

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 1, 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
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Vice Chairman Perry Fields 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.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Robert Ussery and seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams, the agenda for the July 1, 2003 Planning Commission meeting was unanimously adopted.

GC-2003-14

Application by Tom Schuh, agent for Kenneth B. Goodbread and Shirley C. Goodbread, to rezone from OC Office Commercial to HC Highway Commercial, property located at 4797 New Jesup Highway (US 341) at its intersection with Anderson Drive, and consisting of 40,250 square feet with 115 feet of frontage on New Jesup Highway.

Mr. Tom Schuh was present for discussion.

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

This application is a request for Highway Commercial zoning to provide for retail uses and outside storage and display not permitted in the Office Commercial district. The applicant plans to relocate a yard ornament and statuary business that involves outdoor display of merchandise within a fenced and landscaped area.

The area is currently a mixture of commercial and residential uses. Existing development in the area includes a quick-lube business and general offices across Anderson Way (to the northwest), and a telecommunications tower and structures adjacent to the southeast. Anderson Way serves as an entrance to the Anderson Residential Subdivision. The I-95 interchange with US 341 is approximately 3,800 feet to the northwest.

Property to the northwest and southeast is zoned Highway Commercial. Property to the west and south is zoned R-9 Residential (Anderson Subdivision). Property across New Jesup Highway (U.S. Highway 341) is a mix of Limited Industrial, Freeway Commercial and R-9 Residential.

The Future Land Use Map of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as commercial. No municipal water and sewer service is available to the site. Since the 1986 rezoning, the property has continued use as residence and has not had commercial redevelopment. A change to commercial use will require compliance with Section 613 regarding buffer strips. This property abuts residential use across Anderson Drive to the southwest.

A zoning map showing the changes in this area was included in the packages for review.

Zoning History:

- On March 6, 1973, the Planning Commission first considered GC-8-73, an application to rezone property adjacent to this subject property from R-9 to Highway Commercial. The application was recommended for denial as it would constitute “spot zoning” and would have a detrimental effect on surrounding residentially developed property, particularly that to the west or rear.
- On April 17, 1973, the Planning Commission reconsidered two rezoning requests in the nearby area that had been previously recommended for denial, but returned to the Planning Commission by the Board of Commissioners for further review. At that meeting, the Planning Commission established an approach regarding land use for the area along U.S. 341 between I-95 Interchange and GA Hwy 303.
- The subject property was first considered for rezoning from R-9 to HC in 1985 (GC-30-85). The Planning Commission recommended denial based on the intensity of Highway Commercial at the entrance to a residential area. Several neighbors were

present to oppose the rezoning. The application was withdrawn prior to County Commission action.

- The subject property was again considered for rezoning from R-9 to Local Commercial in 1986 (GC-19-86) and the Planning Commission recommended approval. The County Commission, however, approved rezoning to OC Office Commercial, which is a less intense district.

Comprehensive Plan:

A review of the Policies listed within the Land Use Element provided little specific guidance regarding this issue beyond the general terms of Policy VI-14, which states that “all commercial developments shall include adequate off-street parking, loading facilities, landscaping and be adequately buffered from non-commercial land uses.”

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 use would be consistent with the development that has occurred along US 341, but would not be consistent with the residential development to the south and west without significant restrictions addressing use and buffers.

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

The proposed use could have an adverse impact on the residential area to the south and west without significant restrictions on use and provision of buffers.

- 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.

Unlikely, given the limited size of the parcel.

- 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.

Since the development of the Anderson subdivision, there has been a considerable change in the character of the area, including the completion of I-95 and the extensive development of commercial uses at the interchange, the improvement of US 341, and the introduction of a significant number of commercial uses along US 341. In 1973, the Planning Commission adopted an approach recognizing the commercial nature of properties abutting U.S. Highway 341 between I-95 interchange and GA Highway 303. This was the basis for approval of rezoning property adjacent to and southeast of the subject property.

This property was originally developed as residential and has been in continuous use as residential since. As indicated by the zoning history, the difficulties in dealing with the zoning of this and nearby properties reflect the conflict between commercial and residential uses. These conflicts can best be mitigated by (1) limiting the introduction of incompatible uses (particularly those involving excessive noise, traffic, and truck traffic) and (2) providing adequate buffers.

The specific nature of the proposed business is relatively innocuous, but care needs to be given to limiting the potential impacts of other businesses that could be permitted under the proposed zoning. The best approach would be to use either a Planned Commercial zoning approach or to place adequate conditions on the subject proposed zoning. In either case, the issues that need to be addressed are limitation of uses and provision for buffers. Also, in either case the best means of assuring that these issues are addressed is to provide for site plan review by the Planning Commission.

Staff recommends approval of this rezoning request subject to the following conditions:

1. Uses shall be limited to retail/wholesale business or office (items 3 and 13, respectively, under §713.2 of the Zoning Ordinance).
2. Open yard storage of merchandise shall be limited to yard ornaments and similar objects and shall not include display of automobiles, mobile homes, travel trailers or similar objects.
3. The property shall be fenced using ornamental fencing, but not chain link (except that black or dark green chain link may be used in conjunction with landscaping along the south line and the south portion of the west line of the property) and that a landscaped buffer shall be provided along the south line and the south portion of the west line. Plans for the landscaped buffer shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, which shall determine that the landscaped buffer is sufficient to prevent objects and activities on the property from being seen from nearby residential

properties. The Planning Commission shall also review and approve the appearance of any new or changed structures on the property to ensure that they are consistent with the appearance of residential properties in the area.

4. Use of the property or any change in the layout of development on the property shall be subject to site plan approval by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Gary Nevill had questions about a possible access through Anderson Way. Mr. Phillips stated that the Planning Commission could include as a condition that there be no access through Anderson Way. He stated that Georgia DOT will impose some restrictions on access from US 341, but staff does not know the specifics at this time. The property does however have frontage on Anderson Way and on Anderson Drive.

Mr. Fields stated that he has some concerns about access off of New Jesup Highway, regardless of the DOT authorization. He stated that the county has distance requirements from centerline to centerline of access on a major highway, but he is concerned that there may not be enough property frontage for a curb cut in the specified area. Mr. Phillips stated that he would try to find out whether or not there is enough frontage for a curb cut.

Mr. Tom Schuh gave a brief presentation. He explained that he is here on behalf of Kenneth and Shirley Goodbread to request a zoning change from Office Commercial to Highway Commercial at 4797 New Jesup Highway. He stated that this change would be concurrent with zoning in the area and a better use of the existing property.

Mr. Ussery wanted to know if the applicant has a proposed use for the property. Mr. Schuh replied yes. He explained that he imports ornamental iron and pottery from Mexico. He has three locations in Glynn County that he sells items out of, but he does not have the facilities needed to set up the ornamental iron and the pottery, which are extremely heavy items. Mr. Schuh stated that he needs a place just to sell middle to upper middle class items. Mr. Ussery asked if there would be an outside display. Mr. Schuh stated that he has contracted with the Royal Palm Trading Company and the Village Mews to be his decorators. He then elaborated on the overall design plan. He stated that he is primarily restricted to wholesale all over the country. He does not have a retail yard at this time, which is why he is proposing one for this area. Mr. Ussery asked if he planned to do any on-site manufacturing. Mr. Schuh replied no, everything comes from Mexico.

Ms. Ann McCormick expressed concerns about the existing house located on the property and wanted to know if the applicant had any plans for the house. Mr. Schuh stated that he has no plans for the house at this time other than to use it as an office. He stated that the house is actually a hindrance, but again, he doesn't have any plans for it at the moment.

Mr. Fields stated that he is concerned about access off of New Jesup. He asked Mr. Schuh if he would have a problem with limiting access to Anderson Way. Mr. Schuh stated that he has no plans for ingress or egress off of Highway 341. He has a turning

lane on site and Anderson Way would suit his needs. He stated that in reviewing the plans and the property he could not have thought of a lower impact business to put in this particular area. He stated that he does not have a problem with restricting access. Mr. Fields stated that he is really concerned about tractor-trailers coming in and around Anderson Drive. He stated that he does not mind if the traffic pattern is located within the property in question, but he is concerned about the truck traffic on Anderson Drive in the residential neighborhood. Mr. Schuh stated that there would not be any tractor-trailer traffic in the subdivision. He stated that he appreciates preserving the integrity of the homes in the area.

Mr. Fields wanted to know if there are any plans to install exterior lighting. He stated that other businesses in the area have low-impact lighting at night directed toward the residential neighborhood. Mr. Schuh stated that he would have no problem directing or adjusting the lighting in the area. Also, with the type of buffer that he is proposing, which will completely insulate the neighborhood on the backside of the property, there should not be any problems or complaints.

Mr. George Lincoln of 152 Anderson Way stated that he would not have a problem with the proposed business as it is being described at the moment. However, once the property is rezoned to Highway Commercial, in the event something should happen to Mr. Schuh's business, someone else could come in and put in a fast food restaurant, a used car lot or any other permitted use. Mr. Lincoln stated that if Mr. Schuh remains at that location, he would probably have no complaints, but he is worried about future uses if Mr. Schuh were to leave.

Mr. Fields explained that staff has suggested in one of the recommendations that the approval be conditioned on limiting the area to a retail or wholesale business or office. At this time, Mr. Phillips expounded on the conditions stating that uses shall be limited to retail/wholesale businesses or office, which are items permitted in the Highway Commercial Zoning District. He explained that this would preclude other uses listed in that particular district, i.e., restaurants, etc. The other condition relative to use is that the open yard storage of merchandise shall be limited to yard ornaments and similar objects and shall not include display of automobiles, mobile homes, travel trailers or similar objects. For further clarification, Mr. Fields explained that all of the other permitted uses would not be allowed on this property. The applicant would have to come back to the Planning Commission for any modifications. Mr. Lincoln asked if a gasoline station would be considered retail. Mr. Fields replied no. Mr. Lincoln asked if a convenient store would be allowed as retail/wholesale. Mr. Fields replied no. He stated that a clothing store, a shoe store or traditional retail outlet would be considered retail/wholesale. He stressed that the applicant's request is being limited to what he is proposing. Mr. Lincoln stated that if this is the case, he has no further objections.

Mr. Lincoln wanted to know the future plans for the existing house. Mr. Schuh stated that eventually he would like to have a 20,000 sq. ft. warehouse. Mr. Fields stated that a change such as that with regard to the location of the building and the architectural design would require approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lincoln asked if there would be any negative impact on property value as a result of the proposed activity. Mr. Fields stated that he could not answer Mr. Lincoln's question because that is not a function of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Phillips explained that the purpose of the conditions attached to the zoning is to have the conditions with the land and if a subsequent owner made use of the property, the proposed use would be limited by those conditions. The only way to modify the conditions is to go through the same process of applying for a rezoning.

Ms. Gwen Noe, adjacent property owner, stated that Mr. Schuh is a wonderful person, but his stock and trade is flea market business. He has operated several flea markets since being in Brunswick for many years, and she has been one of his customers at various times. She stated that Mr. Schuh currently has a flea market on Blythe Island Highway and it has been in that location for several years. Ms. Noe urged the Planning Commission to ride by and look at the establishment on Blythe Island Highway before making a decision. She stated that once Mr. Schuh opens his business she feels sure that it will turn into a flea market type establishment, similar to the one on Blythe Island Highway. She does not want a flea market at her front door. Ms. Noe stated that this would devalue her property. Also, the residents have a difficult time getting in and out of the subdivision because of traffic, especially with the big trucks coming in at the establishment across from the subdivision.

Ms. Noe wanted to know that if the Planning Commission approves what Mr. Schuh is asking for, will he be allowed to have a flea market and sell the items on the property. Mr. Fields stated that according to the ordinance, a retail business does not include a flea market. He stated that the applicant is limited to selling yard ornaments or similar objects; however, Mr. Fields stated that he has a problem with the phrase "similar objects." Again, he stated that the applicant would not be allowed to have a flea market at that location.

Mr. Robert Manor of 106 East Shore Drive commended Mr. Phillips on the conditions added to this request. He also feels that Mr. Schuh's business would look very nice in appearance. However, he is concerned about the traffic situation. Mr. Manor stated that he is retired from the Department of Transportation and he is a defensive driving instructor for the National Safety Council. Therefore, he is familiar with traffic studies. He has observed that this area has a very hazardous intersection. He stated that he is very concerned about the ingress and egress being off of Anderson Way. The roadway at that site meets minimum standards for Glynn County and it is already very congested with cars entering the "Express Lube." Mr. Manor stated that parking has not been mentioned and he is not sure if there will be on-street parking on Anderson Way or parking within the applicant's compound. Mr. Fields pointed out that Glynn County does not allow on-street parking. Mr. Manor stated that he is concerned from a traffic standpoint. He stated that a traffic light would probably be installed at that particular area in the near future in an effort to reduce some of the traffic problems.

Mr. Douglas Flowers of 145 Anderson Drive stated that he does not want an undesirable business near his home. He knows now that this is not the case, which makes him feel better. He stated it was pointed out that road frontage would be on New Jesup Highway; however, he would like to know if road frontage would be allowed on Anderson Way. Mr. Fields stated that concern has been expressed about access off of New Jesup Highway because no one wants another curb cut at that location. He feels that the consensus of the Planning Commission would probably be limited access to Anderson Way to avoid having a curb cut on Highway 341 for ingress and egress.

Mr. Flowers stated that he has no problem with the type of business that Mr. Schuh is proposing, but if this changes what can the residents and homeowners do? Mr. Fields suggested that they contact Mr. Phillips of the Planning and Zoning Division, who will in turn contact the Planning Commission and they will proceed accordingly.

Mr. Charles Arnett of 110 East Shore Drive expressed the same concerns as the other residents. He stated that if this establishment is what Mr. Schuh is proposing, he would have no problems with it. He pointed out that access to the property concerns him quite a bit in that Anderson Way is a narrow residential road. It is not a commercial drive. He stated that there is already too much traffic in the area.

Ms. Noe wanted to know if it is possible to have ingress and egress on the opposite side of the existing house. Mr. Fields stressed that the Planning Commission could not order the applicant to cross someone else's property. Mr. Ussery stated that DOT might not allow the applicant to have access off of Highway 341. Ms. Noe pointed out other businesses in the area with access off of Highway 341. However, Mr. Ussery explained that the DOT would have to make that determination.

Mr. Fields had questions about the county's requirements for a curb cut. Mr. Phillips stated that the county's standard is that the access would have to be located at least 60 ft. from the intersection, but it also says that on any road that is a state highway, the access requirement would be to obtain a permit from DOT.

Mr. Fields stated that he is a little concerned about the issue of signage. Mr. Phillips stated that signage would fall under the sign ordinance and in this case, staff would be concerned if it were permitted.

Mr. Fields then addressed the issue of parking for loading and unloading deliveries. He stated that the ordinance does not allow you to park in the middle of the street to unload a truck. In making a recommendation, perhaps something could be added to that affect as a condition.

Mr. Phillips stated that if the zoning is approved by the Board of Commissioners, the applicant will be required to prepare and submit a site plan. The site plan will address issues such as ingress and egress, location of parking and the location of the buffer. The ordinance has a provision indicating that once an establishment has reached a certain size operation, a loading area is required. He is uncertain if a loading area would be required

in this case due to the minimum size operation. However, this would also be addressed in the site plan.

Regarding condition #3 in the staff's report which states that "the property shall be fenced using ornamental fencing, but not chain link (except that black or dark green chain link may be used...on the south portion), Mr. Fields pointed out that they should be more concern with making sure that the buffer achieves a certain goal, i.e., maintaining a residential appearance to the back of the business. Regarding the on-street off-loading issue, Mr. Fields stated he assumed that no business was allowed to block a public street in order to unload.

In addressing Ms. Noe's concerns about the access off of Highway 341, Mr. Fields stated that there is a distance requirement that would have to be adhered to. If there is a curb cut on Highway 341 for Mr. Schuh's property, he stated that he does not know how close it would be to the adjacent property.

With regard to Mr. Phillips' comment about certain issues being addressed at the site plan approval stage, Mr. Fields stated that the only issue to be addressed during that stage is approval of the buffer, and/or if the applicant makes any changes in the layout in the development of the property. Mr. Phillips stated that he thought condition #4 of the staff's report ("use of the property or any change in the layout of development of the property...") was sufficient for requiring plan approval. However, Mr. Fields pointed out that "the Planning Commission shall also review and approve the appearance of any new changes." He stressed that he cannot recall a situation where site plan approval was required for a change in existing structures. Mr. Ussery stated that parking, which is not there now, would be required. A loading space, which is not there now, would also be required. He further stated that the Planning Commission could require the applicant to provide a loading space. Mr. Phillips stated that this needs to be thoroughly clarified in the recommendation. Ms. McCormick reiterated her concerns about the existing house with regard to the site plan approval process.

Mr. Ussery was unsure if parking could be included as a condition of the business license. Mr. Phillips stated that it would be a condition of the zoning. The business license is reviewed for compliance with zoning. Mr. Fields stated that a buffer would obviously be required as a condition of the zoning before issuance of a business license. Perhaps that could be extended to require the applicant to submit a general layout plan showing the parking, dumpster, loading area, etc. so that everyone knows how he intends to operate his business at this site. It was pointed out for clarification that if the only change being made is to secure the business license for the buffer, the Planning Commission could require a general layout plan, or a plan that conforms to the general layout plan requirements. If there are other changes to structures or layout of the property, then a complete site plan would be required.

As an observation, Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that the Planning Commission should be careful not to impose any more restrictions on this applicant than on any others.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery, seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted to recommend approval of this request subject to the following conditions:

1. Uses shall be limited to retail/wholesale business or office (items 3 and 13, respectively, under §713.2 of the Zoning Ordinance).
2. Open yard storage of merchandise shall be limited to yard ornaments and similar landscaping items traditionally sold and shall not include display of automobiles, mobile homes, travel trailers or similar objects.
3. The property shall be fenced using ornamental fencing, but not chain link (except that black or dark green chain link may be used in conjunction with landscaping along the south line and the south portion of the west line of the property) and that a landscaped buffer shall be provided along the south line and the south portion of the west line. Plans for the landscaped buffer shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, which shall determine that the landscaped buffer is sufficient to prevent objects and activities on the property from being seen from nearby residential properties. The Planning Commission shall also review and approve the appearance of any new or changed structures on the property to ensure that they are consistent with the appearance of residential properties in the area.
4. A layout plan will be required prior to obtaining a business license in conjunction with approving the buffer, which is designed to maintain the residential character of the neighborhood.
5. Prohibit access to Anderson Drive.
6. No on-street loading will be allowed; off-street loading will be provided.

PP-2003-0604-1610 Village Creek Way, Ph. III

Request by Portman Investments for approval of a preliminary plat on property that is zoned R6 and is located north of South Harrington Road, between Frederica Road and Harrington Lane. The property is adjacent to Village Creek Way Phases I and II. The proposed subdivision is a 5.6 acre tract that will create 27 lots, with the smallest lot being 6,033 square feet in area.

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

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

The Development Review Team reviewed this preliminary plat and returned comments of compliance on all accounts. Additionally, staff had the following comments:

Drainage:

Drainage easement will be needed on lot 16.

Engineering:

Construction plans should address drainage to adjacent homeowners.

Planning Official:

Need to look at traffic circulation. May need some stub streets to adjoining properties if indicated after analysis. (After further review, this was determined not to be necessary.)

Utility Management:

(1) Proposed water main connects to existing 8-inch main on Harrington Lane; (2) Per the October 9, 2001 letter from the County Engineer to Mr. Bill Portman, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be submitted to Utilities Management before the drawings are submitted to the EPD for review.

Traffic Safety:

Will need Street ID and Regulatory signs on construction plans.

The plat complies with the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Any technical issues will be resolved through the preparation and review of the construction plans. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

PP-2003-0221-1500 Wesley Crossing Subdivision

Variance from Road Elevation Requirement

Request by Rhumbus Real Estate Investment, LLC for a variance from the requirement for minimum elevation of a minor street within a subdivision. The preliminary plat for

the subdivision was originally approved at the March 18, 2003 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Ernie Johns, Mr. John Hunkele, Jr., and Mr. Mike Cudd were present for discussion.

In a memorandum addressed to the Planning Commission, Mr. Phillips explained that this subdivision, which consists of seven lots, was approved March 18, 2003. At the time it had not been determined that the project would violate the requirement relative to elevation of the minor street within the proposed subdivision. A letter was submitted by Mr. Hunkele explaining the situation and the need for the variance. Staff concurs that there is a need and that the variance would not violate the intent of the Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to grant the variance request for Wesley Crossing Subdivision. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: June 10th

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Minutes of June 10, 2003 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Gary Nevill, Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Perry Fields did not attend the June 10th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

Under **Planning Commission Items**, Mr. Robert Ussery stated that there needs to be a greater method of tracking limitations on rezonings to ensure that a new purchaser adheres to the guidelines set forth. Mr. Fields stated that we have been relying on the diligence of staff, which he commended. He pointed out that every parcel of property in Glynn County has a GIS statement, a parcel tax ID number and a zoning classification and these are all contained in a database. A code system could be established within that database as a means of tracking limitations. Mr. Phillips stated that he would confer with the GIS Department on the technical capabilities, consult the County Attorney on procedure, and report back to the Planning Commission. It was also suggested that staff confer with Mr. Glenn Bolinger, Traffic Safety Engineer, regarding the county's criteria for requiring a traffic light.

STAFF ITEMS

a) **Notice Requirement**

Mr. Phillips explained that staff is in the process of reviewing all of the notice requirements as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, and will make a more comprehensive presentation to the Planning Commission at an upcoming meeting. In the meantime, there is a technical problem concerning the assignment of responsibilities and the coordination of tasks. Staff suggests that this problem be remedied as soon as possible by means of an amendment, and recommends that the Planning Commission authorize staff to advertise the following amendment:

An amendment to change the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article X (Amendments), Sections 1105.1 (Notice of Public Hearing), 1105.2 (Withdrawal), and 1106 (Notice), and for other purposes.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to authorize staff to advertise the above referenced amendment.

b) **Height Limitations: Proposed Amendment for Discussion**

In a memorandum addressed to the Planning Commission, Mr. Phillips explained that at the June 10th meeting, the Planning Commission directed staff to include this item on the agenda for further discussion rather than advertising it for a formal hearing. Staff contacted the County Attorney's office and was advised that a public hearing would be required.

Following a brief discussion, the Planning Commission tentatively scheduled a called meeting for July 29th to discuss and make a recommendation on the proposed Height Limitations Amendment as written (with minor modification for clarity).

c) **Water Supply Impact: Proposed Amendment for Discussion**

At the direction of the Planning Commission, staff contacted the County Attorney regarding whether or not an additional public hearing would be required for this proposed amendment. The Assistant County Attorney advised that a public hearing should be conducted. It was therefore the consensus of the Planning Commission to advertise the above referenced amendment as written for the July 29th called meeting.

d) **Calendar of Amendments**

A calendar of ordinance amendments was included in the packages for review. A schedule of upcoming meetings was also included, followed by a general discussion.

In other business, Mr. Phillips distributed a copy of a revised PD Text for Frederica Academy (**GC-2003-12**). The Planning Commission took action to approve this application at its July 17th meeting and the revisions were included in the motion. The application is scheduled for final action at the July 17th Board of Commissioners meeting.

For information purposes, Mr. Phillips distributed an article from the *Georgia Planner* concerning mobile home regulations for the Planning Commission's review.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.