

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
May 7, 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
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
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.

At the Chairman's request and with the consensus of the members, Agenda Item #13 (***Proposed Deadline Amendment***) was deferred for 30 days. Chairman Stewart appointed a committee to review this amendment for additional input from individuals affected by this process before its adoption. The committee consists of Mr. John Peterson, Mr. York Phillips, Mr. Bobby Shupe, Mr. Terry Driggers and Mr. Ernie Johns, with Mr. Shupe serving as Chairman. The committee will report back to the Planning Commission at the June 4th meeting.

Chairman Stewart also requested a 30 day deferral of Agenda Item #15 (***Proposed Traffic Safety Devices Amendment***). The members concurred. Mr. Glenn Bollinger was advised to confer with major developers and the County Attorney regarding aesthetics and liability issues of traffic signs, and report back to the Planning Commission at the June 4th meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to accept the May 7th Planning Commission Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

GC-2002-05

Request to rezone from R-6 (Single Family Residential) to GR (General Residential) property located on the east side of Mallery Street approximately opposite its intersection with Martin Street (620 Mallery Street, St. Simons Island) and consisting of 31,355 sq. ft. (0.72 ac.) with approximately 153 feet of frontage on Mallery Street. Property owned by Helen T. Morton and Reba Johnson.

Ms. Reba Johnson and Attorney Tom Lee were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

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

Use would be similar to uses on surrounding property.

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

Use would not adversely affect the use of adjacent property.

- 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.

Change in use would not substantially impact public facilities.

- 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. The area generally east of Mallery is shown as Medium/High Density Residential and the area west is generally shown 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 are no unique conditions affecting this site.

For the record, Chairman Stewart reported that he had received two letters of opposition to this request: 1) Mr. Raymond H. Jarvis of 540 Poplar Avenue, SSI dated April 29th; and 2) Mrs. Mickey Robbins of 532 Poplar Avenue, SSI dated May 1st.

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

SUP-02-03

Special Use Permit to allow an outdoor commercial recreational facility in a GC (General Commercial) zoning district on property consisting of 3.00 acres located at 1901 Old Jesup Road, which is situated on the southwest side of Old Jesup Road southeast of its intersection with Anna Way, the property having 427 feet of frontage on Old Jesup Road. Name of proposed Special Use is Tee Time Golf and Games. Property owned by Al Chapman; Landon Investments, Agent.

Mr. Landon and Mr. Ernie Johns were present for discussion.

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

This Special Use Permit is required under Article VII, Section 712.3 Special Uses (1) Amusement center or outdoor commercial recreation facilities. The proposed use in this case is a golf driving range known as Tee Time Golf and Games. The property consists of 3.00 acres located at 1901 Old Jesup Road, which is situated on the southwest side of Old Jesup Road southeast of its intersection with Anna Way, with 427 feet of frontage on Old Jesup Road.

Proposed development area is located within the GC General Commercial zoning district, and includes tee area, 16' X 20' building and gravel parking area of approximately 26 spaces.

Landon Investments proposes to include the undevelopable area within the Georgia Power easement (zoned FA Forest Agricultural) as a landing area for the driving range. It was not included within the General Layout Plan because it will not be developed. Additionally, a golf course is listed as a permitted use for FA. It is staff's interpretation that a golf driving range is allowable in FA Forest Agricultural under the permitted use of golf course.

A review of zoning records revealed that a 1/6/1977 (GC-38-76) rezoning of the subject property to GC (General Commercial) stipulated that no buildings be constructed within a 25 foot buffer along Old Jesup Road. The current General Layout Plan is consistent with this requirement.

A review of maps for Little Lake Farms, Phase II (PP-00-36), indicate intent to develop a residential area beyond the GA Power easement area, however, the Preliminary Plat for the area is not approved.

Staff recommends approval of this request, provided that passive use of the GA Power easement area as a receiving area for golf balls cease upon development of the FA Forest Agricultural area south of the driving range.

Mr. Ernie Johns stated that the GA Power easement is in the FA district, which does not require a special use permit for this type of operation. Chairman Stewart wanted to know if the applicant received a letter from GA Power regarding the easement. Mr. Johns stated that Mr. Landon has been in contact with GA Power but they have not provided any letters. Mrs. Segers confirmed that staff and the developer have been unsuccessful in their attempts to contact GA Power. She stated that she received a voice message from GA Power indicating that they do not see a need to issue a letter at this time. Mr. Johns explained that the area in question is an easement but it is not property that belongs to GA Power; it belongs to Mr. Landon. Mr. Landon's predecessor gave GA Power certain rights to use the easement. Mr. Landon has all other rights to the property as long as he does not build anything under the power line. Mrs. Segers stated that the easement is on the deed and is contained in the records of Glynn County.

Mr. Aspinwall wanted to know if there were any plans to erect some type of netting as protection from the golf balls. Mr. Landon replied no. Chairman Stewart expressed concerns about hours of operation and lighting. Mr. Landon stated that the business will operate from 8:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. He will eventually have lighting but he doesn't feel that it is necessary at this time. Chairman Stewart stated that the Planning Commission needs to see a lighting plan before any type of lighting is installed because of the nearby residential areas. He commented that "a driving range is a magnet for kids." Therefore, the Planning Commission needs to also see some type of fencing on the

outside perimeter as a safety precaution for children. Mr. Landon stated that if it gets to be a problem he would install a fence.

Mr. Hart wanted to know if there are any other types of games proposed. Mr. Landon stated that he would only have golf games.

Chairman Stewart suggested a deferral to allow the applicant to submit a lighting plan, propose some type of fencing, hours of operation, and to address the GA Power easement.

Mr. G. E. Bryant of 1900 Old Jesup Road was present to speak on behalf of himself and three widows in his neighborhood who are concerned about the area becoming a hangout for teenagers. He stated that he has no objection to the driving range.

At this time, Mr. Landon requested a deferral until the June 4th meeting. The Planning Commission concurred.

Comprehensive Plan/STWP

Proposed Update of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan Short Term Work Program covering the period 2002-2006. The STWP is a list of activities to be undertaken to implement the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the County.

The proposed "Resolution," along with other pertinent information related to the STWP was included in the packages for review. In a memorandum addressed to the members, Mr. Phillips explained that the purpose of the Planning Commission's review is to ensure that the proposed program is consistent with the objectives of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. In order for the county to continue its status as a Qualified Local Government (QLG), the update needs to be adopted and notice provided to DCA prior to October 31st. The QLG status makes the county eligible for certain state grants, loans and permits.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of the proposed update of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan STWP. 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 was not in attendance at this time.)

Hospice of the Golden Isles (SP200204091027)

12 Acres, Located at 1692 Glynco Parkway
Zoned Planned Development (Highway Commercial)
Southeast GA Regional Medical Center, Owner/Developer

Mr. Chris Amos was present for discussion.

In a memorandum addressed to the Planning Commission, Mr. Tyler Frazier explained that this particular piece of property is zoned Planned Development and is parcel CR-5 of the Golden Isles Gateway Tract. When considering the Hospice plans, five requirements set forth by Section 619.4 of the Zoning Ordinance were considered: adequate provisions for water supply, fire protection, sewage collection and treatment, and adequate provisions to protect mature trees.

Parcel CR-5 of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development sets forth medical restrictions as indicated by the Highway Commercial zoning in accordance with Section 724.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. This facility meets all of the requirements for a community hospital, or more specifically, a free standing inpatient facility.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff’s recommendation is for approval with minor adjustments that can be worked out during the building permit application process.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. 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.)

Southport Development (SP200203051641)

3.74 Acres, Located at Candler Drive & Palisade Drive
Zoned Planned Development
Southport Development, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that Southport is located in one of the fastest growing areas of the county. Staff has looked at the building and the site plan to verify the coordination between the architectural drawings and the site plan to determine how the structure will fit within the Planned Development. He stated that staff does not have a Planned Development Text for this site. However, Chairman Stewart pointed out that this request was deferred from last month so that the Planning Commission could review an overall Planned Development. Mr. Frazier stated that staff is making two recommendations.

The first recommendation deals with the actual building as it relates to the site. In some places water is being shown in different locations and there needs to be some clarification with regard to the architectural drawings, but these directions need to come from the master plan itself. Staff did receive a master plan for part of the Planned Development, which was included the packages for review. Mr. Frazier stated that the master plan was never part of the actual Planned Development Text when it was passed in 1992. Therefore, a number of the requirements of the Planned Development Text were not considered, such as the number of curb cuts on the public right-of-way, ingress and egress, and the location of curb cuts from intersections. Mr. Frazier stated that staff does not want to delay the contractor, but staff is requesting that some type of action be taken to determine a direction for this particular master plan. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval of the site plan contingent on direction of the requirements set forth by the original Planned Development.

(It was noted that Mr. Perry Fields arrived at 10:00 a.m.)

Mr. Hal Hart stated that the only thing adopted with regard to the Planned Development Text was the Highway Commercial District, which is a guideline but it is not very definitive. For clarification, he stated that staff is asking for more input as to how we administer a Planned Development in the future. Mr. Hart expressed concerns about the number of curb cuts proposed. The ordinance states that there can be two entrances per public street but this development has three on one side and four on another side.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Larry Bryson explained that this development consists of 8 or 10 individual lots. The curb cuts listed on the master plan are for future access to the proposed large grocery store chain, as well as for 40 additional businesses. He stated that the number of curb cuts in his opinion is not excessive. These will be needed to handle the volume of traffic generated by the entire site. Chairman Stewart feels that the proposed number of curb cuts would create a traffic hazard. He would prefer to stand by the text, which allows two curb cuts per street, rather than four or five.

Mr. Hart stated that in accordance with Section 723.7 i), the applicant has to prove that there is an unusual situation to demonstrate the need for more access points. Also, this is more of a general layout plan rather than a site plan in that there is no parking calculations and no total calculated acreage. The applicant has shown the loading zones but not the parking. Mr. Hart stated that this does not meet the requirements for site plan approval. Mr. Fields reminded the members of what was asked of the applicant at the last meeting. He stated that the applicant has corrected the site plan and added ideas of what the remainder of the project would look like, and in his opinion, he has done the best that he can do at this point. He stated that the applicant does not know what to commit to because he does not have the tenants yet.

Mr. Bryson explained that Phase I of the project was presented at the last meeting. At that time, the Planning Commission requested to see a master plan of the entire parcel, which is what he is presenting today. He then pointed out Phase I on the plans, and a general discussion followed.

Chairman Stewart asked if the site plan that staff has reviewed meets the requirements of the PD Text of Glynn County. Mr. Frazier replied yes.

Ms. Ann McCormick had questions about the ownership of the water and sewer. Mr. Bryson explained that once water and sewer leaves the right-of-way it becomes a private system.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to approve Phase I of this development. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Hal Hart.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:35 a.m.

Arnold House (SP200203111020)
Located on Ocean Boulevard & Neptune, SSI
Zoned Resort Residential
James G. Timbes, Owner/Developer
Arnold House (SP200203110957)
Located on Ocean Boulevard & Neptune, SSI
Zoned Highway Commercial
James G. Timbes, Owner/Developer

Mr. James Timbes and Mr. Larry Bryson were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that the entire site would benefit from the combination of the two lots of the site plan (Highway Commercial property & Resort Residential property). Staff identified four requirements in considering both of these site plans in accordance with Section 619 of the ordinance as follows:

- 1) **Adequate provisions for ingress and egress:** It appears internal traffic will suffer from the inherent property constraints, most notably size. Since the intended use is the same for both properties, why not combine traffic circulation and parking when

considering the overall plan. While the zoning for the two lots are separate, it is important to identify that the actual uses are the same and permitted by both land use classifications.

- 2) **Adequate provisions to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from the view of adjacent properties and streets:** These site plans were initially prepared in January 2000 with little design development since that time. While Mr. Bryson's drawings characteristically separate pre and post development conditions, this set reads with several layers being displayed on a single page. It is unclear how the proposed use will operate and interact with its neighbors. The architect has also submitted schematic floor plans and elevations to supplement the planning drawings for functional clarification.
- 3) **Adequate provisions to control the location, intensity and direction of all outdoor lighting:** It is unclear what considerations have been given to identifying impacts resulting from the proposed inn upon the neighborhood.
- 4) **Adequate open space.** This review comment would apply only to the site plan for the Highway Commercial land use classification. Open space only accounts for 20% of the total 20,000 sq. ft. If the two sites were considered in combination, it would be possible to increase the amount of open space.

A secondary on-site issue for consideration is the status of the two structures that have been identified by the Georgia Historical Resources Survey. Suggested criteria for determining whether or not these two structures are historically symbolic and significant are: if the structures are indicative of a larger vernacular style of architecture that represent the historic and cultural character of the community; and have the structures been constructed with technological advances that were noteworthy from the period in question.

Mr. Perry Fields had questions about the setback off of Ocean Boulevard and the possibility of reducing the parking. Mr. Frazier stated that staff is not certain if the setback is 80 ft. or 50 ft. He stated that he has seen evidence of both. Mr. Fields stated that it is not listed on the site plan, but the minimum is 25 ft. It was determined that the structure is not in the setback.

Mr. Fields had additional questions about the buffer and parking in the setback. Mr. Phillips explained that the property is zoned HC and is abutting HC property, but the use of the adjoining property is residential. Under Section 613 of the Zoning Ordinance, there must be a buffer at a minimum of 3 ft. between the parking areas, driveways and a residential use in order to accommodate the landscaped area. Mr. Bryson stated that the area adjacent to the property is a parking lot and is not a residential use. He stated that particular area is zoned Highway Commercial and there is no buffer required for the commercial use.

Mr. Michael Grey of 1213 Forest Street stated he understands that property owners have a right to build what they want to on their property, but he is not looking forward to living next to a hotel. He expressed concerns about the trees near the middle of the road and traffic. Chairman Stewart stated that although the property is zoned Highway Commercial, efforts would be made to protect the neighbors as much as possible. Mr. Fields pointed out that according to the plans, none of the trees on Forest Street would be removed. Mr. Bryson concurred.

Mr. Aspinwall also expressed concerns about the trees and the parking spaces. In an effort to save a few of the trees he wanted to know if some parking could be waived. Mr. Bryson stated that it is possible that he could reconfigure the parking.

Mr. Fields was concerned about the number of extensions granted to this site plan and wanted to know how many extensions are allowed. Mr. Phillips stated that he is not aware of any restrictions. Mr. Bryson pointed out that this is a new application. It is not an extension. Chairman Stewart added that the previous 12-month extension had expired and this is in fact a new application. Any ordinances enacted or restrictions deemed necessary would apply at this time.

During the course of discussing the parking situation, it was suggested that perhaps some of the parking could be moved from the Highway Commercial to the Resort Residential property; however, Mr. James Timbes stated that such a move would create more congestion as well as visual problems. Mr. Fields stated that he is not in favor of moving the parking to the Resort Residential side, but he thought maybe the parking could be reduced on the Highway Commercial side in order to save some of the trees. Chairman Stewart suggested that the parking remain where it is and that the applicant is to work with staff to try and save some of the trees without causing a great impact on the parking. Mr. Timbes stated that if he has to cut down the trees, several oak trees would be replanted on the perimeter of the property.

Mr. Aspinwall was concerned about signage and lighting. Mr. Timbes stated that Mr. Bryson has taken care of the signage. He assured the members that it would be a very attractive design that would fit within the character of the neighborhood. He stated that he does not have a lighting plan. The only lighting will be for security purposes. Also, there would be low fencing around the pool on the Neptune side and he is proposing a landscaped buffer on the north side, rather than a chain-linked fence.

Mr. Fields reiterated his concerns about granting an extension to this site plan. Mr. Timbes stated that it is his sincere intent to build out this project in a timely manner. Hopefully there won't be a need for an extension, but he cannot be sure at this point.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request with the applicant to consider a parking reconfiguration in an attempt to save some of the trees at his discretion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye:

Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Mike Aspinwall.

Marshes Edge Lane (PP200204051746)

4538 Acres, Sea Island Company Tract
Planned Development-3000 Acres;
Conservation Preservation-1538 Acres
Sea Island Company, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier pointed out that the Sea Island Tract is a little more than 3 acres for the access easement, which is identified on the survey. The property is part of the North Island Planned Development Text and it is a fairly large tract. Staff has received construction plans for the road and the bridge. The structural drawings for the bridge have been forwarded to Georgia DOT. Staff is coordinating with water and sewer for the pipe located over the bridge as to how it will integrate into the structure. There is also a DNR permit pending for the bridge.

Mr. Frazier stated that construction plans will link Marshes Edge Lane across the bridge into an assistant living community and over to Delamonte Road. There will be a thoroughfare connection through the property. He stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Fields wanted to know the current length of Marshes Edge Lane. Mr. Frazier stated that Marshes Edge Lane is 3000 ft. Mr. Fields stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve a road that is over 1200 ft. but there is no request for a variance. In previous instances, a variance would have been required. Mr. Frazier agreed, but stated that clarification is needed as to whether the road is public or private. There is also the question of whether this is a right-of-way dedication or an easement. Technically, he understands Mr. Fields' point with regard to Section 602.2 g) and the requirements for a variance, but in reviewing the construction plans, it was his interpretation that it did not require a variance. Chairman Stewart agreed that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve a dead-end road. Mr. Fields stressed that he just wants to be consistent. Mr. Frazier explained that in the past, these were points of privilege of the Planning Official as indicated under Article IX of the Zoning Ordinance.

There was a brief discussion as to whether the applicant could apply for a variance at this time. Mr. Phillips stated that the ordinance requires that a written request be submitted. Arrangements can be made to obtain a written request and this item could be placed back on the agenda. He explained that this particular road is shown on the plan

for the road circulation in the Northend Development Planned Development Text. The origin of the site for the retirement center is Sea Island and it is part of that PD. The provisions for ensuring the thru connection are reasonably established by way of the PD and the layout of the roads. As an increment of the development, it does not technically meet that requirement at this time.

Mr. Bobby Shupe explained that the reason this is before the Planning Commission today is because staff recommended that it be submitted as a preliminary plat. The applicant's request was to call this a private access easement, which does not have a length requirement. He stated that they have gone through several renditions of the zoning. This is called the secondary access. In the PD Text it was not designed to be the primary use, but it was going to be a way to have ingress and egress for some of the mechanical aspects. Mr. Shupe stated that personally, he thinks that it should be a private access easement and should be approved as such, rather than as a preliminary plat. He stated that there is a timing issue and the applicant is ready to start construction.

Mr. Shupe stated that the final issues are being worked out about the bridge. The applicant was hoping to get this plan approved today so that they could start the construction necessary to build the bridge, which is a long-term process. However, the applicant is willing to defer the request and modify the application if the Planning Commission feels that it is necessary, and bring it back with more information.

Mr. Fields stated that if the road in question were paved tomorrow, would it have a public purpose. Mr. Shupe stated that the purpose of the road at this time is to serve the senior retirement community, which is in the process of being constructed.

Mr. Phillips explained that there are three levels of streets: public street, private street, and a private access easement, which is normally found in conjunction with a small rural development. Technically, it could proceed as a private access easement, but eventually public utilities would come into play and it would then qualify as a private street. Mr. Phillips stated that staff's intention was to treat it as a private street because it is not proposed at this point to be a public street. It is proposed to be a private street. He stated that he did not realize the ramification of putting the "cart before the horse" in this case.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request subject to finalizing the road system inside. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued. Mr. Shupe stated that his client would not be opposed to adding a caveat that the "final plat would not be approved until the site plan demonstrates that the road connection system is approved." After discussion, the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Mike Aspinwall and Mr. Perry Fields. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Wayne Stewart.

Myers Plantation (PP200204051756)

47 Acres, Located on Myers Plantation Rd. off of Emanuel Loop Rd., Forest Agricultural-44 Acres; Conservation Preservation-3 Acres
Greg Harris, Owner/Developer

Mr. Greg Harris and Mr. Ernie Johns were present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that in reviewing this application, staff had two concerns: soil modifications and buffers. Section 618 states that “development adjacent to freshwater wetlands, as defined as those protected by Section 404 (Clear Water Act) as determined by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, shall provide a buffer of natural vegetation around all freshwater wetlands.” Staff consulted with Ms. Rhonda Knight of the Coastal Resources Division who confirmed that wetland delineation is not required in this case. Mr. Jimmy Partin of the Environmental Health Division was present to address the soil modifications.

Mr. Partin stated that in requesting a soil report, each individual lot is evaluated to determine any soil modifications. In the past, this particular area (Myers Plantation) has had some poor soil conditions. Mr. Fields asked if the bad soils could be excavated out. Mr. Partin stated that the bad soils could be filtered out in some areas but there has to be an outlet in order for it to work. He elaborated further on this process.

Mr. Frazier stated that the ordinances are unclear with regard to the Corps of Engineers requirements, but staff is satisfied with Ms. Knight’s findings pertaining to the wetlands. He stated that staff would like to continue its efforts in raising the issue of soil modification as it relates directly to surface mining operations and permits in other areas.

Mr. Frazier stated that during the pre-development conference with Mr. Johns, it was determined that a variance request was not necessary in this case. Mr. Phillips pointed out that this is a proposed development on an existing road. Mr. Fields stated that the road in question is not a public road. It is a private access easement and it has never been maintained by the county. It is a dirt road that was there before establishment of the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Fields wanted to know how they could approve a subdivision that does not touch on a public road. Mr. Frazier explained that there are three different dirt roads going in different directions at the intersection of the area that Mr. Fields is referring to. Mr. Johns pointed out the right-of-way of the road and showed Mr. Fields where it touches the property line.

Mr. Fields had questions about the water system. Mr. Phillips stated that a community well system is proposed, which would remain private. Mr. Fields then asked if the proposed system would be strong enough to service the fire hydrants. Mr. Tim Ransom of Environmental Engineering suggested that the Planning Commission include as part of their recommendation that whatever type of water system is installed needs to support fire suppression. Mr. Johns disagreed. He stated that the increase in the size of

the system and the size of the lines would cause a water quality problem. He feels that this should be addressed at the construction plan phase. Chairman Stewart stated that this is a major subdivision and fire protection needs to be included now. Mr. Johns stated that there are ponds on the remaining property and dry hydrants could be placed as a source of fire protection. Mr. Ransom explained that dry hydrants are non-regulatory and ponds are not dependable.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request subject to the following conditions: 1) staff is to confirm that the corner does in fact touch the right-of-way of the public road; and 2) a fire suppression system is to be installed to the requirements of the Glynn County Fire Department. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

Admiral's Retreat (PP200204051814)

3 Acre Tract, Located on North Harrington Road
St. Simons Island, Zoned R-6
Hurricane Construction, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that this preliminary plat was originally approved last year, September 4, 2001. The new preliminary plat proposes doubling the size of the entire subdivision. The new road is centered on the combination of the neighboring property. The only issue of concern is the drainage system. Mr. Frazier stated that staff's recommendation at this time is for approval.

Mr. Buster Reese explained that drainage has been pre-positioned to accommodate the full build-out. He stated that there are pipes that appear deeper than they need to be but all of the pipes will be connected and setup to drain to the marsh. He stated that staff is in the process of consulting with adjoining property owners to help reconfigure the drainage so that it works better for everybody.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

(Mr. Jonathan Williams excused himself from the meeting at this time.)

Regents Park, Phase I (PP200204051805)

11 ½ Acres, Located on Green Swamp Road

Zoned Forest Agricultural

FLB, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Ernie Johns and Mr. Gene Brockington were present for discussion.

Following the staff’s report and a brief discussion, the applicant requested a deferral of this preliminary plat until the June 4th meeting. The Planning Commission concurred.

Review of Wheel Fun Rentals

Mr. Phillips stated that this item is being presented for informational purposes only. A memo included in the packages explained that this business is located in a General Commercial Zoning District within the Village Preservation Overlay District. The use is permitted subject to the provisions outlined in the Zoning Ordinance within those districts.

Mr. Ryan, the owner, made application and was given permission by the Planning Commission to make several appearance changes to the building under Section 709.9. However, this approval did not address the use or other features of the development of the site. The facility does not provide adequate parking as required in the ordinance and the owner has been cited for parking violations, outside storage and outside sales.

Mr. Ryan contends that he is not in violation of the ordinance in that Section 709.3 of which he was cited for states “...there shall be no open or outside storage area or sales area on **public right-of-way or sidewalks** in the district unless an organized promotion of a Merchants Association or similar group and approved by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners.” Mr. Ryan stated that the activities that he has been cited for do not take place on a **public right-of-way or on a sidewalk**.

Staff was advised to review the parking situation and to consult the County Attorney for clarification on the language in Section 709.3 of the ordinance. Staff was also advised to confer with the owner on the process of submitting an application for consideration, if he so desires.

GC-2002-ZT2

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions), Section 611 (Off-Street Parking Requirements), by adding thereto a new Section 611.7 entitled “Permitted Reduction in Number of Spaces Required.”

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of this amendment to the Board of Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. (Mr. Jonathan Williams was no longer in attendance.)

GC-2002-ZT4

An Amendment to the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations Articles VI, VII and VIII to provide for the coordination and compliance with the Glynn County Addressing Ordinance, to include Sections 602.1, 602.2, 603.6, 703.1 and 801(2). The Glynn County Addressing Ordinance was adopted January 17, 2002.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips. Afterward, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this amendment to the Board of Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. (Mr. Jonathan Williams was no longer in attendance.)

Planning Commission By-Laws

Article I-Officers; Article II-Meetings; Article III-Committees;
Article IV-Membership; Article V-Adoption

The proposed changes to the Planning Commission By-Laws were circulated among staff and the members for review prior to the meeting. Following minor corrections, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend that the Glynn County Board of Commissioners adopt the Planning Commission By-Laws as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Lamar Cole, Perry Fields, Hal Hart, Ann McCormick and Wayne Stewart. (Mr. Jonathan Williams was no longer in attendance.)

Minutes

- a) Regular Meeting - April 2, 2002
- b) Work Session - November 15, 2001
- c) Work Session - January 14, 2002
- d) Work Session - February 19, 2002

Adoption of the Minutes was deferred until the June 4th Planning Commission meeting.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to conduct a work session on Friday, May 31st at 9:00 a.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building.

Chairman Items

There were no committee reports at this time.

Staff Items

- a) Mr. Phillips advised that a full report on the “Status of Contract for Land Development Code Update” would be made at the May 31st work session.
- b) The Planning Commission members were advised to review the enclosed information on “Training Opportunities” and report back to staff or to the Chairman with their preference as soon as possible.

Mr. Hart reminded staff to include “institutional uses” under Section 619.1 of the Ordinance Amendments. Mr. Phillips stated that he would prepare this amendment separately and advertise it for the June 4th Planning Commission meeting.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.