

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

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

STAFF PRESENT: York Phillips, Planning Manager
Gail Wendel, Admin/Recording Secretary

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.

Chairman Fields asked Mr. Phillips if there were any corrections to the agenda to which he replied no. Chairman Fields asked for a motion to approve the agenda, motion was made by Mr. Nevill, seconded by Ms. McCormick, and all voted aye.

GC-2003-31

Application by Driggers Development, Inc., and RSG Development Co. to amend the approved Planned Development text for the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development (as amended) for certain sites within development areas R-3, R-4, and R-4W located generally along Harry Driggers Boulevard and including Country Walk Subdivision, Hardwood Forest Phase II Subdivision, and other unplatted areas consisting of approximately 900 acres.

Mr. Terry Driggers was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that at the December 16, 2003 public hearing the Planning Commission recommended approval of this application, however, request was made to bring it back to make sure that the corrections that were discussed are clear to the Board. He further stated that he has had discussions with Mr. Driggers today and yesterday and as a result there is another revision he would like to discuss.

Mr. Phillips handed out copies of the revised table. He stated that the first change that was made was at the last meeting and had to do with clarifying which areas this amendment applies to. He referred to the handout and pointed out that this correction was made with Mr. Richard's input. He further discussed the changes in the table. Mr. Phillips stated that the other addition that was made states that if 70% of the lots are in one category, then that category can be used for all of the lots.

Mr. Phillips stated that the second section came up because of the question "what happens when you have more than two categories?" He pointed out that variations could create this situation. If there are three or more categories and if one of them is at least fifty-one percent (51%), then you reduce the number of categories that you apply. You

use the category that has the 51% for all of the lots that fit that category or fit a category with larger lot sizes. If there are smaller lots than what fits into that majority category, then you use what is indicated for the smaller lots. Mr. Phillips stated that this item is on the County Commission agenda for this Thursday (January 8th) and he will present it with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

There was further discussion and it was pointed out that the language is contorted. Chairman Fields stated that it makes sense if you dissect it a sentence at a time. He then asked Mr. Driggers if he wanted to add anything to the report to which he replied no. Chairman Fields then asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment in favor or in opposition or any comments at all, to which no one replied. Chairman Fields stated that, hearing none, he asked for a motion. Vice-Chairman Ussery made a motion to approve and Mr. Williams seconded. Chairman Fields asked if there was any discussion on the motion and hearing none asked for a vote. The motion was unanimously adopted.

GC-2003-34

Application by Charles Powers, agent, to amend the approved Planned Development text for the Mariner's Cay Planned Development on property located south of Druid Oaks Drive approximately 650 feet east of its intersection with US 17 North. The property contains 76 lots on 10.131 acres.

Mr. Charles Powers was present for discussion.

Chairman Fields asked Mr. Phillips if it was now 73 lots and Mr. Phillips stated that the proposal was reduced to 73 lots. Mr. Phillips pointed out that the Planned Development that was approved in 1982 was for about 100 multi-family lots.

Mr. Phillips stated that we have discussed this at two or three meetings and we have a preliminary plat pending. He stated that this piece of land was rezoned to Planned Development-Residential and is part of a larger site containing some commercial that is to the west, closer to U.S. Highway 17 North. This was approved in 1982 and the nature of the property and the nature of regulations that have changed since that time mean that the approved criteria for the development of this site really no longer works. For one thing, flood plain management regulations have kicked in and the county has had to adopt certain standards requiring the elevation of structures including residences above the flood elevation. In addition, wetlands rules have changed and while that does not affect this site that much, the commercial site will be impacted as well as the access to this development because of the wetlands located there. Therefore, they have proposed a change in some of the standards for this development so that a housing unit type which fits into the requirement for the elevation works. Also, so that the access for the development will be off Druid Oaks Road which will be even farther away from Belle Point.

Mr. Phillips stated that the net effect of the change would be to reduce the number of units and change from multi-family to single-family on individual lots. The lots are smaller than we have in our conventional zoning districts, but they do work. We have a recommendation from the Fire Department to ensure that when the buildings are permitted that they maintain certain fire ratings because of their proximity to each other.

Mr. Phillips stated that the other changes that are reflected here have to do with restrictions placed upon the zoning by the Board of Commissioners when this was adopted in 1982. First, there was a provision for a fairly substantial wall to be built on the southern property line where the development abuts Belle Point. The problem now is that in order to build this wall, they would have to destroy a lot of vegetation and to maintain the vegetation as it is now would probably be a more effective buffer than the wall. Second, the access to the property along Druid Oaks Lane would require landscaping and they request that the requirement be postponed until the development of the commercial site is constructed. Mr. Phillips stated the staff recommends approval.

Mr. Aspinwall asked if when originally approved, was the side setbacks 5 ft. and why wasn't it 7 ft.? Mr. Phillips stated the master plan that was approved was multi-family units, which wouldn't require any setbacks and that smaller lots dictated smaller setbacks.

There was further discussion on this and Mr. Phillips stated that the small setback is the reason for the Fire Department's requirements. Mr. Phillips also pointed out that these units would be built up and that the Fire Department was present to discuss this design and they required "one-hour fire resistant rating." Vice-Chairman Ussery pointed out that this development is not unlike some of the patio homes on St. Simons. Mr. Phillips agreed.

Chairman Fields asked Mr. Powers if he wished to add anything to the report to which he replied no. Chairman Fields asked if anyone in the audience wished to make a comment. Mr. Duett Thomas of 241 King Cotton Road asked if the homes are to be mobile units or permanent houses to which Chairman Fields replied they would be stick-built homes. Mr. Joe McDonough pointed out that the setbacks are the result of downsizing the project; it is different from a single-family residential subdivision.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve on the condition that the letter from the Fire Department is attached. Vice-Chairman Ussery seconded and Chairman Fields asked Mr. Phillips if the intent is that all exterior walls have a one-hour resistant rating. Mr. Phillips replied that we should just include the operative language. Mr. Nevill agreed. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Chairman Fields directed that the findings of fact be added to the record 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.

- 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 as 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.

See background and analysis sections above.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposed changes will overcome problems caused by changes to the regulations since the original approval in 1982 and will improve the overall development.

RECOMMENDATION: That the requested change to the planned development text be approved, subject to construction meeting Fire Department recommendations.

GC-2003-35

Application by Faulk & Foster / ALLTEL, agent for Inn of Lake City, Inc., owner, to amend the approved Planned Development text for Hampton Point Planned Development to permit a telecommunications tower on property located approximately 80 feet northwest of Butler Lake Drive approximately 250 feet southwest of its intersection with Rice Mill Road and consisting of approximately 1525 square feet.

Belinda Bodie was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that telecommunications towers are allowed in certain areas and certain zoning districts and that the ordinance further states that they are permitted in Planned Development provided that the text indicates that they are permitted. He pointed out that Hampton Point was developed before that requirement came into being and therefore the text doesn't have any text one way or the other concerning telecommunications towers. The proposal is to amend the Planned Development Text to incorporate a provision that would allow telecommunications towers. Mr. Phillips stated that the actual tower for this amendment will be submitted as a site plan to be considered at the meeting of January 20th Planning Commission meeting. He then described the location of the tower site and stated that it would mostly be hidden by the trees.

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.

Yes.

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

No.

CONCLUSIONS: This change would create the opportunity to consider a request for a telecommunications tower within this development. Site plan review would be required and all requirements of Article XIV would need to be met. Recommendation is for approval.

Vice-Chairman Ussery asked Mr. Phillips about the height and he stated that the tower is 150 ft. and that he had the results of the balloon test.

Chairman Fields pointed out that the language allows for a telecommunications tower anywhere in the Hampton Point development, he recommended that the language be further amended to be site specific. Mr. Phillips pointed out that the language from the heading of the report could be used to solve that problem.

Vice-Chairman Ussery pointed out that the balloon test photos were extremely helpful and should be required on all tower applications. There was further discussion.

Chairman Fields pointed out that according to the map, he can't tell exactly where the tower is being placed. He asked if the 1525 square feet would be enough space. Mr. Phillips stated that he has the site plan, the 1525 square feet is the lease area and that the tower is not anywhere near 150 ft. to a residential lot. Chairman Fields stated that if the language were amended to be site specific, he would not have a problem with it.

Mr. Williams pointed out that maybe all of the citizens would not understand what is going to happen and where it is going to happen. He stated that sometime ago there was a proposal to put a gas station and grocery store on the corner of an intersection and at the first meeting there were no residents of Hampton Point present, but at the second meeting, there were many present. He hoped that that was not the case here. Mr. Phillips stated that the sign was placed on Butler Lake Drive which is the entrance to the subdivision and that we probably notified more people than necessary.

Chairman Fields asked Ms. Bodie if she wished to add to the presentation. She stated that she had extra copies of the balloon tests and site plan. She further stated that they would have no problem with the amended text.

Resident Alva Youngner pointed out that the digital photos were taken when the lots in Montrose had not been cleared and the tower in fact will be very visible. She pointed out that there is a tower that has just been constructed approximately 3 miles and asked if this tower could not share that location. She gave a drawing and a photo to the Board.

Chairman Fields asked if there were any further comments from the audience. Tony Thaw (222 Hampton Point Drive) asked Belinda Bodie if the tower could be located at the Southern Linc tower previously mentioned.

Jim Crankshaw of 940 Champney stated that there is a lack of cellular service in Hampton Point. He has driven by the sign many times and that everyone in Hampton Point must know of this hearing. He stated that he assumed that this tower will improve their service and strongly supports the construction of the tower. Mr. Aspinwall asked if the service trouble was just his carrier. Mr. Crankshaw stated that he has had two carriers and that neither was good in the area.

Ms. Bodie answered the earlier question as to whether or not they would be allowed to locate on the Southern Linc tower, she was not aware of any reason they could not. Mr. Aspinwall asked Ms. Bodie if this was the only location they looked at and she replied that it was the only one to agree to lease them space. Chairman Fields asked Ms. Bodie if they contacted Southern Linc and she stated that she would find out.

Chairman Fields asked Ms. Youngner if she had another comment. She replied that she does get service out there with Verizon.

Mr. Phillips suggested that on page 3 where it says “notwithstanding other provisions to the contrary,” insert the word “a” and change “towers” to “tower” so that it reads “notwithstanding other provisions to the contrary, a telecommunications tower shall be permitted within the Planned Development” and then insert the following language that’s in the caption “on property located approximately 80 feet northwest of Butler Lake Drive approximately 250 feet southwest of its intersection with Rice Mill Road and consisting of approximately 1525 square feet.”

Ms. McCormick stated that in the past year there have been about 6 towers to go up. Could there be a survey to say how many it is going to take. Mr. Phillips stated that we used to handle about one application every 12 to 18 months. He further stated that G-8 is the driving force behind this increase. He further stated that the GIS Department is creating a map of all tower locations.

Chairman Fields asked if the tower ordinance requires that to place a tower within a mile of another tower, they must demonstrate a need. Mr. Phillips stated that is correct and the cost of constructing a tower encourages companies to co-locate. There was further discussion.

Vice-Chairman Ussery moved to approve with the amended language and Mr. Aspinwall seconded. Voting aye: Vice-Chairman Ussery, Mr. Aspinwall, Mr. Kaufman, Mr. Nevill, and Mr. Williams. Voting Nay: Chairman Fields and Ms. McCormick.

SUP-2003-02

Application by Faulk & Foster / ALLTEL, agent for Plum Creek Timberlands, owner, for a Special Use Permit to allow a 350’ tall telecommunications tower on property located approximately 5.4 miles west of the US 341 (Jesup Highway) Zuta Branch Road intersection, and approximately 2.5 miles north of SR 32, and consisting of 5.3 acres.

Belinda Bodie was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that this proposed tower is being heard because it exceeds the 150 ft. limit for Forest Agricultural. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Bodie stated that Forsyth will actually own the tower and Alltel will be one of the carriers. Chairman asked if there was anyone to speak on this issues to which no one replied.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve and Mr. Aspinwall seconded. The motion was unanimously adopted.

VP-2003-07

Application by Philip B. Belt, Jr., and Kim C. Belt for approval of changes to a residence located on the north side of May Jo Street between Demere Road and 12th Street (625 May Jo). The changes include addition of a garage.

Mr. Phillip Belt, Jr. was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that this is an existing residence located next to one that was considered a while back. The garage will be a two-story structure but will still be within the average height of the adjacent buildings. The building footprint will increase but will not exceed the 50% coverage in the ordinance. Also, the attachments show that the

proposed improvements are consistent with the nature of this area. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Fields asked that the following findings of fact to be included:

Under Article VII, Section 709.8. consideration of proposed improvements shall be based on a variety of criteria, including but not limited to:

- A) Conformity of the plans submitted to the purpose and provision of this ordinance.
Proposal is in conformity. The use of the property will not be changed.
- B) Conformity and harmony of external material and design with existing and neighboring structures.
Proposed design, materials and colors are in harmony with existing and neighboring structures.
- C) The effect of the improvements on neighboring structures or sites.
Proposed design would have a positive aesthetic effect.
- D) The consistence and compatibility with existing architectural design and building exterior finishes used on neighboring properties or in the overlay zone.
Proposed design and materials are consistent and compatible with the existing architectural design in the neighborhood and in the overlay district.
- 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.
Proposed design and materials appear to be consistent and compatible with the existing architectural design in the neighborhood.
- 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.
No change in existing landscape has been proposed.

CONCLUSIONS: Provisions of Section 709.8, regarding Site Plans, Architectural Alterations and Landscaping, have been met. Requirements under Section 709.5 General Provisions regarding height and coverage also appear to have been met. Recommendation is for approval.

Ms. McCormick made a motion to approve and Mr. Aspinwall seconded. The motion was unanimously adopted.

PP-2003-1111-1100 Scarlett Oaks Plantation, Phase I
Application by Winston M. "Sonny" Bowen, agent for Bo Paw, Inc., owner, for approval of a preliminary plat for property located on the east side of US 82, approximately one-half mile north of its intersection with US 17 and SR 303. The property consists of the first phase of development and includes 55 patio home lots located on 16.035 acres.

Mr. Sonny Bowen was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that this is part of a larger project rezoned to PD Planned Development about 5 years ago. We have been working with the owner on construction plans and the plat and have resolved a number of issues. This project would be served by county water and sewer and the access is off U.S. Hwy. 82. There are no material issues that can't be solved at the construction phase of the project.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that GIS will require the project name be changed because of conflicts in the area and he recommended that the preliminary plat be

approved subject to these changes being resolved, which would be worked out before construction plan approval.

Mr. Nevill asked Mr. Phillips if there was a variance to water and sewer and he replied that they would be on county water and sewer. There was further discussion of how water and sewer would be connected.

Chairman Fields asked about the name problem and said he was unfamiliar with the use of "Scarlett" out there. Mr. Phillips stated that the developer would have to work that out with GIS.

Mr. Nevill asked if there is a variance for the length of the cul-de-sac and Mr. Phillips replied that this particular street will extend through later phases and there is another access point on U.S. Hwy. 82. There is also the possibility of access on GA. Hwy. 303.

Chairman Fields asked Mr. Bowen if he actually owns property that touches on GA. Hwy. 303 and he replied that he did.

Mr. Sonny Bowen, owner, came to the podium and introduced himself and stated that he lives in Blackshear. He stated that this property is divided by a DOT ditch and there are 33 acres on the east side of that ditch, and that portion has access to GA. Hwy. 303. Chairman Fields asked Mr. Bowen if they plan to continue with the patio home concept. Mr. Bowen stated that is correct and stated that they have approximately 25 acres along U.S. Hwy. 82 that will probably be used for commercial property and the portion east of that ditch, the 33 acres, was originally rezoned for a mobile home park but that is no longer the plan. Chairman Fields stated at this time we are approving a phase one, which indicates that there will be other phases. He then asked if the patio home concept will be continued throughout, and lots will not become larger. Mr. Bowen stated that is correct.

Mr. Nevill stated that we do not have the planned development text in front of us. He asked what other types of homes will be allowed and will they be just stick built? Mr. Bowen stated that multi-family is allowed but they will not be asking for mobile homes. Chairman Fields asked how many lots are in phase one, and Mr. Bowen replied 55 lots.

Chairman Fields asked if anyone in the audience had any comments to which no one replied.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve and Mr. Williams seconded. There was discussion on inserting verbiage on working out the name issue. Mr. Phillips stated that it is not a subdivision issue and would have to be worked out with GIS. Chairman Fields asked if there was further discussion, hearing none, he called the question. Voting Aye: Mr. Aspinwall, Mr. Fields, Mr. Kaufman, Ms. McCormick, Mr. Nevill and Mr. Williams. Mr. Ussery Abstained from Voting.

SP-2003-1106-1430 Forest Road -Tower
Application by Sea Island Company for site plan approval for a telecommunications tower on property located at 103 Forest Road between Oglethorpe Drive and Forest Road approximately 150 feet north of their intersection, and consisting of approximately 2,100 square feet.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Mike Mann of Verizon Wireless were present for discussion.

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

This is a request by Sea Island Company for site plan approval for a telecommunications tower on property located on 103 Forest Road between Oglethorpe Drive and Forest Road. The site was rezoned from RR to FA in December 2003 in order to allow consideration of a telecommunications tower. The proposal is to construct a 150 ft. monopole tower. The antennas are to be flush mounted on the tower to reduce the visibility.

This site is located adjacent to a maintenance facility used by Sea Island. While there are number of trees in the area, the tower will be partially visible from a limited number of homes and streets. There are no residential structures within the 150 ft. area. This will require the Planning Commission to approve a waiver.

The ordinance provides criteria to be used by the Planning Commission in considering proposals for telecommunications towers, and further provides that the Planning Commission may “waive or reduce the burden on the applicant of one or more of these criteria if the Planning Commission concludes that the goals of the ordinance are better served thereby.” The criteria to be applied are listed as follows:

1. Height of the proposed tower.
2. Proximity of the tower to residential structures and residential district boundaries.
3. Nature of uses on adjacent and nearby properties.
4. Surrounding topography.
5. Surrounding tree coverage and foliage.
6. Design of the tower with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness.
7. Proposed ingress and egress.
8. Availability of suitable existing towers and other structures as discussed in Section 1403.1 of this ordinance.

There is a relatively high demand in this area for various telecommunications services. This demand is not being adequately met by the existing system and more antennas will help resolve this problem. This proposal is one of the least objectionable methods for meeting this need. Staff’s recommendation is for approval with the waiver of the setback from the residential lots.

Chairman Fields commented that variances are usually presented to the Planning Commission in the form of a written request. Mr. Phillips explained that in comparison with the Subdivision Regulations, the language in the Telecommunications Ordinance is a little different. The Subdivision Regulations has a specific provision for variances and requires a request. This is not explicitly required in the Telecommunications Ordinance and they are not always technically described as variances but rather described as modifications or waivers.

Mr. Aspinwall thanked Mr. Edenfield for meeting with the adjacent property owner and clarifying his concerns about the tower site.

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

SP-2003-1219-1445 Rainbow Island - Tower

Application by Sea Island Company for site plan approval for a telecommunications tower on property located on Rainbow Island approximately 300 feet south of Sea Island Causeway, and consisting of approximately 1,800 square feet.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Mike Mann of Verizon Wireless were present for discussion.

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

This site was rezoned from RR to FA in December 2003 in order to a telecommunications tower. The proposal is to construct two monopole towers, each no higher than 150 ft. (estimated to be 135 ft.) The antennas are to be flush mounted on the towers to reduce the visibility.

The site is located adjacent to the GA Power substation and a recreation area used by Sea Island. While there are a number of trees in the area, the tower will be partially visible from the street. There are no residential structures in the vicinity. No waivers are required for any of the applicable regulations.

The ordinance provides criteria to be used by the Planning Commission in considering proposals for telecommunications towers, and further provides that the Planning Commission may "waive or reduce the burden on the applicant of one or more of these criteria if the Planning Commission concludes that the goals of the ordinance are better served thereby." The criteria to be applied are listed as follows:

1. Height of the proposed tower.
2. Proximity of the tower to residential structures and residential district boundaries.
3. Nature of uses on adjacent and nearby properties.
4. Surrounding topography.
5. Surrounding tree coverage and foliage.
6. Design of the tower with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness.
7. Proposed ingress and egress.
8. Availability of suitable existing towers and other structures as discussed in Section 1403.1 of this ordinance.

There is a relatively high demand in this area for various telecommunications services. This demand is not being adequately met by the existing system and more antennas will help resolve this problem. This proposal is one of the least objectionable methods for meeting this need. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Chairman Fields wanted to know if there is a technical advantage to having flush mounted antennas. Mr. Mike Mann explained that by using flush mounted antennas they are sacrificing some abilities to add capacity for future use.

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

SP-2003-1219-1500 Golf Course - Tower

Application by Sea Island Company for site plan approval for a telecommunications tower on property located approximately 900 feet west of Avenue of Oaks (Retreat Avenue) and approximately 1,200 feet south of Kings Way, and consisting of 2,400 square feet.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Mike Mann of Verizon Wireless were present for discussion.

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

This proposal is to construct a monopole tower no higher than 150 ft., subject to FAA limitations. The antennas are flush mounted on the tower to reduce the visibility. Mr. Phillips stated that he discussed this application with Mr. Steve Brian who stated that the Airport Commission does not have a problem with this proposal.

This site is adjacent to a golf course maintenance area used by Sea Island. While there are a number of trees in the area, the tower will be partially visible from the street. There are no residential structures in the vicinity. No waivers are required for any of the applicable regulations.

The ordinance provides criteria to be used by the Planning Commission in considering proposals for telecommunications towers, and further provides that the Planning Commission may "waive or reduce the burden on the applicant of one or more of these criteria if the Planning Commission concludes that the goals of the ordinance are better served thereby." The criteria to be applied are listed as follows:

1. Height of the proposed tower.
2. Proximity of the tower to residential structures and residential district boundaries.
3. Nature of uses on adjacent and nearby properties.
4. Surrounding topography.
5. Surrounding tree coverage and foliage.
6. Design of the tower with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness.
7. Proposed ingress and egress.
8. Availability of suitable existing towers and other structures as discussed in Section 1403.1 of this ordinance.

There is a relatively high demand in this area for various telecommunications services. This demand is not being adequately met by the existing system and more antennas will help resolve this problem. This proposal is one of the least objectionable methods for meeting this need. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

It was noted that the presentation on the next two agenda items would be done simultaneously but require separate motions. Mr. Jeff Halliburton was present for discussion and to answer questions.

SP-00-11 PAWS Phase One East

Request by Wildlife Realty Associates for extension of site plan approval for the parking lot area located on the east side of the Altamaha-Brunswick Canal, west of Petersville Road. The approval was extended on January 21, 2003 to expire December 4, 2003.

The subject site plan covers the parking area on the east side of the PAWS project, east of the Altamaha Canal and west of Petersville Road. The parking lot will be one of the first projects associated with the development of the theme park area. The original approval ensured that perimeter buffers are preserved and authorized staff to approve final building plans consistent with the approved site plan.

The site plan was originally approved in 2000 and extended on December 4, 2001 for one year. In January 2003 the plan was again extended to December 4, 2003.

There are no significant changes in conditions or changes in regulations that would be inconsistent with the approved. Plan. This is a request for a one-year extension. It is expected that the final plans will be submitted in the near future and that construction will be underway soon. When building permit site plans are submitted, they will be reviewed to ensure that they are within the parameters established by the original approval. If not, they will be presented to the Planning Commission for review.

Staff recommends retroactive approval of the extension for one year to expire December 4, 2004.

SP-00-15 PAWS Phase Three West

Request by Wildlife Realty Associates for extension of site plan approval for the western portion of the project located generally north of SR 99 (north of the Coastal Pines golf course), approximately 2½ miles west of I-95. The approval was extended on January 21, 2003 to expire December 4, 2003.

The subject site plan covers most of the western portion of the site (west of I-95). This portion of the site initially involves animal preserve, animal husbandry facilities and support facilities. During the early phases of operation, this area will not involve tourist traffic, although this may change later.

The site plan was originally approved in 2000, and extended on December 4, 2001 for one year. In January 2003 the plan was again extended to December 4, 2003.

There are no significant changes in conditions or changes in regulations that would be inconsistent with the approved plan. This is a request for a one-year extension. It is expected that the final plans will be submitted in the near future and that construction will be underway soon.

Staff recommends retroactive approval of the extension for one year to expire December 4, 2004.

Mr. Jeff Halliburton gave a brief overview of the project and clarified the extension request. He stated that the theme of the park has changed considerably. He explained that they will likely finalize the master plan within the next 30 days and will offer to meet or have a workshop with staff and members of the commission to review the plans.

Chairman Fields asked Mr. Halliburton if they had received permission to build the bridge over the Brunswick Altamaha Canal. Mr. Halliburton replied yes. It was noted that the entrance to the parking lot on the east side would remain the same, with an emergency exit off of Petersville Road. The 100 ft. buffer from the extended right-of-way of GA 99 to protect the lighting and sound from the residents of Heritage Estates is

also still in place. Mr. Halliburton stated that the parking area on the west side has not changed.

Ms. Reba Fischer, a local resident, asked if the public would be invited to the workshop. Chairman Fields replied yes, there would be an advertisement in the Brunswick News notifying the public of the time and location of the workshop.

Ms. Kim Gollin of St. Simons Island wanted to know if this is the second extension for the project. Chairman Fields replied yes. He also noted that the extension is permitted in accordance with the ordinance. However, for clarification Mr. Halliburton stated that this is actually the third extension. He further stated that the time frame for the design stage is estimated to take about 12 months and the construction period is estimated at 18 months. He stated that they are working toward an opening date for the park sometime in the late spring of 2006.

Following discussion, a motion was made Mr. Jonathan Williams to grant a one-year extension for **PAWS Phase One East** (expiration date is December 4, 2004). The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to grant a one-year extension for **PAWS Phase Three West** (expiration date is December 4, 2004). The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.