

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
January 7, 2003 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Perry Fields, Vice Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Ann McCormick
Gary Nevill
Robert Ussery
Jonathan Williams

ABSENT: Hal Hart

STAFF PRESENT: York Phillips, Planning Manager
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

In the absence of the Chairman, Vice Chairman Perry Fields called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Fields announced that the applicant for Agenda Items 8 & 9 (*PAWS Project*) has requested a deferral. These items will be heard at the January 21st Planning Commission meeting.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Ann McCormick and seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill, the Agenda for the January 7th Planning Commission meeting was unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-11

Application by Mark Johnson, agent for Tommie A. Williams, owner, to rezone from Conservation Preservation to Residential Estates, property located north of CSX Railroad near the intersection with Oak Grove Island Road and consisting of 16.463 acres upland and 9.145 acres wetlands for 25.608 total acres.

Attorney Jay Roberts, representing the applicant, was present for discussion.

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

This request would allow the development of a single-family residence, including accessory uses, along with the ability to subdivide additional zoning lots for single-family residential development. This application was first scheduled to be heard July 2, 2002, and was deferred by the applicant. Following discussions with staff, the applicant has provided additional information, including: clarification that the rezoning request does not include marsh property; requested condition that minimum lot size be three acres; and a limit of four lots within the 25.608 acres. Additionally, the applicant has provided a general layout plan to illustrate a proposed minor subdivision of the property into four lots.

The property is located at the end of Oak Grove Island Road on the northern tip of Oak Grove Island. Property to the east is zoned Conservation Preservation (CP) and Residential Estates (RE). Land to the south is Planned Development-General and Forest Agriculture. Property to the west and north is zoned Conservation Preservation. The property is accessed by a dirt road described in the June 15, 2001 deed as a 20 ft. causeway (the roadway has been improved since that time), and includes a second access road (0.12 acre) authorized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers May 28, 2002.

To the east of the property is a 30 acre +/- tract known as Julian's Hammock. This area was rezoned from CP to RE in August 2001 with the condition that it not be subdivided into more than eight lots. It was later subdivided into lots of greater than three acres, and was exempt from the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations.

The Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map identifies this area as Forest Agriculture. Areas just east and south are identified as low density residential. Development should be very low density due to the limited visibility of the causeway intersection with Oak Grove Island Road and CSX Railroad crossing, and the environmentally sensitive nature of the subject property. Although the RE zoning classification allows a minimum lot size of 30,000 sq. ft., development of this density would create a burden on transportation infrastructure. Approximately 18 lots of this size are possible within the 16 +/- acres of upland. Furthermore, any development should be designed to limit non-point source pollution in stormwater runoff and septic systems due to the environmentally sensitive nature of marsh and wetlands. A restriction on the number of lots would reduce the overall impact of the 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. A medium density residential subdivision (Oak Grove Island) is located south of the subject property. Located east is Julian's Hammock, a low density residential subdivision.

- 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.

Development should be very low density due to the limited visibility of the causeway intersection with Oak Grove Island Road and CSX Railroad crossing, and the environmentally sensitive nature of 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 Agriculture Forestry.

- 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 16.463 acre upland area is Mandarin and Pelham soil series. Both are suitable for development. This information is listed in the Soil Survey of Camden County and Glynn County, Georgia issued November 1980.

Development of more than one lot would require, as a minimum, a minor subdivision for up to four lots served by a 60 ft. wide private access easement. This is the stated intent of the applicant. The existing causeway to the property recently has been improved and meets standards for a private access easement.

The site is appropriate for very low density residential development. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) minimum lot size of three acres
- 2) maximum of four lots total
- 3) subdivision of lots subject to Glynn County Subdivision Regulations

During a brief presentation, Attorney Jay Roberts stated that the applicant is in agreement with the staff's recommendations. In response to a request by the Oak Grove Homeowners Association, the applicant is proposing additional restrictions: 1) house size limited to a minimum of 2000 sq. ft.; and 2) mobile homes to be restricted.

Mr. Mike Aspinwall stated that according to staff, the applicant could put 18 or actually 16 homes on the lot. He wanted to know why the applicant is accepting less. Mr. Roberts explained that they want to try to protect the area. By allowing four home sites well below what is allowed by Residential Estates, they're proposing enforcement by putting deed restrictions in the deed when the property is sold, or recording restrictive covenants on the property to reflect the deed restrictions.

Mr. Robert Ussery had questions about the access to the property. He asked if there is enough room for a road in the narrow strip. Mr. Bobby Shupe replied yes, the road is in and was done with the approval of state and local agencies. He stated that they could not build the road to county standards and have the right slopes. Therefore, the private access easement was their only option. The owner does not want to do a high density development.

Ms. Ann McCormick expressed concerns about the wetlands and the marsh area. Mr. Roberts stated that the applicant has no intention of infringing on the marshland at all.

Mr. Ussery stated that there appears to be a wide divergence between the DNR line and the Corps line, which creates the small 1.2 acre hammock. Mr. Shupe stated that the area in question is U.S. Army Jurisdictional freshwater wetlands.

Mr. Bud Myrick stated that even though the road has been improved to some degree, there is still some tracking on to Oak Grove Island Road. He wanted to know if the developer would consider paving the first 50 or 100 ft. of the road. He also wanted to know if the restrictive covenants would be incorporated in the plans. Mr. Roberts stated that the restrictive covenants would be incorporated into the plans. Also, the restrictions would be placed on the deed when the property is sold. In addressing Mr. Myrick's concerns about the road, Mr. Roberts stated that there is a maximum of four houses proposed under the current plans and the level of traffic would not be very high. Mr. Shupe added that Mr. Williams is planning to pave the road completely but he has to generate the funds first.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this rezoning subject to the three recommendations referenced by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Discussion continued. For clarification, Mr. Phillips asked if the motion is for approval of the portion of the property that lies upland from the marsh delineation. Mr. Fields replied yes.

Regarding staff's recommendation about complying with the Subdivision Regulations, Mr. Fields wanted to know why would staff ask something of the applicant that he is already required to do. Mr. Phillips explained that staff included this as a recommendation because if the request is handled as a minor plat under the 801 criteria, there would have to be four lots served by a private access easement with a 20 ft. well drained roadway to comply with the Subdivision Regulations. Another possibility is that if all lots were over three acres, this would not be subject to the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Fields stated that according to the ordinance, it is a requirement to have the road frontage on a public road even on three or more acres. He stated that he just did not want to burden the applicant with a preliminary plat and a final plat process for a four-lot subdivision.

After discussion, the motion for approval subject to staff's recommendation was unanimously adopted.

GC-2002-25

Application by Atlantic Survey Professionals, Inc., agent for Alice A. Lewman, owner, to rezone from Forest Agriculture to General Commercial, property located on the south side of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad (Glynco Spur Railroad) right-of-way approximately 80 feet northwest of Canal Road, and consisting of approximately 20,878 square feet with approximately 181.57 feet of frontage on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad right-of-way.

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

The subject parcel is a portion of a triangular area bounded by Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25) to the west, Atlantic Coastline Railroad right-of-way to the north, and Canal Road to the southeast. This triangle is adjacent to the Golden Isles Gateway Tract Parcel CR 1. Zoning in the general area is a mixture of commercial to the south, Planned Development General to the north, and Forest Agriculture to the east. The property directly adjacent to the west, south and east has been recently zoned to General Commercial. The stated intent of the applicant is that these parcels are to be developed in concert with each other.

The Glynn County future land use map identifies the subject property as low density residential, while the nearby HC and LC zoned property is shown as commercial. The location of this property, in close proximity to good transportation facilities (particularly the Spur) and separated from residential (the property is bounded by the railroad right of way, beyond which is a commercial area within the Golden Isles Gateway Tract), suggests that some commercial development is appropriate. Consideration needs to be given to the development of a coordinated commercial area and more likely for non-retail or mixed retail and non-retail uses. This suggests that a coordinated development plan be prepared with the participation of the other landowners, if possible.

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 zoning would allow uses that are compatible with the zoning of immediately adjacent land.

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

Not likely.

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

Yes, although single-family residential use would be of limited benefit.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use, which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

No.

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

The future land use map identifies this area as low density residential and commercial. It is also in close proximity to the multi-use node at the intersection of I-95 and Spur 25.

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

No.

Commercial development of this site would be appropriate, but should be coordinated with the development of other land in this immediate vicinity if possible. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

It was noted that no one was in attendance to represent this request. Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item until later in the meeting pending arrival of a representative.

GC-2002-26

Application by Factor One, LLC, owner, to rezone from Forest Agriculture to Planned Development Residential property located to the west of McKenzie Road approximately 700 feet northwest of its intersection with U.S. 341 and consisting of approximately 202 acres with 2,100 feet of frontage on McKenzie Road.

Mr. Richard McKinna and Mr. Ray Richard were present for discussion.

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

This is a proposed residential development located generally west of US 341 and east of a large wetland system. The Sterling community is a short distance to the northeast. The proposal includes approximately 490 lots, along with several areas of jurisdictional wetlands. To the east and northeast are a DOT yard, a county park and recreation area, and some limited commercial development. (A proposed zoning text was included in the packages.)

The Comprehensive Plan designates this area for residential development, interspersed with agriculture, forestry, and undeveloped areas (i.e. generally representing the major wetlands.) The intersection area of US 341 and SR 99 (Sterling) is indicated as

a “multi-use node,” representing more concentrated development including retail and service commercial.

This area is not currently served by water and sewer, but is within the “urban service district” as depicted on the future land use map. Public water and sewer is being extended to the corner of Canal Road and SR 99 as part of the EDA grant associated with the wildlife park project. Staff has discussed the extension of these services to the Sterling area in conjunction with this project and other possible developments in the vicinity, and is working on a formal proposal to present to the Board of Commissions for consideration. Such an extension would be in lieu of the development of a private package sewer plant and private central water system to serve this site. Without central water and sewer, this site would yield fewer units and would place septic systems within close proximity to a major wetland. Furthermore, without a central water system, fire protection would be limited.

Consideration should be given to public acquisition of the major wetland system to the west. Contribution of land to the county can be used to match federal and state funds to help with this acquisition.

At this time, Mr. Fields asked if this is a request for a rezoning or is it an adoption of a PD Text. Mr. Phillips replied both; it is a rezoning to PD with the adoption of a PD Text. Mr. Fields then asked if the PD Text is based on the assumption that there will be water and sewer on the site. Mr. Phillips stated that there will be water and sewer either by virtue of a county supplied system developed in cooperation with the owners, or it might be through a private or county package treatment plant, and a county or privately developed central water system independent of the extension of sewer with the concept that it would be hooked into the county system at a future date.

Mr. Phillips continued with the staff’s report by reading the six criteria outlined in Section 1103 of the Ordinance as follows:

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, particularly in consideration of the character of development projected by the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

- 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.

McKenzie Road may require improvement at some point. Proper development of the area will require provision of public utilities.

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

The future land use map identifies this area for residential development.

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

While development to date has been limited, this area is destined to grow as the result of the County's growth.

The proposed zoning change is consistent with the overall expectations for the growth and development of this area as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. Provision of public utilities will greatly enhance the character and functioning of new development, and will protect the environment. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Robert Ussery had questions about the acreage in this development. Mr. Ray Richard pointed out the rezoning area and the 93 areas of wetland for clarification. In addition, he stated that there is 82 acres of marshland further down from this property.

Mr. Gary Nevill had questions about the well site in the package plan. Mr. Richard explained that if the developer decided to go with the private package plan, it would be permitted in an area of future development and would treat the wastewater for the first 150 lots to EPD requirements, thereby having a zero discharge. The concept is once the county water and sewer gets to the development, then the developer would hook his system up to the county system and abandon the wastewater system. He stated that this is a common approach in developing areas where there is no infrastructure.

Mr. Ussery wanted to know how different is an industrialized single-family dwelling unit from mobile homes. Mr. Richard explained that industrialized single-family dwelling units have to be approved by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). The unit is actually taken out on site in several pieces and put together. The county zoning regulations allow this type of housing, provided they are DCA approved. Mrs. Segers pointed out that these are permitted in the residential districts as outlined in the ordinance.

Mr. Richard stated that this development would be done in phases, and at some future date he would have to request a variance for the road.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if the dwelling units would be similar to the urban renewal type housing. Mr. Richard stated that he is not familiar with the urban renewal housing, however, there were problems in the past with construction of industrialized dwelling units and as a result, DCA adopted specific guidelines to make sure inspections are done and the quality of construction is appropriate.

Mr. Eddie Sanford wanted to know what affects the wastewater would have on the surrounding property. Mr. Richard explained that this approach does not directly discharge treated wastewater into the swamp, river, creek or marsh. It is sprayed, like an irrigation system, into the pine trees so that plants absorb all of the nutrients. He stated that this a preferred approach by DCA and it is becoming more and more popular in Coastal GA because it does not pollute direct discharge.

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

GC-2002-27

Application by Kern-Coleman & Co., agent for Title Properties, LLC, owner, to amend the Planned Development Zoning Text for the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development (Tract R4W) for property located on the north side of Harry Driggers Boulevard, approximately 14,600 feet west of its intersection with US 17 and consisting of 33.37 acres with approximately 2,349 feet of frontage on Harry Driggers Boulevard. The project is to be known as Caleb's Crossing.

Messrs. Greg Wilkes, Toss Allen and Terry Carter were present for discussion.

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

This project consists of 39 buildings containing 154 units (38 buildings have 4 units and one has 2 units) located on the north side of Harry Driggers Boulevard within the Golden Isles Gateway planned development. This request involves the modification of the planned development text as it pertains to multi-family development. Among the changes is the front setback standard, which would allow parking and carports within 10 ft. of the right-of-way (although the principal residential buildings would be set back at least 20 ft.).

A later version of the proposed Planned Development Text was submitted. This later version proposes an increase in the density (10 dwelling units per acre compared with 8 dwelling units per acre) and an overall number of dwelling units. Staff's review is based on the earlier version.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this area for residential development. Utilities and services are available to serve this project or can be easily provided. The project area has a number of wetlands, and the drainage system will require care in its design and construction.

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

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use, which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

No.

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

The future land use map identifies this area for residential development.

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

No.

This proposal changes the design guidelines for multi-family projects, but does not significantly alter the overall expectations for the development as originally approved. Staff recommends that the proposed zoning change be approved. This recommendation is based on the Planned Development Text as originally submitted and reviewed by the Golden Isles Gateway developer.

For clarification, Mr. Ussery stated that one reason for this request is to allow car ports within 10 ft. of the front property line. He stated that he is not clear on the density. Mr. Frazier explained that there were two versions of the PD Text and staff included the one that was approved by Branigar. When they reviewed the deed they noticed that there was a specific restriction for 8 dwelling units per acre. He stated that quadruplexes are not specifically stated as uses. Staff had difficulty fitting the use in the GC section. They then worked on the text in order to make the quadruplexes fit within the residential use section of the Branigar Planned Development.

Mr. Fields had additional questions about the density. Mr. Toss Allen stated that the overall density was based on upland acres with a zero density basically on the wetlands. This calculation was based on gross instead of net. Staff agreed with this assessment. Mr. Phillips added that the density was based on the acreage after deleting the wetlands. He stated that if you're including roads and common areas, it is based on gross. If wetlands are added to the total, it is much lower. For further clarification, Mr. Frazier read the definition of "development area" as outlined in the ordinance as follows:

Development Area: All land determined to be suitable for improvement and building, but not including permanent preservation areas such as productive marsh, beach, most seaward stable dune, Beach and Dune Development setback area, lake, stream, landmark tree, historical site, or utilized for streets, alleys or access easements.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about being consistent. If in the past streets were disallowed, then they should be disallowed this time. He stated that he does not have a problem with this if in the past streets were allowed in the gross calculation, as long as staff is being consistent. However, it is his recollection that they have always taken streets out when calculating density.

Mr. Terry Driggers stated that he is not aware of any kind of density requirement written in the PD Text for the Gateway Tract. It has a total number for the entire tract. He stated that Branigar has been "divvying" out the density per parcel. The county would have no restrictions regarding the density. He pointed out that according to his deed restrictions, the density is based on upland acres total gross.

Mr. Greg Wilkes presented a sketch of the development for review and elaborated on the 10 ft. setback.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to recommend approval of this request with any added restrictions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Ussery with an amendment that the request be approved with the 10 ft. variation being allowed for car ports only. The buildings would remain at 20 ft. The amendment was accepted. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Gary Nevill, Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields. (Mr. Fields commented that he does not think 10 ft. would be enough.)

GC-2002-28

Application by Driggers Construction Company, Inc., owner, to rezone from R-9 One Family Residential to PD-R Planned Development Residential, property located on the east side of Carteret Road north of its intersection with Emanuel Farm Road, and consisting of approximately 23.938 acres and having approximately 950 feet of frontage on Carteret Road and approximately 1,216 feet of frontage on Emanuel Farm Road. The project is to be known as Bridgeway Subdivision.

Mr. Terry Driggers was present for discussion.

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

This is a proposal for the development of a subdivision of approximately 77 single-family residential lots in an area generally characterized by residential development. The proposed minimum lot size is 7,000 square feet. By comparison and based on a simple recalculation of the net area, the existing zoning would yield approximately 60 lots.

The proposal is for a planned development, regulated by a Planned Development Text. The text is consistent with the standard provisions for single-family residential districts. Staff notes that the wording associated with "conditional uses" needs to be clarified.

Utilities in the area are provided by the City of Brunswick, however staff has not received details of how service will be provided. This issue can be addressed at the preliminary plat stage.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this area for low density residential 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.

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

No.

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

Yes

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use, which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

No.

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

The future land use map identifies this area for low density residential development.

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

No.

The proposed uses and density are generally consistent with the surrounding area and the designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Provision of utilities will need to be resolved at the preliminary plat review stage.

Staff recommends approval of this request subject to staff being authorized to work with the applicant to clarify the language in the proposed PD Text regarding “conditional uses.”

Mr. Nevill wanted to know what problem staff had with the phrase “conditional use” as contained in the PD Text. During the course of staff’s explanation, Mr. Robert Ussery suggested that the term “conditional” be deleted from the text and replaced with the phrase “common area uses.” Mr. Driggers agreed.

Mrs. Ann Burgess of 391 Carteret Road stated that she owns 400 ft. of property on the west side of the proposed subdivision. She wanted to know if there would be one road going into the subdivision, and which road would be utilized. Would it be Emanuel Farm Road or Carteret Road? Mr. Driggers stated that there would be one entrance coming off of Emanuel Farm Road.

Mrs. Wanda McLaughlin of 329 Nottingham Drive expressed concerns about the wildlife in the area. She stated that this development would have a tremendous environmental impact on the area. Also, the developer has buffered most of the property with trees; however, on her side he is proposing to install a fence. She wanted to know if the developer could leave trees to buffer her side of the development instead of the fence.

Mr. Driggers stated that it is his intent to develop a high quality single-family residential subdivision. Currently under the R-9 Zoning District, 90 plus single-family residential lots are allowed, but he is proposing 77. He stated that he has reduced the lot size from 9000 square feet to 7000 square feet. He pointed out that 26% of this property would be left in buffers and lakes, and he is proposing deed restrictions. In order to consider additional buffers as requested by Mrs. McLaughlin, Mr. Driggers stated that he would have to consult with the surveyors and designers to see if there is enough room to squeeze anything in that direction. He stated that he buffered from what he thought was the most critical areas: the roadways and the development to the east. There is already an existing 45 ft. drainage easement to buffer the property in the rear, which is where he intends to put the fence.

Mr. W. H. Reeves stated that he lives on the north side of the ditch at 321 Nottingham Drive. He would also prefer to have trees as a buffer. Mr. Fields explained that it would be illegal for the Planning Commission to impose additional buffers.

Mr. Eddie Sanford, 333 Nottingham Drive, stated that when the property is sold, who would be responsible for maintaining the fence. Mr. Driggers stated that the fence would go with the property.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to recommend approval of this request with the text change (replace the word “conditional” with “common area uses”). The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Gary Nevill

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 8:00 p.m.

GC-2002-29

Application by James Wesley and Brenda J. Wiggins, owners, to rezone from R-12 One Family Residential to M-R Medium Residential, property located on the northeast side of Old Cypress Mill Road approximately 1,230 feet north of its intersection with Benedict Road (address 4097 Old Cypress Mill Road), and consisting of approximately 0.64 acres and having approximately 160.65 feet of frontage on Old Cypress Mill Road.

Mr. & Mrs. Wiggins were present for discussion.

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

This proposal involves the change in zoning on a single parcel that is part of a larger development site. As a result of the change, the zoning will be consistent for the entire development parcel. A site plan for the project has received approval from the Planning Commission (Moss Creek, approved December 17, 2002). The area involved in the zoning change makes up a part of the stormwater management system for the larger project. In addition, there is an existing house on this portion that could be used as an office or community building for the larger project.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this area for low density residential use. Immediately to the south is medium density residential.

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

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use, which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

No.

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

The future land use map identifies this area for low density residential use.

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

No.

This proposal is consistent with the proposed development of the Moss Creek project and staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

SP-2002-1120-1630

Sea Island Support Campus North, Day Care Center

Request by owner for approval of a site plan on 2 acres zoned Planned Development. The subject property is located on the Sea Island Causeway west of the intersection with Frederica Road.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

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

The Planned Development, Sea Island Support Campus that governs this property was approved October 1999. A text amendment to allow the proposed use is pending approval by the Board of Commissioners.

The original purpose of the North support campus was to alleviate traffic congestion and to replace antiquated facilities on Sea Island near the Cloister. The campus includes such support functions as general receiving and purchasing, fleet service and maintenance, building and grounds maintenance, and employee parking. In addition to the support functions, the site may also accommodate retail and commercial development. This proposed childcare facility would serve to support the needs of Sea Island staff.

Staff has reviewed the site plan for this child development center. Engineering, Utilities Management, Drainage, Traffic Safety, and Fire have all reviewed the site plan and consider it to be compliant.

Parking calculations appear to be in order when the large employee parking lot is taken into consideration. The developer has provided 33 total spaces including 2 handicap-parking spaces. Suggested provisions are well in excess of the required amount.

The site plan identifies a number of jurisdictional freshwater wetlands. Total wetlands comprise 3.46 acres of the site. Also, the subject property shares its western boundary with a large jurisdictional wetland and saltwater marsh. The Glynn County Comprehensive Plan, Natural Resource Element states four policy goals and objectives that should be considered in conjunction with review of this site plan as follows:

- Acquire, preserve and encourage areas for natural open space. Protect and preserve natural open space wherever possible.
- Encourage the preservation of coastal resources, productive wetlands, and other natural resources.

- Avoid land uses that would jeopardize environmentally sensitive areas. At the time of site plan review, proposed developments will be scrutinized for their potential impacts on environmental resources.
- The Live Oak Tree as State Tree of Georgia, is a significant resource to Glynn County and shall be protected when feasible.

The Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Section 618, states that development adjacent to freshwater wetlands shall provide a buffer of natural vegetation. As discussed at the December 17th Planning Commission meeting, Section 618 lacks a specific standard for buffers or guidelines for what activities are appropriate within buffer areas. Staff is planning to present this issue to the Planning Commission as a discussion item at the January 21st meeting. In the meantime, Section 618 mandates a buffer. In lieu of a specific standard, staff recommends a 15 ft. natural, vegetative buffer adjacent to all on-site jurisdictional wetlands.

The site plan complies with the requirements set forth in Section 619 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to the inclusion of a 15 ft. natural vegetative buffer along all Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands,

Mr. Gary Nevill stated that the 15 ft. buffer recommended by staff is inconsistent with previous requests. The Planning Commission concurred. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

It was noted that no one appeared to represent Agenda Item #2 (*GC-2002-25*). Mrs. Segers reported that Mr. Ernie Johns, who is the agent for this request, had taken ill. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to continue this item at the January 21, 2003 Planning Commission meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

Oak Grove Island, Phase VI

Request by Oak Grove Island Limited, LLP for extension of a preliminary plat approval for Phase VI, Oak Grove Island.

Mr. Bud Myrick was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that the original preliminary plat was approved in the late 1980's for five years, and was extended at two-year intervals several times subsequently. The last extension was granted in December 2000, and expired in December 2002.

The applicant has circulated a plan showing the areas on the preliminary plat where development has not yet been submitted for final approval. This information will be particularly helpful for staff who has not been involved with this project for a significant length of time.

Since the last extension, there have been no substantial changes in regulations or conditions that would materially affect this project. In addition, it has been the practice of the applicant to update construction plans with each phase so that the project can be monitored with up-to-date information.

Staff recommends that the approval of this preliminary plat be extended to November 30, 2004, subject to no significant changes in the layout or character of the development without the Planning Commission's approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the extension of this request to November 30, 2004 subject to staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: December 3rd

Regular Meeting: December 17th

A motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Ussery. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Gary Nevill, Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Ms. Ann McCormick did not attend the December 3rd meeting and therefore abstained.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Gary Nevill and seconded by Mr. Robert Ussery, the Minutes of the December 17, 2002 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

Under **Planning Commission Items**, Ms. Ann McCormick reported that she had received several requests to change the Planning Commission meetings back to morning meetings. She stated that these meetings were changed to accommodate residents who could not attend morning meetings. However, in her opinion, attendance seems to be about the same. Ms. McCormick stated that night meetings have become an inconvenience for staff and for some members. She suggested that the members think about this and perhaps consider re-addressing the issue.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.