as 6,000 square feet. Most areas with R-6 zoning are much older. Areas not currently zoned R-6 should not be rezoned to this category. Instead, small lot developments should use some form of planned development zoning or other special techniques should be developed to accommodate such developments. Furthermore, infill development involving higher densities should reflect special attention to compatibility with surrounding lot sizes and development styles, and make appropriate use of buffers.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff is recommending denial of this request.

It was noted that Mr. Jim Fucetola, agent, was present to answer questions, etc.

Speaking in opposition were Mr. Edward Miller, Ms. Sarah Shearouse and Mr. Joe Marshall. Those speaking in opposition expressed concerns about the foul odor from Lift Station #3. They also contend that if approved, this development would put a strain on the current resources and would not enhance their neighborhood.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 10-minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:40 a.m.

GC-2002-09

Request to rezone from General Industrial to General Commercial, property located on the west side of Habersham Street south of its intersection with Community Road (GA Hwy 303) and consisting of approximately 193,842 sq. ft. (approximately 4.45 acres) and having 417.44 feet of frontage on Community Road and approximately 423.48 feet of frontage on Habersham Street. Property owned by Sawyer & Associates.

Camden Motor Sports (SP200205071605)

4 Acre Tract, Located on Habersham Street at
Community Road, Zoned General Industrial
Sawyer & Associates, Owner/Developer

Staff requested that the site plan and the rezoning application be reviewed simultaneously. Mr. Robert Cheek was in attendance to represent the site plan; however, no one was present to represent the rezoning application. It was established that an Agent Authorization Form had been submitted with this application but it was not included in

the packages. Therefore, the Chairman deferred both applications until later in the meeting to allow staff to retrieve the Agent Authorization Form for the rezoning application.

Lake Cottages, Phase II (SP200205071626)

3 Acre Tract, Located on Sea Island Road at Frederica Road, Zoned Resort Residential
Sea Island Company, Owner/Developer

Sea Island Lake Cottages (PP200205061132)

3 Acre Tract, Located on Sea Island Lake Cottages Drive
Zoned Resort Residential
Sea Island Coastal Properties, Owner/Developer

Attorney Jim Gilbert and Mr. Bill Edenfield were present for discussion

Staff requested that the site plan and the preliminary plat be reviewed simultaneously. During the course of discussion, it was noted that a written request for a variance on the 1200 ft. cul-de-sac had also been submitted for approval. However, due to unresolved issues with the site plan, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to address the variance first and then the preliminary plat. The issues surrounding the site plan with regard to roads and drainage would have to be resolved and brought back next month for review. The applicant requested a deferral of the site plan until the July 2nd meeting. The Planning Commission concurred.

After addressing the 1200 ft. cul-de-sac, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to grant the variance for Sea Island Cottages Drive. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted. A motion was then made by Mr. Fields to approve the preliminary plat for Sea Island Lake Cottages. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

At this time, Mr. Frazier returned to the meeting with the Agent Authorization Form for Application GC-2002-09. The Planning Commission proceeded with the rezoning application but agreed to review and take action on the site plan separately.

GC-2002-09

Request to rezone from General Industrial to General Commercial, property located on the west side of Habersham Street south of its intersection with Community Road (GA Hwy 303) and consisting of approximately 193,842 sq. ft. (approximately 4.45 acres) and

having 417.44 feet of frontage on Community Road and approximately 423.48 feet of frontage on Habersham Street. Property owned by Sawyer & Associates.

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

The subject site is undeveloped and wooded. To the east of Habersham Street is an industrial use. To the northeast, on the opposite side of Community Road is a convenience store. The site is adjacent to the east end of the Community Road (SR 303) overpass over the railroad tracks – the tracks pass to the west of this site.

The Glynn County Comprehensive Plan shows this site for commercial development.

The area is adequately served by utilities and has good access. There is a mix of commercial retail, wholesale, heavy service commercial, and light industrial uses along Community Road.

The proposed development is a motorcycle sales and service establishment. The character and intensity of this use is consistent with uses in the area and with uses that would be permitted under the existing zoning.

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.

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 for commercial 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.

The proposed zoning and use are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with the use and development of adjacent property; and therefore, staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Discussion continued which prompted Mr. Fields to amend the motion to include that no access would be afforded from Community Road; all access would be from Habersham Street. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

Camden Motor Sports (SP200205071605)

4 Acre Tract, Located on Habersham Street at
Community Road, Zoned General Industrial
Sawyer & Associates, Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Cheek was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff has reviewed this site plan and recommends approval subject to all drainage issues being addressed prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

Stillwater (PP200205061547)

84 Acre Tract, Located on Hampton Pointe Drive
St. Simons Island, Zoned Forest Agricultural
DKK Development Company, Owner/Developer

Mr. Frank DeLoach and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

According to Mr. Frazier, staff reviewed this preliminary plat and found it to be in compliance with the Glynn County Ordinance and Regulations. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Bobby Shupe pointed out that the entrance road name was changed (Stillwater Drive) to meet GIS requirements.

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

Pilot Travel Center (PP200205061519)
21 Acre Tract, Located on U. S. Highway 17 South at I-95
Zoned Freeway Commercial
Edwards Partnership, L.L.C., Owner/Developer

Mr. Gary Nevill was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated staff's recommendation is for approval of this preliminary plat.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Nevill stated that the private access would be changed to a private road.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart provided Section 602.5 is adhered to. The motion was unanimously adopted.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS
GC-2002-ZT3

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance and Glynn County Subdivision Regulations to modify application submittal deadline requirements. Includes Glynn County Zoning Ordinance Sections 619.1, 621, 709.9, 709.11, 717.4, 723.4, 723.6, 804.7.2 A.1, 813.1 A., 814.1, 814.6, 904.2, 1004, 1009, 1102.2, 1105.2, and Glynn County Subdivision Regulations Sections 702, 704, 708, 803, and for other purposes.

This amendment was deferred from the May 7th meeting to allow the committee appointed by the Chairman to provide additional information. The committee was chaired by Mr. Bobby Shupe and included Mr. John Peterson, Mr. York Phillips, Mr. Terry Driggers and Mr. Ernie Johns. On behalf of the Planning Commission, Chairman Stewart expressed his appreciation to Mr. Shupe and the committee members for their assistance and for the timely manner in which they completed this assignment.

Ms. Meredith Trawick asked if this amendment would reduce the time allowed for public comment. Chairman Stewart replied no, it would in fact allow more time for the public to comment.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-ZT5

An Amendment to the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations Articles VI and VII to standardize traffic control devices in accordance with the design standards set forth by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and for other purposes, to include Sections 602.2 (m), 602.5 (c), 602.6 (d), and 706 9. I.

The amendment was included in the packages for review. Mr. Glenn Bollinger was in attendance to answer questions. Mr. Fields expressed concerns about a section of the amendment which states: “Acceleration, deceleration and turning lanes will be required where it is determined to be necessary by the **County Engineer and/or the County Traffic Safety Engineer.**” Mr. Fields stated that this should not be an either or situation. It should be more definite and should include one or the other to avoid conflicts between the two entities. The Planning Commission concurred and advised staff to work toward designating someone for this task. This amendment was deferred until the July 2nd meeting.

GC-2002-ZT6

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VII (Signs) to remove the requirement for fees for banner permits issued to non-profit organizations, and for other purposes.

During the course of discussing this amendment, it was determined that the phrase “non-profit organization” needed to be defined. Therefore, staff was advised to confer with the County Attorney for a legal definition and bring this amendment back for review and approval at that July 2nd Planning Commission meeting.

GC-2002-ZT7

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions) to require site plan approval by the Planning Commission for institutional uses on St. Simons Island and Sea Island, and for other purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Hart thanked staff for their efforts in preparing this amendment. He then made a motion recommending that it be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

CHAIRMAN ITEMS

Chairman Stewart gave a brief overview of the May 31st Work Session. He explained that they are hoping to have everything completed with a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners in time for their August 15th meeting. He stated that he would not be in attendance at the July 2nd Planning Commission meeting and has asked Mr. Hal Hart to chair the meeting in his absence. Ms. McCormick will also be absent for the July 2nd meeting.

Chairman Stewart explained that the original date to begin the two monthly Planning Commission meetings had to be rescheduled in order to avoid a conflict with the Board of Commissioners meeting. Due to the July 4th holiday being on a Thursday, the Board of Commissioners scheduled its regular meeting for Tuesday, July 2nd at 6:00 p.m. Therefore the Planning Commission will hold its regular meeting on Tuesday July 2nd at 9:00 a.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building. Enactment of the new By-Laws will commence on August 6th at 6:00 p.m. in the Public Safety Complex. The Public Hearings will be advertised in accordance with the ordinances.

PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Mr. Fields suggested that staff not include in its report a recommended motion for the Planning Commission. Chairman Stewart stated that he is also uncomfortable with this language. Mr. Phillips agreed to eliminate the language from the staff's report. Mr. Fields further stated that when staff is submitting a recommendation with conditions, the conditions should be listed in the report. Staff concurred.

STAFF ITEMS

a) R-6 District and PD for Small Lots

Mr. Phillips will confer with the County Attorney on the appropriate language for this item and bring back a detailed report at the next meeting.

b) Open Display and Sales in Village Preservation District

Mr. Phillips stated that in reading the ordinance for the Village District there are too many sub-ordinance clauses with regard to open display and sales. He stated that he would research this further and prepare an amendment for the Planning Commission's review.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.