

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 5, 2002 9:00 A.M.

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

ABSENT: Hal Hart

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
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.

Chairman Stewart advised that a joint meeting is being scheduled with the Planning Commission, Board of Commissioners, City Commissioners and representatives from TE Consolidated about the surface mining proposal with regard to water usage, site plan review and DNR issues. Therefore, *Application GC-2001-39* is not on today's agenda. (Chairman Stewart will forward a letter to the above referenced parties.)

Regarding *Application GC-2002-04*, action of denial by the Board of Commissioners for this request was during the February 1, 2001 meeting. The applicant initiated resubmission on January 14, 2002. It has been determined that this request does not meet the one-year time requirement for resubmittal in accordance with Article XI, Section 1107, and was therefore pulled from the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 were listed under *Consent Agenda* and voted on accordingly:

1) 410 Mallory Street (VP-01-19)

Application for restaurant

Property owned by Wells Investments, L.L.C.

No one was in attendance to represent this item; therefore it was deferred by the Planning Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Perry Fields and seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams, 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.)

2) 532 Ocean Boulevard (VP-01-20)

Application for bicycle rental business

Property owned by Thomas D. Stewart

3) 415 Demere Road

Request to remove one (1) pine tree within the Village Preservation District.

4) Brunswick Ready Mix (BPSP-200201101137)

Variance request for new concrete plant

Property owned by Evans Concrete, L.L.C.

GC-2001-27

Request to rezone from PD-C Planned Development Commercial to FC Freeway Commercial, 111.983 acres, described as northeast quadrant of the intersection of Interstate 95 and Spur 25 located at Millennium Boulevard; the parcel having 5,662 ft. of frontage on Spur 25 (Golden Isles Parkway). Property owned by Sawdawg, L.L.C.

Mr. Ron Sawyer was present for discussion.

Mrs.Carolynn Segers explained that there are no specific guidelines in the County Zoning Ordinance as to what to consider when changing a PD Text. However, she stated that staff's recommendation is for approval. She proceeded with the following findings of fact:

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, all adjacent property now requires development to Freeway Commercial standards.

- 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.

The current zoning of the property presents the potential for excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities or utilities. These issues will have to be addressed regardless of either current PD or proposed Freeway Commercial standards.

- 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 commercial with pockets of undeveloped or unused lands.

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

This application, if approved, would remove the requirement of site plan approval, in accordance with Article VII, Section 723.3.3 and Article VI, Section 619 of the Zoning Ordinance. Effectively, the Planning Commission would be eliminated from the review process on the entire CR-6 Tract.

Mr. Perry Fields stated that a PD Text has signage requirements, lighting requirements, building height requirements, setbacks and general site plan approval. This type request, in essence, is like writing “a blank check.” Mr. Sawyer disagreed. He stated that this particular property is no different than the other quadrant zoned for Freeway Commercial and it is no different than the property near the Mall zoned for General Commercial. He stated that he has to follow all Freeway Commercial guidelines, which are the only guidelines listed in the PD Text. Mr. Fields pointed out

that the entire PD Text for the whole development has additional restrictions on property use, signage and entrance signs that would be deleted. Mr. Sawyer stated that Branigar is aware of his proposal and they have signed off on it. Mr. Fields stressed that he is not concerned about what Mr. Sawyer is proposing to build, but he is concerned about the property being sold to someone who may not be as caring as Mr. Sawyer. Mr. Sawyer stated that the property has deed restrictions to prevent any undesirable uses.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about Golden Isles Parkway being a controlled access, which would be removed from the PD Text. Mr. Sawyer argued that the Golden Isles Parkway is a DOT approved highway. He pointed out the area that has limited access.

Chairman Stewart stated that he is also concerned about giving up the PD Text in that it has been the most affective tool for Glynn County. He echoed Mr. Fields' sentiments about not being concerned as long as Ron Sawyer owns the property. Mr. Sawyer assured the Planning Commission that the property would be sold with guidelines.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of removing Tract CR-6 from the PD Text with the stipulation that the access is no more than the current point of access and one additional access. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams 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. Property owned by Jack E. Cauley.

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

It was noted that this application was deferred from the January 8th meeting in order to allow the Planning Commission to review a site plan. Today's request is the applicant's original submission. Staff's recommendation remains for approval. The following staff's report was included in the packages for review (with no changes).

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.

Due to the number of citizens present to speak in favor of this request, Chairman Stewart placed a 7-minute time limit on each speaker. The same time limit was allowed for those speaking in opposition.

Mr. Bill Smith, president of Southern Contractors, stated that he did the site plan for Mr. & Mrs. Cauley. During the site analysis, he determined that there is approximately 50% paved area and 50% unpaved area. He stated that there is a lot of green space available for planting grass, trees, etc. and the applicants have agreed to put up a 6 ft. fence or buffer as required by the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Elizabeth Cauley, owner and director of the Academy of Hair Arts and Design located on Norwich Street gave a brief overview of the school and her educational background, which includes a Doctorate Degree in this field. She stated that as far as she

knows, she is the only person with a Doctorate Degree qualified to train every cosmetologist and barber in this region. She stated that for years she had been searching for the best location to put the beauty school so that it could accommodate students and clients in Glynn County and surrounding counties.

Mrs. Cauley explained that the property is already zoned Local Commercial and there are a number of other businesses that could go on the property. The beauty school will be a new building and the area will be buffered. She stated that most of the clients are quiet, retired people. She stressed that she cannot imagine anybody not wanting a beauty school, compared to some of the other uses that could go on the property.

Mrs. Cauley stated that at the last meeting concerns were expressed about one individual benefiting from this facility while others would be negatively impacted. She pointed out that every household in Glynn County needs the service of a hairdresser, and without a facility to properly train individuals, this service could not be rendered. She stated that she has received full support from the Governor's office.

Regarding traffic concerns, Mrs. Cauley stated that the property is in front of the subdivision and would not affect the residents. The hours of operation would be Tuesday through Saturday from 9:00 a.m. till 3:00 p.m. She stated that they have given the ditch to the county so that equipment can be brought in and out. Also, as stated by Mr. Smith, they have planned to take care of the landscaping, trees and buffers so that there won't be a hindrance to the residents.

In conclusion, Mrs. Cauley stated she feels that the beauty school will be an asset to the community now and in the future.

Mr. Roy Miller of 100 Kensington Drive stated that he is not opposed to education. He stated that his concerns have been addressed and he is in favor of this request.

Ms. Kelli Mowatt of St. Simons Island (student) was present to speak in favor of this request.

Mr. George Metz of 111 Baybridge Drive was present to oppose this request. He was very outspoken and had to be told several times by the Chairman to lower his voice. Mr. Metz stated that he is not against education but he is opposed to this beauty school coming into his neighborhood. He pointed out that most of the people present to speak in favor of this request are not residents of this subdivision. He stated that this is where he lives. This is his neighborhood. He expressed concerns about traffic and the possibility of the parking lot becoming a late night hangout for juveniles. Also, there will be 20 students; however, those 20 students will have 20 customers to work on. He's concerned about the increasing number of cars coming in and out of the area during the day. Mr. Metz suggested that the applicants use the property to build houses rather than a beauty school.

Ms. Deloris Miller of 100 Kensington Drive stated that she would like to see a site plan and see what type of buffer is being proposed before she decides if she's against this request or not. She pointed out that she is not opposed to education.

Chairman Stewart stated that he walked the area, knocked on doors and talked to most of the residents. Their main concerns seemed to be about the buffer and the safety of the children in the neighborhood, particularly the emotionally challenged children living in the group home near the proposed site. Chairman Stewart stated that he would also like more information from staff concerning the drainage ditch that crosses a portion of the property.

Mr. Perry Fields stated that he does not see an educational facility listed under the General Commercial Zoning District as a permitted use or as a conditional use. However, Local Commercial, which is what the property is already zoned, allows the following as a permitted use: "school offering instruction in art, music, dancing, drama or similar cultural activity." Mr. Fields stated that a beauty school would fall under this category as a form of artistic or cultural activity. That being the case, the property would not have to be rezoned for this purpose.

After reviewing the ordinance, Chairman Stewart agreed with Mr. Fields and further explained to the Cauley's that they do not have to rezone the property. The current zoning would allow them to build a beauty school, but they would be required to submit a completed site plan. Mr. Cauley stated that if this is correct, then the Planning Commission is in conflict with what staff has told him. Mr. Fields assured Mr. Cauley that the problem is being fixed and he doesn't need to rezone the property. Mr. Cauley agreed to submit a completed site plan and requested a deferral until the March 5th Planning Commission meeting. The deferral was granted.

The next three agenda items (*GC-2001-35, 36, 37*) contain the same PD Text and the same reports from staff, which were included in the packages for review. It was therefore the consensus of the Planning Commission to review the three applications together, with the motion reflecting all three.

GC-2001-35

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agriculture to PD Planned Development, 3.77 acres, described as being near the intersection of Andy Tostensen Road and Highway 17 South, located at 191 Tostensen Road; the parcel having 145 ft. of frontage on Andy Tostensen Road. Property owned by Samuel A. & Karen H. Tostensen.

GC-2001-36

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agriculture to PD Planned Development, 3.4 acres described as being near the intersection of Andy Tostensen Road and Highway 17 South, located at 221 Andy Tostensen Road; parcel having 300 ft. of frontage on Andy Tostensen Road. Property owned by William J. & Louise C. Tostensen.

GC-2001-37

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agriculture to PD Planned Development, 8.98 acres described as being near the intersection of Andy Tostensen Road and Highway 17 South, located at 129 Andy Tostensen Road; parcel having approximately 395 ft. of combined frontage on Andy Tostensen Road. Property owned by Andrew H. Tostensen III.

Mr. Samuel A. Tostensen was present for discussion.

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

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

Yes, the subject property is in proximity to Interstate 95. During the past decade, the development of the area has emerged as commercial in nature. Furthermore, the frequent use of the rail line immediately north of the subject property has reduced its suitability for single family residential. This is the character of the current use.

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

Adverse effect is possible, given that the property to the south is recently zoned for Planned Development similar to General Residential. An established neighborhood is located north of adjacent property (GC-2001-37), although a railroad right-of-way and utility easement provides a buffer between the proposed development area and the neighborhood.

- 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.

The proposed zoning classification, as detailed in the Planned Development Text, may result in a use which could cause excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities and utilities. This issue may be addressed during the site plan review phase. Additionally, county sewer service is available in proximity to the subject property and Glynn County has received permits for a well in proximity to the subject property.

- 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.

Neither the future land use map nor the Comprehensive Land Use Plan indicated expectation of the commercial and residential growth experienced in this area. Further, the Planning Commission may choose to entertain a recommendation for a traffic study of the proposed development area prior to making a decision on the proposed zoning request in accordance with Article XI, Section 1104(B) 13.

Staff's recommendation is for approval. Staff also requests submittal of a larger format copy of the Tostensen Estate survey by C. M. German, Jr. and Associates, dated 2-24-87, to provide for legibility.

During the course of discussion, Mr. Perry Fields expressed concerns about spot zoning with regard to the neighbors and the area. Mr. Tostensen explained that the Bryan's, who are the adjacent property owners to the south, have no problem with the rezoning. The other three residents in that quadrant are his family members.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of Applications GC-2001-35, 36 & 37. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields.

GC-2002-01

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agriculture to HC Highway Commercial, 0.31 acres, described as being near the intersection of Chris Road and GA Highway 99; property having 130 ft. of frontage on Chris Road. Property owned by Bobby Lee Cargile, II.

Mr. Cargile and Mr. Jim Conine were present for discussion.

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

Yes, the subject property is in proximity to Highway Commercial Districts. Developed property in visual proximity to the subject property is used for large truck sales and service. The proposed use is for a repair garage.

- 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, proposed use will not greatly impact existing streets.

- 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.

Property owner has filed a minor plat application to create a buildable lot to locate his existing repair garage business. This subdivision includes a portion of the adjacent Highway Commercial parcel to the west.

Mr. Jim Conine stated that he made a mistake when he drew the plans for this rezoning. He drew the plans for the proposed building at 30 ft. x 60 ft. However, he should have used a 2 to 3 ratio, which would put the building at 40 ft. x 60 ft. Mr. Conine stated that he was advised by staff to bring this to the Planning Commission's attention. Mr. Fields wanted to know if the 0.31 acres is enough land to construct the

building. Mrs. Segers replied yes. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-02

Request to amend the PD-G Planned Development-General zoning text of Glynco-McBride Jet Park to add telecommunications tower as a permitted use. Subject property is 19.95 acres, located at 2100 Sidney Lanier Drive, Brunswick; parcel having 2,121.14 feet of frontage on Sidney Lanier Drive. Property owned by OSG Tap & Die, Inc.; SBA, Inc., Agent

Mr. Jack McGee was present for discussion.

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

Yes, property is undeveloped and is across from the perimeter fence of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. Since property is in proximity to airport runway, the Glynn County Airport Commission has received an ASAC study for the proposed site. The Commission's letter outlines requirements to be met at special use permit stage of review.

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

The proposed permitted use has the potential for adverse impacts. The special use permit review process, however, provides opportunity to limit these potential impacts, including receipt of approvals from the Glynn County Airport Commission and Brunswick and Glynn County Development Authority for proposed telecommunications towers.

- 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 would not increase impact to these systems beyond that which was approved under Glynco-McBride Jet Park Zoning Text (GC-14-86).

- 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 Industrial.

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

(Additional information was provided by the applicant in separate binders for the Planning Commission’s review.)

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend approval of this request subject to site plan approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-03

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agricultural to HC Highway Commercial, 1.67 acres, described as being near the intersection of Blythe Island Road and Fancy Bluff Road, located at 7394 Blythe Island Road, adjacent to Parcel 1 & 2 of the Scarlett Estate. Property owned by Lamar A. and Esther D. Bell.

Mr. Neil Foster was present for discussion.

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

Yes, subject property is in close proximity to Highway Commercial districts.

- 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, proposed use will not greatly impact existing streets.

- 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 Commercial.

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

Proposed use is for a wholesale business.

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

SUP-01-10

Request for Special Use Permit application for a restaurant, located at 410 Mallory Street, SSI, Property owned by Wells Investments, L.L.C.

There was no one in attendance to represent this request. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to defer this item. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 15 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:00 a.m.

Hampton Plantation, Phase VIII (PP200112100958)

6.2 Acre Tract, Located off Rice Mill near Butler Lake
Drive, Zoned Planned Development
Montrose Group, LLC, Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

This application includes a variance request and a preliminary plat application. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to review the two requests at the same time, with separate motions.

During the course of discussion, this application was first thought to be incomplete due to staff not receiving a letter from Coastal Resources Division regarding the marsh delineation. However, it was pointed out that the letter is customary and not a requirement. The delineation line is required and is included on the plans. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Robert Ussery stated that the variance should be granted for the following reasons:

- 1) This project is zoned Planned Development and the development text outlines the special nature of this type of patio home development requiring a variance to the Subdivision Regulations.
- 2) The peculiar shape of the parcel makes the inclusion of two additional cul-de-sacs impractical.
- 3) The two dead-end streets as planned are only 95 ft. and 125 ft. long.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the variance request for Hampton Plantation, Phase VIII. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the preliminary plat for Hampton Plantation, Phase VIII. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

Arnold House Inn (SP200201091042)

Located on Beachview Drive at Neptune Drive
St. Simons Island, Zoned Resort Residential
James G. Timbes, Owner/Developer

Mr. Tyler Frazier stated that staff received a letter from Mr. Larry Bryson requesting that this application be deferred until the March 5th meeting.

GC-2002-ZT 1

An Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance to require site plan approval for developments in the Limited Industrial, Basic Industrial and General Industrial Zoning Districts.

Mr. Frazier explained that the intent of this proposed amendment is to seek approval and compliance from the engineering review process that would typically occur with something of a higher level of development, such as a power plant, which from staff's point of view should require site plan approval. Currently, developments of this nature only require a building permit and the level of review at the building permit stage is inadequate. Again, staff feels that site plan approval would be a higher level of review. Mr. Fields stated that if this proposal is approved, does Glynn County have anyone on staff qualified to examine these types of plans. Mr. Frazier explained that staff needs to coordinate with the state and their permitting system. Site plan approval stage is typically where staff would coordinate with the state on the different types of permits that go through EPD. This is more about intergovernmental coordination between Glynn County and the State of Georgia.

Mrs. Segers commented that "just because staff does not have the expertise, does not limit staff from seeking experts on these issues." She emphasized that staff wants to be able to provide a formal public discussion of all proposals. Chairman Stewart asked if there is anyone on staff currently qualified to review traffic, buffers, etc. Mr. Frazier replied yes. Mr. Fields stated that he's concerned about the judgmental calls. He stressed that he doesn't have a problem with the concept but he does have a problem with Glynn County having to hire a consultant.

Mr. Bob Miles wanted to know if the Glynn County Development Authority had any thoughts on this amendment, or were they even notified. Chairman Stewart stated that the amendment was legally advertised. He stated that he had spoken with several developers and no one seemed to have a problem with this. Mrs. Segers explained that if this amendment receives approval from the Planning Commission, it would then be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for final action at their regular meeting of March 7th.

Mr. Terry Driggers stated that he doesn't have an issue with checking a site plan for buffers or traffic, but he does have a problem with interagency coordination and Glynn County being the "watchdog" for the state and federal government.

Following discussion, Chairman Stewart passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Lamar Cole and afterward made a motion recommending approval of the proposed amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained from Voting: Mr. Perry Fields.

Comprehensive Plan: Policy IV-I

Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee Recommendation to Implement Proposed Elements of Comprehensive Land Use Plan

Mr. Peterson explained that a letter is included in the packages from the County Administrator outlining a potential process to have the Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee bring an annual recommendation to the Planning Commission for Capital Improvements regarding SPLOST Projects. This is being proposed in an effort to involve the Planning Commission in this process. (Also included with the memo is a list of Alternatives, Goals and Objectives.)

For further clarification of the County Administrator's request, Chairman Stewart stated that if the recommendation were approved, the Planning Commission would be in agreement that a Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee should be established, and any Capital Improvements will be forwarded to the Planning Commission as general information on where utilities, etc. would be located. Mr. Peterson stated that Chairman Stewart is correct. Also, the Planning Commission Chairman or designee would be a member of the committee.

Mr. Fields stated that he doesn't have a problem with someone from the Planning Commission serving on the committee to help define future capital needs; however, the Planning Commission has no control over how Glynn County spends money. Chairman Stewart agreed and added that he doesn't think any of the members would want to be involved with Glynn County finances. Mr. Peterson stated that he would convey these concerns to Mr. Eckert. It was therefore the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item.

Minutes

- a) January 8th Regular Meeting
- b) January 15th Public Meeting
- c) January 16th Public Meeting

Upon a motion made by Mr. Lamar Cole and seconded by Mr. Perry Fields, the above referenced Minutes were approved and adopted with any necessary corrections.

Planning Commission Items

a) Appointments

Chairman Stewart appointed members of the Planning Commission to study specific areas of the proposed ordinances as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1) Hal Hart | Site Coverage |
| 2) Lamar Cole | Resort Residential |
| 3) Mike Aspinwall | SSI Village Preservation District |
| 4) Ann McCormick | Building Height |
| 5) Perry Fields | Buffers |
| 6) Jonathan Williams | Site Plans |
| 7) Wayne Stewart | Trees |

The committee leader may select persons from the community to assist in these areas. A work session has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 19th at 6:00 p.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building to see how the group is proceeding.

Chairman Stewart stated that the Planning Commission is no longer under the 60-day time constraint. A motion was unanimously adopted by the Board of Commissioners to allow the Planning Commission as much time and they deem necessary with regard to the proposed ordinances. Chairman Stewart stated that the Planning Commission will however proceed as quickly as possible. He was advised to give an update on Planning Commission issues at the March 7th Board of Commissioners meeting.

b) Proposed Amendments to Sections 302, 611.6 of the Zoning Ordinance

Sections 302, 611.6 to define "Greenspace" in the Ordinance; to provide for a waiver of parking space requirements if "Greenspace" is preserved within the development; and for other purposes.

Mr. Tyler Frazier stated that this data is being provided as information only at this time. Two definitions of “Greenspace” were included in the packages for the Planning Commission’s review. The need for the definition is due to the proposed revisions to Section 611. Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements.

Mr. Perry Fields stated that he has a problem with the definition that *Greenspace* means “land and water that is undeveloped, natural state or that has been developed only to the extent consistent with, or is restored to be consistent with, one or more of the following goals: flood protection, wetlands, rivers, lakes, etc.” He stated that in his opinion, *Greenspace* is “land that is otherwise developable.” Wetlands are not developable, except maybe jurisdictional wetlands. You cannot develop in a river, flood protection area or archaeological and historic resources. Mr. Fields stated that we need to look for a definition that says if the land is not paved, then a certain percentage of the developable land needs to be deed restricted.

Mrs. Segers pointed out that the two definitions included in the packages were provided by the County Attorney’s office. Staff will research this more and bring it back to the Planning Commission. In the meantime, Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Fields to work with staff on the language for this definition.

c) Proposed Amendments to Sections 707, 801.1 of the Subdivision Regulations

Sections 707, 801.1; to grant the Community Development Director or his designee the authority to approve changes to road design and layout and approve increases or decreases in the number of lots for development within Zoning District Two during construction plan review; to require minor subdivisions to comply with the design standards of Article VI of the Subdivision Regulations and for other purposes.

Mr. Fields stated that during the construction plan phase, these changes should not be limited to District Two. Chairman Stewart agreed. Mrs. Segers stated that it should read “Planning District Two.” Nevertheless, Chairman Stewart stated that it should be countywide. Mr. Frazier explained that this language is verbatim from the proposed changes. He stated that staff would edit these changes and bring them back to the Planning Commission.

Regarding Section 801.1 of the Subdivision Regulations, Mr. Frazier stated that this language is also verbatim from the proposed changes. Mr. Fields stated that he has a problem with placing 801’s under the entire Article VI of the Subdivision Regulations, in that it would defeat the purpose of a minor plat. Chairman Stewart asked Vice Chairman Lamar Cole to assist staff with the language in this section and bring it back to the Planning Commission.

d) Status of Planning Commission By-Laws

Mr. Perry Fields volunteered to draft an amendment to the by-laws and perhaps circulate the changes at the February 19th work session. The Planning Commission is proposing to go to night meetings starting at 6:00 p.m., with two meetings per month.

Staff Items

a) Plan of Action for Traffic Safety/Creation of Glynn County Road Classification Map

Mr. Frazier stated that as part of the traffic safety initiative, the first plan of action is to create a Glynn County Road Classification Map as indicated in the Subdivision Regulations. He stated that with the coordinated efforts of GIS and Traffic Safety, the intent is to classify every public road in Glynn County, starting at the top with the higher classifications and then moving towards the lower classifications. He stated that during this process they expect to have some problems because there is also not a Glynn County Public Road Map as indicated in the ordinance.

Mr. Frazier stated that although there are several items listed within the ordinances that could be helpful to staff, these items do not exist. He stated that staff would continue its efforts and hope to obtain a favorable recommendation from the Planning Commission at a later date.

b) Proposed Amendment to Section 707, MR District of the Zoning Ordinance

An amendment to change the Zoning Ordinance, Article VII, Section 707 to require compliance with Article VII, Preliminary Plat Approval

Mr. Frazier explained that currently, there is no mechanism to convey easements for public service within private roads. Staff is in the process of developing a better approach for providing public service to private developments. The most significant example of where conflict arises is in relationship between private roads, storm water drainage and public service for water and sanitation sewer. There is also some question as to whether site plan or preliminary plat procedures would be the most appropriate place to add problems as subdivisions are defined.

Mr. Tim Ransom of Environmental Engineering was present to address water and sewer issues in relation to this proposed amendment. He explained that the problem is where there is a county road and county utilities being within private property, with no deeds or easements dedicating these services to the county. If the sewer line breaks the

residents are not going to call on the contractor or the developer. Instead, they are going to call Glynn County to make the repairs. This is where the conflict comes in. Mr. Ransom stated that the developers are reluctant to grant deeds to the county because there is nowhere to put water and sewer. If there is some type of provision made through preliminary or final plat procedure, the county could then arrange to have the water and sewer put in areas where they can be fixed.

Mr. Fields stated that what staff is saying is that if the county is going to be responsible for maintaining the water and sewer system within a condominium or apartment complex, then the county needs legal access to those lines. Mr. Fields stated that he has a problem with making people go through a preliminary and final plat approval on an apartment complex. However, if the county is going to be responsible for maintenance of water and sewer within an apartment complex, there should be a mechanism or language stating that the developer has to give some type of authority to the county.

Mr. Bobby Shupe agreed with Mr. Fields. He stated that putting a condominium or an apartment complex through the preliminary/final plat process does not fit. However, any multi-family development in Glynn County has to be brought to the Planning Commission in the form of a site plan for approval. Mr. Robert Ussery stated that in the past, developers have had to dedicate easements for utilities.

There was additional discussion about the need for a mechanism to determine easement dedication with regard to delegating maintenance responsibilities. At the end of discussion, Mr. Bobby Shupe agreed to work with staff on the language for this proposal and to bring it back for further review.

At this time, Mr. Fields suggested that staff review Article VI, of the Subdivision Regulations, specifically Section 602.1 Address Numbering System. He stated that the county now has a Comprehensive Addressing System and therefore this particular numbering system requirement is actually moot at this point.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:29 p.m.