

**MINUTES**  
**GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MARCH 5, 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  
Tim Ransom, Utilities  
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.

-----

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Hal Hart and seconded by Mr. Perry Fields the following items listed under *Consent Agenda* were approved and unanimously adopted. It was noted that no opposition was present and there were no questions from the audience. (Additional information on each item is contained in the files located in the Planning & Zoning office.)

**Eagle Crest Subdivision (PP200202150907)**

87 Acres, R-2 Gateway Tract  
Zoned Planned Development  
Driggers Development, Inc., Owner/Developer

**Sea Palms Cottages, Phase II (PP200202051421)**

5 Acres, Located off Sea Palms Lane  
Zoned R-6  
Singleton Properties, Inc., Owner/Developer

Application VP01-02 was also listed under *Consent Agenda*; however, it was pulled due to an abstention from Mr. Hart as follows:

**Village Preservation Application (VP01-02)**

11,229 Square Feet, Located at 537 Beachview Dr.  
Zoned General Commercial  
Mr. & Mrs. Irvine, Owner; Larry L. Bryson, Developer

A motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve Application VP01-02. 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. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Hal Hart.

-----

**GC-2001-25**

Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial, 0.634 acres, described as Lot 2, Browning Land located at 5050 Old Jesup Road; the parcel having 50 feet of frontage on Old Jesup Road. Property owned by Renee Browning.

Mrs. Renee Browning and Mr. Richard Browning were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mrs. Carolyn Segers stated that staff's recommendation is for denial on the technicality that the future land use map identifies the area as low-density residential.

During a brief presentation, Mrs. Browning stated that they have purchased additional property because the building was a little too close to the property line. Therefore, the frontage amount listed on today's agenda is incorrect. Mr. Richard Browning stated that the road frontage is 120 ft. (124.85 ft. to be exact).

Mr. Hal Hart stated that previously when this application was presented, there was some question about a shed that was located on the property. He asked if this had been taken care of. Mrs. Browning stated that they are planning to remove the shed, but they

are waiting for an approval of the application. She assured the Board that the shed would be removed. Mr. Hart asked if the well easement had been taken care of. Mr. Browning replied yes, they purchased it from the Lewis's.

Ms. Judy Grace, adjoining property owner, stated that the applicants provide a safety net for the area, and she is in favor of this request.

Mrs. Segers presented the following findings of fact in conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance:

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

**Yes, while Forest Agricultural (FA) Zoning dominates the character of the area, commercial uses have been approved at nearby properties.**

- 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.

**It is not in keeping with the future land use map. This area has been identified as low density residential.**

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

**None.**

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

-----

**GC-2001-33**

Request to rezone from LC Limited Commercial to GC General Commercial, 0.961 acres, described as the northeast corner of Altama Avenue and Baybridge Drive; the parcel having 155.69 ft. of frontage on Altama Avenue. (Site Plan Approval per LC zoning action GC-24-75) Property owned by Jack E. Cauley.

Mr. Jack Cauley, Mrs. Elizabeth Cauley and Mr. Bill Smith were present for discussion.

Chairman Stewart explained that at the February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, it was thought that a rezoning was unnecessary in that the current zoning of Local Commercial would allow a beauty school as a permitted use and General Commercial would not. The applicant deferred this request under this presumption and was advised to come back for site plan approval only. However, after consulting with staff, it was discovered that the property would in fact have to be rezoned for this type of business. Chairman Stewart apologized for this oversight and assured the applicant that this was not an attempt to delay him any further. He has every right to request a zoning change of his property. He pointed out that site plan approval is still required as part of the 1975 action. The rezoning and the site plan would be considered at the same time and reflected as such in the motion.

Staff's recommendation remains 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.

**Proposed use as a beauty school includes a limit on number of students, and size of parcel effectively limits many higher intensity uses.**

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

**No, provided required buffers between residential and commercial land uses are put in place. Buffers required as part of 1975 rezoning (GC-24-75).**

- 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.

**Intensity of development is limited by size of the parcel.**

- Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

**Yes.**

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

**Buffer requirement is part of the rezoning to Local Commercial (GC-24-75) and need for buffer continues to be appropriate between residential and commercial land use classifications.**

By a show of hands, there were approximately 25 people present to speak in favor of this request. Chairman Stewart placed a 5-minute time limit on each speaker. The same amount of time was allowed for those speaking in opposition.

Mr. Bill Smith, president of Southern Contractors, was present to answer questions about the site plan. He stated that at the last meeting residents expressed concerns about the buffer, parking, etc. He handed out business cards and advised anyone with additional concerns to come by his office and review the site plan. However, no one has come by his office. Mr. Hart asked if staff had reviewed and approved the site plan. Mrs. Segers replied yes.

Mr. Fields suggested that the fence buffering the commercial property from the residential neighborhood be frame side in so that the “pretty side” of the fence is facing the neighbors.

Mr. George Metz of 111 Baybridge Drive was present to oppose this request. He expressed concerns about traffic, noise and the possibility of the parking lot becoming a late night hangout for juveniles. He presented a petition consisting of 56 signatures of residents in this neighborhood who are also opposed to this request.

For the record, Chairman Stewart read the following language from the petition presented by Mr. Metz: **“We, the undersigned request the Glynn County Board of Commissioners in the petition regarding lands located at the northern corner of the intersection of Altama Avenue and Baybridge Drive deny said petition changing lands usage from limited commercial to commercial. We the undersigned also request the Glynn County Board of Commissioners to investigate to determine if all or part of said land usage was properly changed from residential to limited commercial. The undersigned additionally request if land usage was improperly changed then said land be restricted to originally zoned usage.”**

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this rezoning and the site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Mr. Perry Fields asked that the motion be amended to include that the fence buffering the commercial business from the residential neighborhood be frame side in. Additionally, Chairman Stewart stated that any structural changes are to be brought back to the Planning Commission for site plan review. The amendment was accepted and the following vote was taken: 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.

-----

### **GC-2001-39**

Request to amend the text of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development District (GC-34-99) Parcels R-6, R-8, and R-9 to include surface mining for extraction of mineral sands and reclamation of the parcels for residential community development, 1522 acres located west of Interstate 95 north of Brunswick; property having frontage along portions of I-95, State Route 99, Cate Road and Canal Road. Property owned by TE Consolidated, L.L.C.

Attorney Mark Johnson, Mr. Elliot Mallard and Mr. Mike Phillips were present for discussion.

Mrs. Segers stated that this request was deferred from the January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. There is no change in the staff’s report and the recommendation remains 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;

**The proposed permitted use, as defined in the application narrative, includes reclamation of the land to a level suitable for residential development. This**

**final, long-term land use is considered suitable in view of the use and development of the adjacent and nearby property. Mineral sands extraction procedure represents a short-term use.**

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

**The proposed permitted use, as defined in the application narrative, is performed in a manner which greatly limits adverse effects. This is accomplished by provision of several visual and noise buffers in proximity to the active extraction cells, a 25 ft. buffer between jurisdiction wetlands and the limits of disturbance, storm water run-off control and minimum 100 ft. buffers along all property lines.**

- 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;

**Proposed change does not increase impact to these systems beyond that which was approved under Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development District (GC-34-99). Additionally, trucks entering and leaving the site will be traveling on interior roadways within the site by way of U.S. Highway 99 and Interstate 95. Trucks will not travel on roads maintained by Glynn County.**

- 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 Forest Agricultural.**

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

**The proposed text amendment also indicates a maximum height of 60 ft. for the mobile separator. This is a modular unit that will be installed for short-term use during the sand extraction process. Following completion of the sand extraction process, the mobile separator will be removed from site.**

Noted in the packages was a letter from the Branigar Organization voicing support of this text amendment.

Attorney Mark Johnson, representing TE Consolidated, stated that their goal is to educate, listen to the concerns and show how this proposal will benefit the community. He stated that Ms. Alison Keefer, Coastal Geologist with the Georgia Environmental Protection Division is present to answer questions about the state's roll in this project and to address water issues. He then introduced Mr. Elliott Mallard, Operations Manager for Iluka Resources, who proceeded with a "power point" presentation.

During his presentation, Mr. Mallard pointed out that the only areas that would be mined encompass 571 acres. He explained that there is an impact to the wetlands on the site and also non-jurisdictional wetlands. There will be .039 acres of jurisdictional wetland impact for a road crossing improvement and 18.07 acres of impact to non-jurisdictional wetlands. Although it is not a requirement, TE Consolidated will mitigate for the non-jurisdictional wetlands on an acre-for-acre type basis.

Mr. Mallard stated that the key issue is that adjacent to the mobile separator they would have need for a Miocene well. It would take approximately 90 million gallons of water to fill the ponds. TE is proposing a re-circulation system to recycle the water in order to limit the on-going need for continuous withdrawal. The mobile separator is a self-contained unit and there are no chemicals involved whatsoever. 97% of what is impacted is put back in the land.

Mr. Mallard stated that the entire area would be surrounded by a minimum 50 ft. tree buffer as part of an agreement made with the Branigar Organization. Additionally, they are proposing a 50 ft. wide buffer of top soil, 8 to 10 ft. tall to minimize noise and dust. There would be no impact to Cate Road with regard to traffic.

At this time, Mr. Mallard introduced Mr. Mike Phillips, Chief Executive Officer with TE, who addressed project economics and the benefits to the community. As indicated in the text, the following is the project economics:

Capital Expenditure	\$30 million
Annual Sales Revenue	\$20 million
Annual Operating Expense	\$5.7 million
Annual Indirect Expenses	\$2.5 million

Mr. Phillips stated that this project would create 45 new jobs with additional employment impact of 82, generating \$7.8 million per year for the local economy. The total benefits to the community would be \$8.25 million.

Mr. Mallard expounded on other community projects that TE would be involved with, such as developing a hardwood nursery on the site, and donating land for a school complex. Also, once TE completes its task in the area, they are proposing to donate the Miocene well.

Mr. Orian Pass, Executive Director of the Clay County Development Authority, spoke highly of TE Consolidated, stating that "they are one of his better corporate

citizens.” He elaborated on their community involvement and added that he would welcome this development in Clay County. They are an exceptional group and have always done what they say they’ll do.

Also present in support of this request were Mr. Don Varnadoe and Mr. Joe Iannicelli of the Glynn County School Board.

Mr. Milton Peterman, representing the Glynn County Water Advisory Committee, stated that he is not necessarily for or against this proposal. He pointed out that this is a county-wide committee that has just recently been reorganized. They have not had a chance to review the project but they do have some concerns. He stated that they would like an opportunity to meet with TE Consolidated to get more information about the project.

Chairman Stewart stated that he was really concerned about this request coming back to the Planning Commission before the March 29<sup>th</sup> workshop, in that the workshop is geared toward addressing the water issues, etc. However, due to commitments and deadlines, the applicants are willing to go forward regardless of the Planning Commission’s recommendation. The final decision will be made by the County Commissioners.

Attorney Mark Johnson stated that despite today’s meeting, TE Consolidated will attend and participate in the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. Prior to the meeting, they would be delighted to meet with the Glynn County Water Advisory Committee. Attorney Johnson stated that he asked Ms. Alison Keefer to attend today’s meeting to explain the state’s point of view. He stressed that if the State of Georgia tells TE Consolidated that this project cannot be done without having a detrimental impact on Glynn County’s water system, then TE will not do this project. Ms. Keefer’s role is to protect the state’s resource and to protect the resource of Glynn County. He emphasized that this project will not go forward unless the State of Georgia, after studying all of the science, gives its stamp of approval.

Chairman Stewart asked Ms. Keefer if TE Consolidated could in fact give Glynn County the well. Ms. Keefer replied yes, they can give the well to Glynn County but they cannot give the permit or the right to withdraw the water. For a point of clarification, Ms. Keefer stated that she is not here as an advocate of this project. At the request of TE and county staff, she is only here to answer questions. She stated that her office has not received a permit application yet for this project and cannot say one way or the other whether the permit will be approved or not. Ms. Keefer offered to work with Mr. Peterman, the Water Advisory Committee and with all of Glynn County. She pointed out that the state would listen to the concerns, and all comments would be taken into consideration.

Chairman Stewart asked Ms. Keefer if the state is saying that a 90 million-gallon withdrawal won’t affect Glynn County in the future with regard to housing or commercial developments. Ms. Keefer replied that the state is not saying that at all. In

fact, that is one of the questions that the state wants evaluated and addressed specifically on the permit.

Chairman Stewart stated that he keeps asking one question, “why would anybody want a mining operation in Glynn County” and so far, he has not gotten an answer. He was very adamant about postponing a decision on this request until after the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. He stated that there are still a lot of unanswered questions and he feels that other entities should be involved in the decision making process.

Mr. Jonathan Williams agreed with the concerns expressed about the water usage. However, he stated that “we are debating something that we don’t have the answers for at this time and we need to base our decision on what we do know.” Mr. Williams feels confident that the State of Georgia will stop this operation if there is a problem with the aquifer.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Lamar Cole.

It was noted that this application would be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting with no recommendation from the Planning Commission.

-----

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:00 a.m.

-----

**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 Depratrer Lane; property having 760.31 ft. of frontage on U.S. Highway 341. Property owned by Constance Daniels.

Mr. Horace Daniels was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff’s report, Mrs. Segers stated that staff’s recommendation is for approval with conditions of site plan approval prior to issuance of a building permit and adequate buffers being between the residential property and the commercial development.

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, with the exception of adjacent residential properties, which would require special consideration with regard to setbacks and buffers.**

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

**Properties to the rear of the subject property could be adversely affected.**

- 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 shows the property as being used for agricultural and forestry. However, the subject property is in proximity to a multi-use node.**

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

**The Future Land Use Map shows the property as being agricultural but within a multi-use node at the intersection of GA 99 and U.S. 341. According to the Comprehensive Plan, the multi-use nodes are “foreseen [sic] as future locations for commercial, residential, institutional and recreational uses in a multi-use planned concept.” Multi-use nodes are areas that are anticipated to develop, and where development should be monitored. The Comprehensive Plan further states that “site plan approval would be required for any new rezoning request in these areas.”**

During a brief presentation, Mr. Horace Daniels stated that he had some issues in the past regarding his property; however, they have all been dealt with and cleared up. He is now ready to move forward.

Mr. Jim Depratter, III, adjacent property owner, was present to oppose this request. He stated that the pond that's located 30 yards from his property is a breeding ground for mosquitoes, rodents, etc. Also, the road is not adequate to handle heavy commercial size trucks and they pose a danger to his children playing in the park nearby. Mr. Depratter stated that his well is not far from where the pond is located and the water that's being pumped out is not helping. He stated that this proposed development would not be beneficial for the neighborhood and would devalue his property. He stated that the applicant is constantly digging and hauling dirt from the area.

Mr. Hart explained to Mr. Depratter that if the rezoning is approved, the applicant would not be allowed to continue with the bar pits because a par pit is not a permitted use in Highway Commercial. He then read the list of permitted uses under this zoning district. He stated that the applicant would also have to build a 6 ft. fence and put a buffer between his commercial development and the residential property. Mr. Depratter stated that he was not aware of these stipulations, but this does not alter his opinion. He is still opposed to this request.

Mr. James Depratter, adjacent property owner, was present to oppose this request. He voiced the same concerns as his son (Jim Depratter, III). He also complained about the previous violations brought against Mr. Daniels. He stated that the Judge ordered Mr. Daniels to clean up the property within 30 days or be subject to a fine. Instead of cleaning up the property, Mr. Daniels elected to pay the fine. He stated that Mr. Daniels is still digging holes and is moving closer to his property. Mr. Depratter stated that as a taxpayer, he should not have to put up with this, and he is asking the Planning Commission to deny this request.

Mr. Terry Lane, adjacent property owner, stated that his main concern is digging and leaving the "deep holes." He's afraid that these holes will eventually run his well dry.

Chairman Stewart stated that he's concerned about Depratter lane and asked if dirt is still being sold from the location. Mrs. Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement Division, replied yes, dirt is being sold from the area; however, she advised that Mr. Daniels does have a Soil Erosion Permit and a Surface Mining Permit which allows him to use Depratter Lane as access to his property. She stated that Mr. Daniels has followed the rules. Chairman Stewart added that the state needs to stop issuing Surface Mining Permits before consulting with the county. This is not Mr. Daniels' fault. Chairman Stewart stated that he is going to talk with the County Commission to see if something can be done to possibly counteract this process.

Mr. Perry Fields commented that digging a pond is surface mining and putting a pond in any subdivision requires a mining permit from the State of Georgia. He pointed out that it is not just Mr. Daniels, but this applies to new subdivisions everywhere. He just doesn't know if the answer to this problem should involve the Planning Commission. Mr. Buster Reese explained that a Surface Mining Permit is only required if the dirt is being sold off the premises. If the dirt is retained on the property, then the Surface Mining Permit is not required.

Mr. Horace Daniels stated that the LDA and Surface Mining Permits were issued to him. He stated that he has a 10 acre bonded permit. He pointed out that he does have access to use Depratrer Lane. He is constantly picking up paper and he keeps this road clean, along with Highway 341. He stated that he blows the dirt away when it gets on to Depratrer Lane and there has been no damage done to the road since he has been working in the area. Mr. Daniels stated that 25 ft. of Depratrer Lane is inside his property line. He further stated that he agreed to not pump the water from the area late at night at the request of Mrs. Depratrer. He stated that the deepest part of the pond is about 30 ft. The EPD approved his permit, which requires him to stay 45 ft. off of the property line, and he is actually 47 ½ ft. off of the property line.

Regarding the buffer, Mr. Daniels stated that he could have put the fence up on the property line a long time ago, but in order to do so, Mr. Depratrer would have to move his house because his house is across the property line. He stated that he has a survey to prove this point. He stated that the Depratrer's also have junk and buildings against the line and he cannot put the fence up without hitting one of their buildings. Mr. Daniels stated that he is willing to do whatever is necessary to make everything right.

Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Daniels if he is requesting the rezoning in order to use the concrete crusher, or if he intends to use it for commercial purposes. Mr. Daniels stated that he wants to use the property for commercial purposes. He understands that the concrete crusher is not allowed in the requested zoning district.

Mr. Fields had questions about the grandfathered status of the permit with regard to the requested zoning change. Mr. York Phillips stated that he believes the status would be that it is a non-conforming use, but he would have to verify this before it goes to the County Commission for final action.

Mr. Fields stated that Highway 341 is a DOT highway; therefore Mr. Daniels would have to get permission to access this highway. He wanted to know if staff had addressed this issue with Mr. Daniels. Mrs. Segers stated that the county has not yet received an application for a subdivision of the property, but a letter from DOT would be a requirement of the subdivision application. Mr. Fields had additional questions concerning the curb cuts. Mr. Daniels stated that he has three existing curb cuts. He then pointed these out on the plans.

Mr. Depratrer disputed the comments about his house being on the property line. Mr. Fields asked Mr. Ernie Johns if there is in fact a property line issue. Mr. Johns stated that he does not know if there is an issue at this time, because he has not been involved with this property for over a year. He stated that there is a house located very close to the property line but he's not certain if it is across the line or not.

Mr. Cole noted that the acreage has to be corrected on Tract A. Mrs. Segers replied that it would be corrected.

Mr. Hart stated that there are a lot of unanswered questions and he would like to suggest a deferral so that these concerns can be addressed. Instead of a deferral, Chairman Stewart pointed out that according to Section 1104 12), the Planning

Commission has the discretion to continue a hearing to a later date. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to continue hearing this item at the April 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting at 9:00 a.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Wayne Stewart.

-----

**Presbyterian Church (SP200201300916)**

6 Acres, Located on the corner of Frederica Road  
& Delamontte, Zoned R-12  
Savannah Presbyterian, Inc. Owner/Developer

Mr. Charles Ezelle of Thomas & Hutton Engineers and Mr. Larry Bryson were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, staff had previously recommended approval conditioned on the Special Use Permit verification; however, this has been verified and staff is recommending approval (minus this condition).

Mr. Hart had questions about the height limitations. Mr. Frazier stated that the height limitation for the property is 35 ft. Mr. Larry Bryson stated that the building height would be under the 35 ft. limitation.

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

-----

**Eagle Point Apartments (SP200112120839)**

14.3 Acre Tract, Located on Crispin Boulevard near  
Old Jesup Highway, Zoned Medium Residential  
Robert Boone, Owner; Glynn County Partner, Ltd., Developer

Mr. Glynn Taylor and Attorney Joey Strength were present for discussion.

Chairman Stewart stated that the Planning Commission did not receive the applicant's traffic study in time to thoroughly review it. Mr. Frazier advised that staff has reviewed the traffic study extensively and is willing to share observations. He stated that Mr. Glenn Bollinger, Traffic Safety Engineer, is also present to answer questions. Again, Mr. Frazier stated that staff is willing to address any concerns regarding the traffic impact study and feels very confident that it accurately reflects the proposed conditions and how the apartment complex will impact the area. He stated that staff's

recommendation is for approval. (A previous condition from the Fire Department regarding adding a fire hydrant has been satisfied and addressed on the site plan.)

Mr. Frazier stated that staff has received an estimate on improvements to the intersection of Old Jesup, Cate Road and Crispin Boulevard. Mr. Fields stated that he doesn't have a problem with this as long as the recommendation for approval is not conditioned on the applicant making improvements to the intersection. If the county is going to do these improvements because of this project, then he does not foresee a problem.

Attorney Joey Strength gave a brief presentation. He stated that this project meets zoning and site plan requirements for Glynn County. The applicants have worked with Mr. Bollinger and Mr. Frazier to address the primary impact of traffic and the secondary impact of traffic to the intersection, and at this time they are requesting approval of the site plan.

Mr. Bollinger addressed the traffic in the area and the proposed improvements including the recently installed four-way stop at the intersection. Chairman Stewart asked if the road is large enough to accommodate the current and proposed uses. Mr. Bollinger replied yes.

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

-----

## Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the Minutes of the February 5, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Hal Hart did not attend the February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

-----

## Chairman Items

### a) ID Badges

Chairman Stewart requested that Mr. Peterson furnish the Planning Commission members with ID Badges. Glynn County has agreed to this request.

### b) Code Enforcement - Court

Chairman Stewart advised that he recently attended Magistrate Court to hear some of the Code Enforcement cases and found this to be a very enlightening and educational experience. He invited each of the members to attend court with the Code Enforcement

Division. He assured them that it would be a learning experience for them as well. The members were advised to contact Mrs. Brenda Pittman for the schedule of these hearings.

**c) Board of Commissioners Meeting**

Chairman Stewart stated that he will be attending the March 7<sup>th</sup> Board of Commissioners meeting to give an update on the proposed ordinances, and to ask for the Board's blessing on changing the Planning Commission meetings from once a month to two (2) meetings per month at 6:00 p.m. For security purposes, Chief Carl Alexander has consented to these meetings being held at the Glynn County Public Safety Complex.

**d) Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports at this time. A work session will be scheduled at the April 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting with regard to the proposed ordinances and for other purposes.

-----

**Staff Items**

**a) STWP (Short-Term Work Program/Comp Plan)**

Mr. York Phillips pointed out that a memorandum has been included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review regarding the Short-Term Work Program update and a brief description of what the STWP requires in terms of the process. Upon approval of the material by the staff committee, it will then be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and subsequently for a public hearing. Mr. Phillips stated that this information will probably be ready for review at the April 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and then perhaps a public hearing can be scheduled for May 7<sup>th</sup>.

**b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

An update of the meeting schedule was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. Mr. Phillips stated that the flow diagram would most likely be revised in order to make the process work properly. He encouraged input from the Planning Commission on this matter.

**c) March 29<sup>th</sup> Water Resource & Wastewater Workshop**

A list of possible subjects to be discussed at the March 29<sup>th</sup> workshop was included in the packages, i.e., water supply, water quality and the State Water Plan. Mr. Phillips stated that the public would be notified of the time and location of this workshop.

**d) Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee**

Mr. Phillips stated that the Planning Commission received material regarding the creation of a committee to help oversee the development and maintenance of a Capital Improvement Program. (This information/material was introduced at the February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.) Staff is requesting input from the Planning Commission on establishing a Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee to manage the overall process for

implementing the Capital Improvement Program. The County Administrator is interested in having the Planning Commission be a part of this process.

Chairman Stewart wanted to know who would be responsible for monitoring the SPLOST expenditures in progress. Mr. Phillips stated that it would be a collective effort but the committee would be the main source. The committee would also report to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Commissioners.

During the course of discussion, concern was expressed as to whether or not formal action is required on this particular item in that it was not an advertised item. Chairman Stewart advised staff to verify this and if it is determined that formal action is not necessary, then it is the consensus of the Planning Commission to establish a Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee. If formal action is required, this item will be advised for the April 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting in accordance with the "Open Meetings Act."

**e) Traffic Safety Amendments (Sections 602 & 706)**

The amendment was included in the packages and was presented by Mr. Frazier. He explained that the purpose of this amendment is to grant authority to the Traffic Safety Engineer to acquire acceleration, deceleration and turning lanes on collector streets. Regarding Traffic Control Devices under *Section 602.2 m)* he stated that there are no standards for signage in the county. The accepted standard is the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) which is the manual that Mr. Bollinger refers to when reviewing public roads. However, the county needs to establish a uniform standard for traffic control throughout the county for all roads.

There was a general discussion about the language in the amendment with regard to private access easements, stop signs, appeals process, etc. All comments were taken into consideration. The amendment will be revised to include all notations and brought back for further review.

**f) Off-Street Parking (Sections 302 & 611.6)**

The following was included in the packages: "An amendment to define certain terms in the ordinance; to provide for a waiver of parking space requirements if undeveloped land is preserved within the zoning lot and for other purposes." Mr. Hart expressed concerns about the proposed definition of site coverage under *Section 302*. It was also noted that site coverage (*Section 611.6*) should perhaps be replaced with the term "parking coverage" in this particular instance. All comments were taken into consideration. The amendment will be revised to include all notations and brought back for further review.

-----

Under **Planning Commission Items**, Mr. Hart asked that consideration be given to adding General Commercial under *Section 1102.4 Site Plan Approval*; add the term “institutional” under *Section 619.1*; and consider defining “vocational school” under *Section 710 Office Commercial*.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.