

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 21, 2004 - 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Perry Fields, Chairman
Robert Ussery, Vice Chairman
Jay Kaufman
Gary Nevill

ABSENT: Mike Aspinwall
Ann McCormick
Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
York Phillips, Planning Manager
Iris Scheff, Planner III
Eric Landon, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Uli Keller, County Commissioner Elect

Chairman 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. Gary Nevill and seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman, the agenda for December 21st Planning Commission meeting was approved and unanimously adopted.

GC-2004-32

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial, property located on the west side of New Jesup Highway (US 341), approximately 596 feet north of its intersection with Oak Grove Island Road, and consisting of .697 acres with 283 feet of frontage on New Jesup Highway (US 341) - property address 6461 New Jesup Hwy. The purpose of the request is to make the zoning consistent with adjacent property to the north that is zoned Highway Commercial. Ben Slade, agent for Scott Slade, owner.

There was no one present to represent this item; it was therefore deferred until later in the meeting pending arrival of a representative.

GC-2004-33

Consider a request to rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential to Highway Commercial, property located on the west side of New Jesup Hwy (US 341), approximately 700 feet north of its intersection with Blythe Island Road (SR 303) and consisting of .566 acres with 100.08 feet of frontage on US 341 - property address 4483 New Jesup Hwy. The purpose of the request is to zone the subject property to allow uses similar to adjacent and nearby properties. Property owned by MCJJ Properties.

Mr. Michael Murray was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

The surrounding area is largely commercial in nature and includes a real estate office, a veterinarian, and retail stores. Highway 341 is an existing commercial corridor and remaining residential properties have begun converting to commercial uses. The county's adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area for commercial use.

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 zoning is consistent with surrounding and nearby zoning. Property to the north, east, and south is generally zoned HC.

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

This area is an emerging commercial node due to its close proximity (approximately 1,000 feet) to the intersection of Highway 341 and Community Road.

- 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 property is located on Highway 341, which is adequate to serve a commercial use on this site.

- 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 commercial 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.

Most of the surrounding area is zoned HC, therefore the rezoning of this property to HC would be consistent with the adjacent properties.

The applicant's property is surrounded to the north, east, and south by HC zoned property. The proposal to change the zoning to HC for this property would make it consistent with the surrounding area and county's adopted Comprehensive Plan. Redevelopment of this property for commercial use is appropriate due to its location on

Hwy 341, and the continuation of development along this commercial corridor. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

GC-2004-34

Consider a request to rezone from R-6 One-Family Residential Office Commercial, property located on the north side of Demere Road west of its intersection with St. Simon's Road with 290 ft. of frontage on Demere Road and 109.08 ft. of frontage on St. Simons Avenue, property addresses 2000 and 2006 Demere Road. The property consists of approximately .82 acres. The purpose of the request is to allow development of one office building on the subject properties along with adjoining lots to the west, which are zoned Office Commercial. Ed Mecchella and Doyle Watson, agents for Traci Benton McDonald and Howard V. Seymour, owners.

Messrs. Ed Mecchella, Doyle Watson and Larry Phillips were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

The proposed rezoning is for the purpose of developing an office that would use all five lots. In the immediate area of the five parcels, there is commercial development that is zoned Office Commercial (adjacent), Highway Commercial (next to adjacent property), General Commercial (at the intersection of Frederica and Demere Roads), and Limited Commercial (on Frederica Road). The adjacent property (site of the former Glynn Art Center) was recently rezoned to OC with limitations. If there is intent to combine these properties with that property for purposes of development, there will need to be a rezoning to change some of the conditions of that rezoning.

The county's adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area for Residential use. The property presents a problem, since it is nearly across from the north end of the airport runway and fronts on busy Demere Road. At the same time, it is part of a residential subdivision. Some transitional use and design strategy is appropriate at this location, including consideration of building scale and buffers.

The county is developing plans for the realignment of Airport Road. These properties are in the vicinity of the connection between Demere Road and Airport Road. The layout of the proposed road suggests that any entrances be shifted to the west to avoid interfering with traffic and turning movements associated with the realigned road.

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. This proposal, with some adjustments and limitations represents an appropriate transition between commercial uses, the airport, and Demere Road on the one side and the existing residential neighborhood on the other.

- 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. Development of the five lots for as currently zoned could cause more curb cuts and traffic trips than would coordinated office use on all five lots.

- 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.

- 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 is a transitional situation that requires special treatment to protect the viability of the existing residential neighborhood, while allowing appropriate use and development. Considerations should include access points, buffers, scale of buildings, use limitations, etc. These should be addressed in conditions that can be applied during the site plan review phase.

Staff recommends that the rezoning be approved subject to the following limitations:

- 1) No access to be allowed from St. Simons Avenue.
- 2) No access for customer traffic from the alley to the rear (north) of the site - access would be for service vehicles only.
- 3) A buffer to be provided along the east line (i.e. adjacent to St. Simons Avenue) to be determined by the Planning Commission during the site plan review phase.
- 4) Centerline of main entrance on Demere Road to be located no further east than the line separating Lots 11 and 12, and that such entrance(s) be coordinated with any entrances along the south side of Demere Road, as determined by the County Engineer.
- 5) The buildings on the site to be of a volume and scale consistent with two-story single-family dwellings (specifically height limit of 35 ft. and building width limit of 60 ft.).
- 6) No retail use to be permitted.

Mr. Larry Phillips (no relation to York Phillips) gave a brief presentation. To coincide with the staff's report, he explained that the applicant intends to acquire the common space property, which was the old "Arts Center," along with two tracts from Mr. Seymour and Mr. McDonald and develop one office building on the site. He stated that he recognizes some of the issues that were on the table from the last rezoning of the property. He met with some of the property owners to try to establish parameters for what the developers wanted to do as well as what might be helpful for the property owners. Some of the items described in the staff's report are items that they have agreed

to, i.e., not requiring any access on to St. Simons Avenue and no vehicular access from the property to the alley.

Mr. Larry Phillips explained that originally there was a dumpster site on the eastern end of the property; however upon the request of some of the neighbors, the dumpster pad was relocated to the other end to consolidate pick-up with other neighbors and eliminate confusion with the utility vehicles. He stated that they also discussed putting in some restrictive covenants on the setback portion of the property to ensure that if the property were sold in the future, commitments that the developers are making today would not change. He stated that he submitted a draft copy of the covenants and further explained that what they contemplate doing would be to attach a description showing the property that would be subject to those restrictive covenants which would essentially be the setback area on the east and west ends and on the back side of the property.

Mr. Ussery asked Mr. Phillips if his clients would be amiable to the 35 ft. height limit as recommended by staff. Mr. Phillips replied yes. Mr. Ussery wanted to know if the recommendation for “no retail” is similar to what was previously proposed. Mr. Phillips replied yes, and his understanding is that it would not be a principal use. Under Office Commercial there are a couple of incidental retail uses that are allowed as permitted uses and those would be applicable if necessary.

Chairman Fields pointed out that the “Art Center” is comprised of multiple lots and one of the restrictions placed on the rezoning was, regardless of the multiple lots, multiple buildings would not be allowed. He stated that there was also an issue of parking in the buffer. He stated that these are items that will need to be addressed. He further expressed concerns about staff’s recommendation that a buffer be provided along the east line adjacent to St. Simons Avenue to be determined by the Planning Commission during the site plan review phase. He feels that this should be a qualitative buffer rather than a quantitative buffer because the intersection is on the curb and he’s concerned about blocking sight around the curb.

Chairman Fields stated that another issue that concerns him is parking up to the property line. Mr. Larry Phillips stated that during discussions with the property owners, everyone was concerned about St. Simons Avenue for various reasons, with the main reason being the families that live back there have children that play in the yard and they did not want any increase in traffic. He stated that they talked about the establishment of a low masonry wall within the buffer with perhaps some plantings thereby creating a vegetative buffer for stronger emphasis. He explained that the layout is intended to show that there will be parking in the front. He stressed that he understands that he would have to adhere to the ordinance with respect to parking as well as the design of the buffer. Chairman Fields stated that he is more concerned with the size of the buffer rather than the design especially with this being on a curb. Mr. Ussery pointed out that if the new plan is done for the road they would actually gain some area in front of that particular end of the property, which would then relieve the sight concerns on the curb.

Mr. Mike Haugen of 117 Circle Drive stated that last year he was present to oppose this request mainly because it was not done the way it is being done at this time. His main concern was the St. Simons Avenue traffic and the alley. However, he and the other residents have met with the owners and the developers and have had input into this plan and feel that their concerns have been addressed. Therefore, he is in favor of this request.

Mr. Mark Veader of 1930 Demere Road stated that he is not opposed this request but he does want it noted that he is concerned about the buffer and the possibility of the 20-year declaration being amended.

Ms. Henrietta (Hank) Palacio wanted to know if residential is permitted under Office Commercial Zoning. Mr. Ussery explained that it is allowed in accordance with the ordinance. In fact, one and two family dwellings are allowed under Office Commercial. Ms. Palacio stated that she is also curious as to what the footprint of the proposed building would be. However, Chairman Fields explained that the square footage of the building is not pertinent at this time for this public hearing, but it will be

addressed at the site plan review stage. He elaborated on this process as to the detailed items that would be reviewed during the site plan stage.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to recommend approval of this request with the following conditions:

- 1) No access to be allowed from St. Simons Avenue.
- 2) No access for customer traffic from the alley to the rear of the site. Access would be for service vehicles only.
- 3) A buffer to be provided along the east line adjacent to St. Simons Avenue, to be determined by the Planning Commission during site plan review.
- 4) Dumpster to be placed on the west end of the property.
- 5) Centerline of the main entrance on Demere Road to be located no further east than the line separating Lots 11 & 12 and that such entrance be coordinated with any entrance along the south side of Demere Road as determined by the County Engineer.
- 6) Building height to be limited to 35 ft.
- 7) No retail use to be permitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill. However, during the course of discussion, the motion was amended to include the following language relative to the buffer and the intent of no retail use: *A buffer no more than 10 ft. wide* to be provided along the east line adjacent to St. Simons Avenue, to be determined by the Planning Commission during site plan review; and No retail *as a principal use* to be permitted. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

VP-2004-02

Application by Ed Mecchella, owner, for approval to construct a new cottage to be located at 549 Magnolia Avenue on the southwest side of Magnolia Avenue between Oak Street and Neptune Way.

Mr. Ed Mecchella was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

The application indicates that this property is located on the southwest side of Magnolia Avenue; however, the property with this address is actually located on the north side of the street. The proposed house is 26 feet in height and will have a footprint of 1,508 square feet.

Under Section 709.5 (Village Preservation) new construction must remain within certain size limitations based on the size of structures on the property and neighboring structures as they existed at the time of the adoption of the Village Preservation provisions.

709.5 General Provisions

In all zoning districts except General Commercial Core Districts, no new construction or alteration to existing construction of a principal building or accessory building or structure will be allowed which will result in a lot coverage of greater than fifty percent (50%). Furthermore, no building footprint may be

increased more than the average of the building footprint of the building and structures located on the adjacent side lots existing at the time of the adoption of this Ordinance.

In all zoning districts, no new construction or alteration to existing construction of a principal building or accessory building or structure will be allowed which will increase the height more than ten (10) feet from the building or structure originally located on the property at the time of adoption of this Ordinance or from the average height of the principle structures located on the adjacent side lots at the time of adoption of this Ordinance.

For vacant lots which have been vacant for a period of one (1) year or longer, the footprint of new buildings or structures on the lot shall be no greater than the average footprint of the buildings or structures located on the adjacent side lots of the new construction. The height shall be no more than ten (10) feet greater than the average height of the principle structures located on the adjacent side lots at the time of adoption of this Ordinance.

When no building or structure is located on adjacent lots, the nearest building or structure will be considered to determine allowable scale of new construction.

The application indicates that the height of the adjoining buildings is 24 ft. and 20 ft., for an average of 22 ft. This height may be increased by 10 ft. to establish the maximum height for the new structure. No information has been provided concerning the structure that was located on this lot at the time of adoption of the ordinance.

In addition, no information was provided as to the footprints of any structure on the site or on the adjoining lots. Staff has estimated from aerial photos that the average footprint of buildings on this lot and adjoining lots was 1,723 as of the date of the aerial photography. Therefore, the footprint appears to meet the limitation. Also, Section 709.8 provides that the Planning Commission will review the plans according to the following criteria:

- A) Conformity of the plans submitted to the purpose and provision of this Ordinance.
- B) Conformity and harmony of external material and design with existing and neighboring structures.
- C) The effect of the improvements on neighboring structures or sites.
- D) The consistence and compatibility with existing architectural design building exterior finishes used on neighboring properties or in the overlay zone.
- E) Exterior materials, exterior doors and windows, color schemes and other building elements which are considered compatible with neighboring structures in the overlay zone and appropriate for the area.
- F) The use of landscaping to cause the improvement to conform to the character of the area or to buffer the improvement from the neighboring sites.

Provisions of Section 709 appear to have been met and therefore staff's recommendation is for approval.

Chairman Fields pointed out that in past, the Planning Commission has always seen the building plans, color schemes, roof material, shingles, etc. for Village Preservation applications. However, those items have not been presented in this package. He also questioned the building being offset in the corner. Mr. Ed Mecchella stated that he turned in six sets of drawings, samples of the shingles and paint samples for the outside of the house. He stated that the shingles would be weathered wood and the trim would be white. The offset of the building is to allow enough room if some one wants to put a garage in the back of the property. There is enough room for a 12 ft. wide garage

with enough depth for parking in the back. A sample of the shingles and color samples were presented at this time.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman and unanimously adopted.

VP-2004-03

Application by Ed Mecchella, owner, for approval to construct a new cottage to be located at 632 Demere Way, on the east side of Demere Way between Demere Road and Oak Street.

Mr. Ed Mecchella was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

The application indicates that this property is located on the east side of Demere Way, however, the property with this address is actually located on the south side of the street, approximately 250 feet west of the intersection of Demere Way and Demere Road. The height of the proposed house is not indicated, but appears to be 30 feet. The footprint is indicated as 3494 square feet.

Under Section 709.5 (Village Preservation) new construction must remain within certain size limitations based on the size of structures on the property and neighboring structures as they existed at the time of the adoption of the Village Preservation provisions.

709.5 General Provisions

In all zoning districts except General Commercial Core Districts, no new construction or alteration to existing construction of a principal building or accessory building or structure will be allowed which will result in a lot coverage of greater than fifty percent (50%). Furthermore, no building footprint may be increased more than the average of the building footprint of the building and structures located on the adjacent side lots existing at the time of the adoption of this Ordinance.

In all zoning districts, no new construction or alteration to existing construction of a principal building or accessory building or structure will be allowed which will increase the height more than ten (10) feet from the building or structure originally located on the property at the time of adoption of this Ordinance or from the average height of the principle structures located on the adjacent side lots at the time of adoption of this Ordinance.

For vacant lots which have been vacant for a period of one (1) year or longer, the footprint of new buildings or structures on the lot shall be no greater than the average footprint of the buildings or structures located on the adjacent side lots of the new construction. The height shall be no more than ten (10) feet greater than the average height of the principle structures located on the adjacent side lots at the time of adoption of this Ordinance.

When no building or structure is located on adjacent lots, the nearest building or structure will be considered to determine allowable scale of new construction.

The application indicates that the height of the adjoining buildings is 28 ft. and 32 ft., for an average of 30 feet. This height may be increased by 10 feet to establish the maximum height of the new structure. No information has been provided concerning the structure that was located on this lot at the time of adoption of the ordinance.

In addition, no information was provided as to the footprints of any structure on the site or on the adjoining lots. Staff has estimated from aerial photos that the average footprint of buildings on this lot and adjoining lots was 2413 as of the date of the aerial photography. Therefore, the footprint does not appear to meet the limitation. Also, Section 709.8 provides that the Planning Commission will review the plans according to the following criteria:

- A) Conformity of the plans submitted to the purpose and provision of this Ordinance.
- B) Conformity and harmony of external material and design with existing and neighboring structures.
- C) The effect of the improvements on neighboring structures or sites.
- D) The consistence and compatibility with existing architectural design building exterior finishes used on neighboring properties or in the overlay zone.
- E) Exterior materials, exterior doors and windows, color schemes and other building elements which are considered compatible with neighboring structures in the overlay zone and appropriate for the area.
- F) The use of landscaping to cause the improvement to conform to the character of the area or to buffer the improvement from the neighboring sites.

Mr. Phillips explained that the one of the lots on the side is 2500 sq. ft. and the lot on the other side is 2100 sq. ft. The average would be 2300 sq. ft. The proposal indicates that the footprint area would be 3494 sq. ft., which would not be in compliance with the ordinance. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for denial.

Mr. Ed Mecchella stated that the heated square footage of the house is less than 3000 sq. ft. Mr. Phillips stated that the allowed square footage would be 2300 total footprint, including the garage. Mr. Mecchella pointed out that the house to rear of this property consists of a two-story large addition over 4000 sq. ft. However, Mr. Ussery explained that the ordinance is specific in that they have to consider the houses on either side of the property and not necessarily to the rear. He then suggested that Mr. Mecchella go back and get careful measurements of the homes on either side, bring the information back to staff, and subsequently back to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Mecchella stated that he did not know that the garage is counted as part of the footprint. He therefore agreed with Mr. Ussery's suggestion.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer action on this item to allow the applicant to do additional research and bring the item back for reconsideration at the January 4th meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m.

PP-2004-1124-1000 Cottage Grove

Application by Ron Sluder, owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for a property located on Chanslor Road, approximately 900 feet south from its intersection with SR 99. The proposed project consists of 74 two-family lots on 44.3 acres. The property is zoned Planned Development.

Mr. Ron Sluder was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that a rezoning application was previously submitted for this property and received final action of approval by the Board of Commissioners at their December 2nd meeting. The preliminary plat is now before the Planning Commission for consideration. The proposed use will have the potential for 148 units. Staff has no particular concerns that cannot be addressed at the construction plan phase.

During the course of discussion, there was concern expressed about which version of the plan was circulated for review in that several versions exists. It was then noted that the Planning Commission was not in possession of the current version at this time. Thereupon, this item was deferred until later in the meeting to allow staff to retrieve the current version of the plan for the proposed development.

PP-2004-1129-1200 The Villas at Golden Isles

Application by Ron Sluder, owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for a property located on the southeast intersection of Canal Road and SR 99. The proposed project consists of 28 multi-family lots (6 dwelling units per lot) on 55.158 acres. The property is zoned Planned Development and is located within the Golden Isles Gateway Tract.

Mr. Ron Sluder was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that a rezoning application was previously submitted for this property and received final approval with recommendations proposed by the Planning Commission. It is now being submitted for preliminary plat approval. Staff has no particular concerns that cannot be addressed at the construction plan phase and therefore recommends approval.

Mr. Ussery wanted to know if it is the intent that the lots be further subdivided for a fee simple arrangement in the future. Mr. Sluder replied no. He stated that the lots would be sold as individual units but it is not his intent to make a subdivision. Mr. Ussery then asked if this is a condominium development. Mr. Phillips stated that it is his understanding that it would be a condominium but with individual units being sold separately, as discussed in a meeting with the applicant. The applicant would then bring in a site plan upon completion of the construction plan information.

Chairman Fields stated that there isn't anything for the Planning Commission to consider if this is not a subdivision. Mr. Sluder stated that during a meeting with staff he explained that his intent was to submit a preliminary plat to show the entire development and then submit a site plan showing the phases. He stated that the first nine lots would be the first phase.

Chairman Fields stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve a preliminary plat for a subdivision, but this is not a subdivision. Therefore they don't have anything to consider at this time. Mr. Ussery pointed out that the applicant would have more flexibility developing the project as condominiums because he would only have to show the boundary of the entire project and later show the improvements and where the structures would be placed.

The Planning Commission then suggested that Mr. Sluder confer with staff on the details needed for a site plan and bring this project back for consideration as a condominium development. Mr. Sluder concurred.

At this time, Mr. Phillips advised that staff is now in possession of the current plans for the **Cottage Grove (PP-2004-1124-1000)** development for the Planning Commission's review. There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the preliminary plat for Cottage Grove with the addition of the note "Preliminary Plat - Do Not Record" and with the language on the final plat that says "no access allowed via Chanslor Road." The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman and unanimously adopted.

PP-2004-1026-1530 The Landings at Golden Isles

Application by Ron Sluder, owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for a property located on the southwest corner of Canal Road and SR 99. The proposed project consists of 39 single-family lots on 16.928 acres. The property is zoned Planned Development and is located within the Golden Isles Gateway Tract.

Mr. Ron Sluder was present for discussion.

Staff has no particular concerns that cannot be addressed at the construction plan phase and therefore recommends approval subject to meeting all requirements.

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

PP-2004-1116-1445 Stillwater, Phase II and III

Application by Frank Deloach, agent for Northend Partners LLC, owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for property located on Stillwater Drive, approximately 1,900 feet north on its intersection with Hampton Point Drive. The proposed project consists of 53 single-family lots on 53.219 acres. The property is zoned Forest Agriculture.

Mr. Frank Deloach and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that although the streets in this development are private, the area would be served by county water and sewer. He stated that staff has no particular concerns that cannot be addressed at the construction plan phase and therefore recommends approval subject to meeting all requirements.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman and unanimously adopted.

PP-2004-1119-1115 Hendrix Walk

Application by Debra Hendrix, agent for Springtide Inc, owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for a property located on the east side of Demere Road, approximately 1,000 feet north of its intersection with Arnold Road. The project consists of 7 single-family lots on 2.37 acres. The property is zoned R-6.

Ms. Debra Hendrix, Mr. Chris Amos and Mr. Charles Johnson were present for discussion.

Staff has no particular concerns that cannot be addressed at the construction plan phase and therefore recommends approval of this request.

Mr. Ussery asked if the applicant plans to remove the existing structure. Mr. Chris Amos stated that Ms. Hendrix intends to leave the existing structure and just renovate it. Chairman Fields stated that there is approximately 15,127 ft. in Lot 1 and the applicant could actually split the lot into two lots; however it could not be re-subdivided under the current ordinances for the purpose of getting two lots out of one lot. Mr. Amos stated that Ms. Hendrix will own the lot and she is aware of that detail.

Mr. Nevill wanted to know the radius of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Charles Johnson stated that the radius is 50 ft.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve this preliminary plat. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill and unanimously adopted.

SP-2004-1110-1200 Hotel for Robert Wiedemeyer
Application by Larry Bryson, agent for Robert Wiedemeyer, owner, for site plan approval of a 46-unit hotel located on 1.7 acres. The property is located on the southwest corner of Demere Road and Salt Air Drive. The property is zoned Highway Commercial.

Mr. Robert Wiedemeyer and Mr. Larry Bryson were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips indicated that most or all of the significant issues have been addressed. Any remaining issues can be addressed during the building permit site plan stage of the development review. Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to meeting all requirements.

Mr. Ussery stated that he has a number of concerns. He wanted to know the zoning of the property located south of this development. Mr. Phillips stated that the property is zoned R-6. Mr. Ussery pointed out that the site plan does not identify the zoning of the surrounding property. Also, there is supposed to be some sort of buffer between the R-6 property and the Highway Commercial Zoning District. He stated that a fence may be an option, but nothing is shown on the plan. He then asked if Salt Air Drive is a dedicated private street. Mr. Phillips replied that it is a platted private street. Mr. Ussery asked if a hydrology plan had been submitted as to whether or not a detention pond would be required. Mr. Phillips stated that his understanding is that it was included in the calculations for the condominium project; however, that is an item that would be verified and finalized during the building permit stage. Mr. Ussery had additional questions about the dumpster site that Mr. Phillips advised would have to be addressed by the applicant.

Mr. Larry Bryson explained that he did indicate some parking that backs out on to Salt Air Drive and the condominium project also has numerous parking spaces that back out onto that same drive. He stated that they tried to limit that to as few as possible. It was also backed off of the intersection so as not to impact stacking when making a left/right turn onto Demere Road.

Regarding the dumpster site, Mr. Bryson stated that the dumpster is located in the corner so that it would be coordinated with the same dumpster location for Demere Landing. He explained that the drainage of the whole project was originally engineered by Pruitt & Purcell and this particular piece of property was engineered into that. The detention pond was sized for this property. There are existing drainage structures as shown on the plan.

Mr. Ussery asked if the units would be sold, and if there is some type of agreement that would require a rental pool. Mr. Bryson replied yes, the units would be sold and there is an agreement for a rental pool. He also pointed out that there is a small check-in area, which would be managed from Vernon Mims' Real Estate Company.

Mr. Ussery expressed deep concerns about removal of a number of large Oak Trees on the site. He wanted to know if any type of plan was considered to try to save some of the trees. Mr. Bryson stated that he did look at ways to try to avoid taking down the trees, but nothing gave them enough distancing around the parameter of the property. His goal was to actually push the two buildings apart and create a landscaped area separating the buildings. But in doing so, the root structures would have been destroyed anyway and many of the trees still would have to be removed. Mr. Ussery stated that this seems to be a "plan without a conscience" and it is just so unfortunate that so many trees will be destroyed.

Mr. Nevill wanted to know if the square footage of the lot includes Salt Air Drive. Mr. Bryson replied yes. Mr. Nevill asked if the right-of-way would be included in the developable area for determining the units. Mr. Phillips stated that there is no restriction on the density. The property is zoned Highway Commercial.

Of the 46 rooms, Chairman Fields wanted to know how many would be sleeping rooms. Mr. Bryson stated that there would be 46 sleeping rooms. Mr. Ussery reiterated his concerns about the large Oak Trees in the area. Chairman Fields stated that he feels that Mr. Bryson has made every effort to save as many trees as he possibly could.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman. During the course of discussion, Mr. Ussery asked if a buffer is required on the south side of the development. Mr. Phillips replied that it is his understanding that a buffer is not required. The ordinance indicates that if it is a commercial, industrial or institutional use adjoining the residential then there is a buffer requirement. Mr. Ussery stated that this is a commercial use; therefore a buffer would be required. Mr. Phillips concurred. Mr. Bryson stated that a fence is proposed. After discussion, the motion was amended to specify that a 6 ft. stucco finished wall would be provided on the property adjoining the residential property. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

SP-2004-1215-1400 Sea View Inn

Application by James Sutton Jr., agent for Oglethorpe Group LLC, owner, for site plan approval of an 11-unit hotel located on 0.4 acre. The property is located on the southeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and Ninth Street. The property is zoned Resort Residential.

Mr. Jim Sutton was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

This is a request for site plan approval for an 11-unit hotel located on 0.4 acre. Each unit will consist of 2 sleeping rooms, for a total of 22 sleeping rooms.

Following a preliminary review, the Planning Department has three issues that need to be addressed.

1. The proposed density (22 sleeping rooms) exceeds the maximum density for the site. Based on the zoning of the site the maximum density is 14 sleeping rooms.
2. The site coverage exceeds the allowable site coverage for RR. The proposed site coverage is 55%, which is greater than the allowable 50%.
3. Only the building footprint has been shown on this site plan. Staff is unable to confirm the parking and density calculations provided by the applicant based on the fact that there are no plans for the living floors shown.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff suggests that this request be continued to allow a more detailed review and to allow the applicant to make the necessary modifications to meet the requirements. He explained that the ordinance was recently amended to reflect the definition of sleeping rooms (Section 705.4) and the provision was amended in the Resort Residential District. The ordinance now indicates that there are 35 *sleeping rooms* per acre, as opposed to 35 *units* per acre.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Jim Sutton stated that he was not aware of the recent amendment changes. Had he known, he would have acted accordingly. Regarding the 5% overrun on the greenspace, he stated that the parking spaces by scale are very allowable. They are 9 ft. wide and 20 ft. deep and could be minimized. He stated that he

had discussed with Mr. Frank Norton, president of the Oglethorpe Group, the possibility of reducing the number of units by one and making the development a 10-unit hotel, which would make a more aesthetically pleasing building. Chairman Fields explained that the problem is that we're limited to the number of sleeping rooms. If you have 2-sleeping rooms per unit you would be limited to 7 units, as opposed to 10, which might eliminate the site coverage issue. Mr. Ussery stated at that point, Mr. Sutton may wish to look at the project as a condominium and have 3 bedroom units, as opposed to 2 bedroom units. The density would be a little less but overall it might be a better situation.

Mr. Sutton stated that in order to comply with the number of sleeping rooms, he would have to make some adjustments in the plans. Therefore he concurred with the Planning Commission and consented to a deferral.

It was noted that this item would be placed on the agenda for the January 4th meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Robert Ussery and seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman, the 2005 calendar for the Glynn County Planning Commission meetings was approved and unanimously adopted.

It was noted that there was still no one present to represent the first item on the agenda (*GC-2004-32*). Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item and place it back on the agenda for the January 4th meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m.

Under *Staff Items*, Mr. Phillips explained that the "old paper zoning maps" show something different from that of the computerized zoning maps. The County Attorney has acknowledged that the "old paper zoning maps" are the legal maps. The confusion has created some errors in lot lines, specifically in Glynn Haven. Because of the confusion, staff is recommending that the Planning Commission initiate a zoning change to make the correction to the map. The Planning Commission concurred.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.