

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 2, 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
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.

GC-2001-25

Request to rezone from FA (Forest Agricultural) to HC (Highway Commercial) property consisting of 33,544 square feet (0.77 acres) located on the southwest side of Old Jesup Road at Stable Road and having 124.85 +/- of frontage on Old Jesup Road. Property owned by Renee Browning.

Richard and Renee Browning were present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that this application was considered at the March 5th Planning Commission meeting and was recommended for approval. The proposal had been amended prior to the meeting, but the advertisement did not properly reflect the changed size or location of the parcel. Consequently, the request was re-advertised for today's meeting and for the April 4th Board of Commissioners meeting.

It was pointed out that the staff's report is unchanged and the 6 criteria are already part of the record. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-04

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agricultural to HC Highway Commercial, 31.717 acres, located at the intersection of U.S. Highway 341 and Depratter Lane, P. E.; property having 760.31 ft. of frontage on U.S. Highway 341. Property owned by Constance Daniels.

Mr. Horace Daniels was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that this application was continued from the March 5th meeting. During the course of discussion at that time, the Planning Commission expressed concern as to whether the proposed general layout plan of the property was appropriate. There was also discussion regarding a conflict with the adjoining property and location of the property boundary, particularly along the south end of the west line.

Staff has determined that the layout plan presented at the March 5th meeting was not the correct plan for the Planning Commission's consideration. The plan described a proposed development associated with a prior zoning request.

Regarding the property boundary, staff reviewed the deeds and the survey and determined that they were not consistent. It is not clear what property is included in the applicant's request.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff had some discussions with the applicant but has not received any new information. He stated that he is not sure if action can be taken at this time.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Daniels stated that he met with the county surveyor who advised that it would take him at least two weeks to check and double check everything thoroughly. Chairman Stewart suggested allowing more time for the applicant to obtain this information.

Mr. Fields stated that at the last meeting, there was an allegation of a property line dispute, but he has not seen anything in the record to substantiate this allegation. He stated that it is not this Board's responsibility to resolve property line disputes, and in his opinion, it is not a valid reason to not take action.

Chairman Stewart wanted to know if this request could be addressed with the information that has been provided. Mr. Phillips stated that the only concern that staff has is the question of what piece of property is actually being rezoned. Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know who is responsible for getting these issues resolved. Chairman Stewart stated that it is the applicant's responsibility. Mr. Williams stated that in fairness to Mr. Daniels this request cannot be settled until all of the issues have been resolved.

Mr. Hart stated that according to the survey, the only questionable issue is the encroachment of the road on to the applicant's property. However, Mr. Fields pointed out that Depratter Lane is paved and as such it is a county road, and therefore the applicant has lost the rights to the public to travel the road. He stated that the confusion is the fact that the Planning Commission is again being asked to rezone 31.717 acres, which according to the survey is Tract A and B, but at the last meeting Mr. Daniels indicated that he did not want both rezoned.

Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Daniels if he would like to request a deferral and allow staff to go over everything that he needs in order to apply for the proper rezoning. Mr. Daniels replied yes. This request was then deferred until the May 7th Planning Commission meeting. In the meantime, Mr. Fields suggested that staff and Mr. Daniels discuss in detail the type of buffer (size, width, density) for the western boundary between the residential property and the commercial property.

It was noted that an adjoining property owner, Mr. Chapman, was present to speak in favor of this request. However, he was concerned that he might not be able to attend the May 7th meeting to voice his support. Mr. Chapman was advised to put his comments in writing and submit them to the Planning Commission prior to the May 7th meeting.

SUP-2002-01/Village Preservation

Request for Special Use Permit to allow a Subway Restaurant in a GC (General Commercial) district/VP (Village Preservation) district on property consisting of approximately 13,320 square feet (0.306 acres) located on the north side of Ocean Boulevard, west of its intersection with Neptune Way (511 Ocean Boulevard) and having 120 feet of frontage on Ocean Boulevard. Property owned by William Downey, et al.

Mr. William Downey and Mr. Gary Register were present for discussion.

Mrs. Segers stated that in addition to the Special Use Permit, a Village Preservation Application is included with this request. The two applications would be addressed together but would require separate action. She continued with the staff's report as follows:

The applicant proposes use of the property as a Subway Restaurant. The site is an existing 3,472 square foot building. This improvement only affects 1,214 square feet of the existing building. The improvement portion of the building is the former location of "Hole in One Bagel" which received Special Use Permit approval 10/16/97.

According to Article VII, Section 712.3 Special Uses (3), the following points were considered:

- A. Buffer Requirement. Proposed use includes an existing building, with previously existing 10-foot setback and 72-inch fence. No change is proposed. This proposal is in conformity with this section.
- B. Lighting, sound, outside areas including dumpsters. Proposed use is consistent with other Subway locations in Glynn County in that no loud music will be used, and hours of operation will be 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Sunday-Thursday; 10 a.m. to midnight Friday-Saturday. Exterior lighting will not be changed from current use by adjacent convenience. Proposed dumpster location is behind the building, and a new pad and enclosure will be constructed. Present location is visible from Ocean Blvd.
- C. Parking proposal is in accordance with Section VI, Article 611 Off-Street Parking Requirements, which call for 8 parking spaces, including 6 spaces for customers and 2 spaces for employees. This is based on 362.45 square feet of patron space, with 1 space per 70 square feet of patron space. There are 10 seats provided along a counter space for dine-in patrons.
- D. Not Applicable
- E. Application is in accordance with Article IX, Section 904, and conditions for information items i-v have been met.

The Planning and Zoning Division has reviewed this project, and construction plans have been reviewed by Olin Fraser and Tim Ransom. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

The staff's report on the Village Preservation Application (*VP-01-17*) was included in the packages for review. Mrs. Segers stated that staff is concerned about the color scheme for the roof in that it should be one color. Currently, the roof is a rustic orange. The applicant is proposing to change the color of a portion of the roof to a hunter green and leave the remaining half orange. Staff's recommendation is for approval provided the exterior color scheme is consistent overall.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Gary Register stated that he would be satisfied with leaving the roof as it is. He is soliciting a favorable recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Fields had questions about seating in that the former business (*Hole In One Bagel*) had outside seating. Mrs. Segers stated that there is no outside seating proposed in the current request (*Subway*).

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Village Preservation Application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued. Mr. Hart had questions about signage for the proposal. Mrs. Segers stated the proposed color and lettering change to the existing fascia sign is consistent with the requirements for signs in Section 814 of the Village Preservation District.

After discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted to approve the Village Preservation Application subject to the entire roof being one color (either hunter green or rustic orange) and subject to no outside dining.

SUP-2002-02

Request for Special Use Permit to allow a telecommunications tower in the Glynco-McBride Industrial Park on property consisting of 19.946 acres located on the north side of Sidney Lanier Boulevard, east of its intersection with Ethridge Drive (2100 Sidney Lanier Boulevard) and having approximately 1,400 feet of frontage on Sidney Lanier Boulevard. Proposed tower site is located approximately 100 feet east and 130 feet north of the southwest corner of the 19.946 acre tract. Property owned by OSG Tap and Die, Inc., SBA, Inc., Agent.

Ms. Kate Newton of SBA, Inc. was present for discussion.

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

The Glynco-McBride Jetpark PD-G Text was recently (March 7th) amended by the Board of Commissioners to permit telecommunication towers as a use subject to special use permit approval. Subsequently, an application for a Special Use Permit was submitted for a site on the north side of Sidney Lanier Drive just east of its intersection with Ethridge Drive. The site is part of a 19+ acre tract owned by OSG Tap & Die, Inc.

The surrounding property is partially developed as industrial and governmental/institutional (FLETC is located to the west and southwest). The nearest residential areas are to the east a distance of one-half to one mile. These are mobile home developments with access primarily from US 17.

The applicant has submitted a considerable amount of information addressing the points established in Article XIV of the Zoning Ordinance (Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance). The application appears to meet the criteria established for a telecommunications tower under those provisions.

The site plan has not received formal staff review. Based on a quick review, there are no anticipated issues. (A more extensive review should be complete prior to the Board of Commissioners action.) Staff's recommendation is for approval of the Special Use Permit subject to staff's approval of the site plan.

Mr. Hart stated that he did not receive a copy of the letter from the Airport Commission or from the Development Authority regarding this request. Ms. Newton stated that the letters were submitted to staff. Mrs. Segers explained that the letters were included in the packages at the March meeting for the PD Text amendment.

Chairman Stewart read the letter from the Glynn County Airport Commission dated November 13, 2001 into the record as follows:

"...Upon review of the ASAC study for this site provided to the Airport Commission, we have determined that this site will not have a significant impact on aircraft operating at the Glynco Jetport. Therefore, the Airport Commission recommends approval based on the following conditions being met: 1) Tower structure is limited to an overall height of 168 feet; 2) Appropriate notice is given to the FAA as required...and determination of no hazard to air navigation is found. Results to be provided to the Airport Commission for review; and 3) Due to the close proximity to the airport and the fact that the structure will be located under protected airspace, we request the structure is marked and lighted."

Chairman Stewart read the letter from the Brunswick-Glynn County Development Authority dated December 2, 2001 into the record as follows:

"The Brunswick-Glynn County Development Authority...agreed to allow your company to install a communications tower in the Brunswick-McBride Industrial Park...This approval is contingent upon your receiving approval from the Glynn County Airport Commission...This approval does not exempt you from the normal requirements of the Glynn County Planning & Zoning Commission."

Mr. Fields wanted to know the proposed height for the tower. Ms. Newton replied that the proposed height is 150 ft., but taking into account that there will be a lightening rod on top, the height will actually be 157 feet. She explained that the tower is being built for GA PCS, which is a Sprint affiliate. There is room for a total of four (4) carriers. SBA, Inc. markets the tower and the space on the tower to all PCS and cellular users.

Mr. Hart wanted to know if a landscape plan is being proposed. Ms. Newton replied yes. They will also try to preserve as much existing vegetation on the lot as possible. In addition, they are planning to install a 5 ft. landscaped buffer surrounding the perimeter of the fence.

Mrs. Segers stated that this request is for a Special Use Permit. The property is in a PD Text area and before a building permit is issued, the applicant will have to have site plan approval. The site plan will contain information on the buffer, landscape plan, lighting, etc. The Planning Commission will have a chance to review the site plan before issuance of a building permit.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

Chairman Stewart stated that in order to accommodate the applicants, Preliminary Plats and Site Plans would be addressed at this time, followed by Item #5 (STWP).

Talaxe Lake Subdivision (PP200112061105)

20.7 Acre Tract, Located on west of Highway 17 near
Altamaha Blvd., Zoned Forest Agricultural
Coast Land Development, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Ernie Johns and Mr. Lewis Strickland were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that the intent of the design of this subdivision is for the physically challenged. The subdivision is located in an area that has a number of wetlands. However, staff is in receipt of a letter from the Corps of Engineers identifying those wetlands as being non-jurisdictional.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff had one issue of concern, which was ownership of the adjacent property, but after an extensive search, ownership was determined as being unknown. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Chairman Stewart also expressed concerns about not knowing who the property owner is. He feels that it is the applicant's responsibility to obtain this information. Mr. Fields commented that the zoning is not being changed. Therefore, he doesn't think that an adjacent property owner would have legal basis to object. Chairman Stewart agreed and added that it should be noted in the record that a diligent effort has been made

by the applicant to determine ownership, and staff concurs that the applicant has exhausted all means. He then suggested for future reference that staff check with the County Attorney regarding this issue.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve this Preliminary Plat. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

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 according to Section 723.6 of the Zoning Ordinance, site plan approval is required prior to issuance of a building permit and upon approval of the Planning Commission. Also, in accordance with Section 723.6 3), the site plan shall conform to the requirements set forth in Subsection 619, which outlines the requirements for site plan approval.

Mr. Frazier stated that most of the comments received from various divisions were technical. For instance, the Assistant County Engineer has requested that the developer indicate base compaction per county standards on asphalt pavement. Staff is requesting that this be an added condition if the motion is for approval of the site plan. Mr. Fields asked Mr. Frazier if he is referring to a public road or a private road. Mr. Frazier stated that it is a driveway, rather than a road and it is not dedicated to the public. Mr. Fields pointed out that this is not a building requirement and there is no inspection process for parking lots for private driveways. He stated that he is reluctant to impose something on someone that this Board does not have the authority to do. Chairman Stewart agreed. He asked Mr. Bryson if he had a problem with this. Mr. Bryson replied no. Mr. Fields stated that if the applicant is okay with this, then he doesn't have a problem with it either. Chairman Stewart stated that if this issue has been resolved between the applicant and the engineer, then there is no need to include it into a motion. The Planning Commission concurred.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff is recommending that this site plan be approved conditioned on approval from Water & Sewer with regard to public utilities on the site. He then referred to the memo from Mr. York Phillips regarding the direction of traffic flow and parking. The applicant is providing 82 parking spaces; however, according to

the square footage of the building no more than 65 spaces are actually needed. He further stated that lighting is not addressed on the site plan.

Mr. Larry Bryson gave a brief presentation. He stated that the applicant is still in the process of negotiating with a major grocery chain in hopes of putting a grocery store on the subject property, which is why the parking lot is oversized. The parking lot is open on the two ends because it is anticipated to be the parking lot for the larger store.

Regarding the lighting plan, Mr. Bryson stated that they have always used GA Power to do their site lighting. The most economical way to light a site is via contract with GA Power on a monthly basis. He stated that he would be happy to provide the lighting plan to staff for approval or to the Planning Commission. Mr. Fields commented that this property is in a PD Text and he is not sure how lighting is addressed. Mr. Frazier stated that the PD Text says nothing about lighting. The HC District was copied into the PD Text. Chairman Stewart pointed out that Mr. Bryson has stated that he would provide the lighting plan to staff.

Mr. Fields asked if there is a landscaping plan proposed. Mr. Bryson stated that he doesn't have a final landscape plan yet, but he would provide one to staff as well as to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hart stated that he doesn't see a loading zone and he's wondering how they are planning to service the buildings. Mr. Bryson stated that there is a front loading zone. He presented a sketch of the proposed development of the entire site and pointed out the loading zone and the parking. Chairman Stewart wanted to know if Mr. Bryson could provide a proposed master plan similar to the sketch. He stated that he's concerned about "piece meal" this project. Mr. Bryson stated that he would be happy to provide a master plan; he just doesn't know how close they are going to stick to the plan at this point. Mr. Fields stated that if there is another extension, he would like to have a drawing included in the packages showing the grocery store, the name, etc. for information purposes so that there is something to refer back to at a later date. Mr. Bryson concurred.

Mr. Hart expressed more concern about how the applicant plans to service the buildings. According to the plan, there is a parking lot in the back of the building. Mr. Bryson showed the position of the building on the property. He stated that the first phase is basically 20 ft. wide, which would be front loading. He stated that there is room in the back to create some rear entry if it becomes necessary, but that is not their intent.

Chairman Stewart stated that Mr. Bryson should have submitted a site plan for the entire project. Mr. Hart stated that servicing the buildings from the front would cause congestion, parking would be disturbed, and it would eliminate half of the access. He doesn't think that a front loading zone would be an ideal situation. Mr. Fields suggested moving the dumpsters (that are located in the back) to the far end of the building, run the paving down and have the loading zone in the back. He stated he understands that the applicant doesn't see front loading as a problem at this time, but the potential is there.

Mr. Fields further stated that the Planning Commission needs definite clarification as to who will be responsible for water & sewer maintenance on this project.

Mr. Hart stated that at this point, the applicant wants to start the project. He suggested that a motion be offered for site preparation only for this site plan. He stated that they could come back at a later date with the other details. Mr. Bryson stated that 30 days would at least get them started on the site work. Chairman Stewart stated that they should include the footprint of the building along with the site preparation for a foundation permit only.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the site plan preparation and general layout for the entire project with final site plan approval scheduled for the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Discussion continued. Mr. Fields pointed out the specific issues for this site plan as follows: loading, lighting, landscaping, ownership/repair of water & sewer. After discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted.

Comprehensive Plan/STWP

Information pertaining to the proposed update of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan Short Term Work Program was included in the packages and was presented by Mr. Phillips. Mrs. Barbara Atkins with the Coastal GA RDC was present to answer questions. Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to take this information under advisement and re-advertise this item for the next meeting.

Minutes

Upon a motion made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick, the Minutes of the March 5, 2002 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

Chairman Items

a) Planning Commission By-Laws

The County Attorney provided a proposed amendment to the Planning Commission By-Laws to implement the change to two monthly meetings to be held at 6:00 p.m. at the Public Safety Complex. Staff proposed additional recommendations. This information was presented as an update for review. The members were asked to make any necessary changes, additions or deletions and perhaps be prepared to vote at the next meeting.

Chairman Stewart stated that he is hoping to get the By-Laws adopted and implement the changes with the first meeting being held in July.

b) Committee Status Reports

Ms. Ann McCormick distributed an ordinance sample from Fernandina Beach, Florida outlining their building height regulations. She is continuing her search for information to assist with this portion of the ordinance. There were no other committee reports at this time.

Chairman Stewart had a prior commitment and therefore excused himself from the meeting at 11:05 a.m. The remainder of the meeting was turned over to Vice Chairman Lamar Cole.

At this time, Mr. Hart referred back to the March 5th Minutes, page 18, last paragraph under *Planning Commission Items*. Although the Minutes indicate that Mr. Hart's comments were "consider adding 'truck driving school' as a permitted use under Section 710 Office Commercial," Mr. Hart stated that was not his intention. He stated that what he meant was that under the current language he wondered if a truck driving school would qualify to go in Office Commercial. His intention was to consider defining "vocational school" within that particular section of the ordinance. He asked that this be reflected in the Minutes. Mrs. Loving concurred.

Staff Items

a) Parking Space Reduction Amendment

Amend the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI General Provisions, Section 611 Off-Street Parking Requirements, by adding a new Section 611.7

The above referenced amendment was included in the packages for review. Mr. Phillips stated that this amendment was discussed at the last meeting. There was also a proposal included in the amendments from Commissioner Fendig's committee. It was determined that this could be separated and handled on its own. Staff incorporated language suggested at the March 5th meeting and included the changes in today's proposal.

Mr. Phillips stated that the proposal includes an addition of a new section under the parking regulations essentially for non-residential developments and a minimum of 20 parking spaces. He pointed out two options. The first option is where the site plan is subject to approval by the Planning Official a reduction up to 10% in the total number of

required parking spaces on the basis of converting land from parking use to open space or undeveloped use. The second option is where the site plan is subject to approval by the Planning Commission a reduction up to 25% of the number of required parking spaces on the same basis.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that this proposal is being presented for discussion at this time. Staff needs feedback from the Planning Commission before proceeding with the advertising requirements for official action.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about the following sentence listed in the first option: “The additional undeveloped area may be used for perimeter buffers...” He stated that the original concept was that this was otherwise developable land that would become undevelopable. If buffers are allowed to be used to gain space, then we are not increasing greenspace. Mr. Phillips explained that in the second option where you get above 10 % the layout would be such that the additional open space above the 10% could be restored to parking if it became necessary. Mr. Fields was concern about the possibility of someone asking for an increase of 35%. For clarification, Mr. Phillips stated that the 25% is inclusive of the 10%.

Following discussion, Mr. Phillips stated that staff would solicit additional input from local engineers, etc. make some adjustments, and advertise this proposal for the May 7th Planning Commission meeting.

b) Traffic Safety Amendments

An amendment to change the Subdivision Regulations, Sections 602 and 706 to standardize traffic control devices in accordance with the design standards set forth by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and for other purposes.

The above referenced amendment was included in the packages for review. Mr. Tyler Frazier explained that the amendment only addresses the standards for traffic control devices. He stated that there have been several questions raised regarding the standards for signage on St. Simons and Sea Palms property in terms of private streets and private access easements.

Mr. Frazier further stated that there have been problems with construction plans, which is why the requirement was added to show the location and mounting heights for all signage on construction plans.

Mr. Perry Fields expressed concerns about the following sentence under Section 602.5 c) “...All traffic control devices shall be maintained by the owners of the property within such subdivisions and the county will have no responsibility whatsoever for maintenance

or repair until dedicated and accepted by the Board of Commissioners.” Mr. Fields stated that he has a problem with who is put in charge of maintenance. For example, if there are 10 lots on a private road with 10 different owners, does this mean that those 10 different owners will be fined if they are not maintaining the street signs. He suggested considering that all private streets shall be identified as an owner (one person) or Homeowners Association. There are instances of 10 lot subdivisions and the developer owns the road. Mr. Fields stated that we need to have a mechanism to go after the property owner rather than the owners in the subdivision. Also, there is no mechanism included for enforcement and monitoring. He emphasized that he will not support requiring signage on a private access easement that serves one lot.

Previously when this amendment was presented, the Planning Commission talked about making this apply to commercial 801’s and not residential, but that language is not reflected in this proposal. Mr. Frazier stated that he would make a note of that change along with the comments pertaining to responsibility, enforcement and monitoring. Mr. Hal Hart stated he thinks that the GIS Department would be the easiest way of tracking ownership.

Mr. Glenn Bollinger explained that with this proposal he was trying to clarify what we already have in place and address standards for traffic control devices.

There was a brief discussion on the quality of signage, i.e., standard grade, better grade, best grade, etc. Mr. Lamar Cole asked that this be clarified and listed more specifically in the proposed amendment under Section 602.2 m).

Following discussion, Mr. Phillips stated that staff would do additional research with regard to establishing ownership of private streets for maintenance and enforcement of signage, solicit assistance from the County Attorney, and bring this proposal back for further review.

c) Submittal Deadline Amendments

Mr. Phillips prepared a quick analysis of all of the provisions in the ordinance that have deadlines. This information was included in the packages for review. Currently, six different deadlines are tracked every month. Staff would like to simplify the deadlines and get them more organized so that they are similar. The Planning Commission is in the process of conducting two meetings per month and the deadlines will double. Staff is also working on a different type of review for site plans and subdivisions, particularly in the tracking system for a more expeditious method of review for staff, the applicant and ultimately getting the item on the agenda. Mr. Phillips stated that he would continue these efforts and report back to the Planning Commission next month.

d) Addressing Ordinance Amendments

Mr. Frazier presented changes to the Subdivision Regulations as prescribed by the new Addressing Ordinance, recently adopted by the Board of Commissioners. He stated that he worked with the County Attorney on these changes, which have been identified as being the primary places where the Code of Ordinances would impact the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Frazier pointed out the changes in this proposal and a general discussion followed. During the course of discussion, the following revisions were made (words with lines drawn through will be deleted and words in bold print will be added):

Section 603.6 "...Further, the applicant ~~is required to~~ **shall** comply..."

Section 703 1) "...The applicant ~~must~~ **shall** indicate whether the street names are to be public or private."

Mr. Frazier will make the necessary changes and advertise the proposed amendment for the May 7th Planning Commission meeting.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.