

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 26, 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
Iris Scheff, Planner III
Eric Landon, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

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.

It was noted that this meeting is a continuation of the October 19th Planning Commission meeting, which was deferred due to lack of a quorum.

Before proceeding with the meeting, the agenda was amended as follows:
a) Addendum to **Item #5 (Captain's Cove)** Request for variance to Section 602.2g Permanent Dead End Streets; b) Written request to defer **Item #6 (Island Retreat Extension 1)**; c) Written request to defer **Item #7 (Demere Landing)**.

There being no further changes to the agenda, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery, seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted to accept the changes and approve the agenda for the October 26th Planning Commission meeting.

GC-2004-22

Consider a request to rezone from General Residential to Planned Development, property located on the south side of Southport Parkway and consisting of the Planting Hammock Subdivision containing 20 acres with 795 feet of frontage on Southport Parkway. The principal purpose of the change is to modify the development standards applicable to the platted subdivision and to allow permitted two-family dwellings to be conveyed on individual parcels of land. Property owned by Planting Hammock Development Corporation.

Ms. Pam Drury was present for discussion.

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

This project involves land along the south side of Southport Parkway in the Southport Development. This site was previously rezoned GR and a plat was approved and recorded. The zoning included stipulations calling for (1) maintenance of the 25 ft. perimeter undisturbed or landscaped buffer; and (2) limiting the total number of dwelling units to 166. (The proposal is for 106 units but the original stipulation was for 166 units.)

The current zoning permits two-family dwelling units on each lot, but does not allow for these units to be conveyed separately in fee simple. The request is to allow the existing lots to be split in order to convey an individual lot with each dwelling unit (i.e. one-family attached dwellings as opposed to two-family dwellings). Under the current zoning, development of two-family units requires 6,000 square feet per lot, with two units on each lot. Development of one-family attached units is permitted, but the individual lots must be 4,500 square feet with 45 feet of lot width.

There will need to be some minor adjustment of lot lines on some lots in order to accomplish this proposal. In addition, the PD text provides for some additional flexibility in setbacks and other standards in order to accommodate the design. The total number of lots will be less than the 166 limit established by the Board of Commissioners.

The county's adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area for residential 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.

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, although note that there may be temporary limitations on sewer capacity that might affect this project.

- 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.

No.

The project differs from the approved project only in minor ways, specifically dealing with the ability to convey separate lots with the individual units. The project is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive plan.

Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to (1) maintaining a 25 ft. perimeter buffer and (2) limiting the number of units to 106.

Mr. Ussery wanted to know if the developers would be able to split the flag lots. Mr. Phillips stated that in some cases they would not be able to split the flag lots. However, they are proposing some changes in some of the setbacks, which would take care of the odd shaped conventional lots.

Chairman Fields stated that some of the lots do not meet the 45 ft. frontage requirement. He pointed these out and a general discussion followed. Mr. Phillips stated that the applicants have submitted a sketch showing a representation of what they are trying to do, but nothing has been drawn up as a survey. Chairman Fields stated that this appears to be a concept rather than a preliminary plat. Mr. Phillips stated that is correct, and added that a survey is what they need in order to accurately measure the frontage, the width, and all dimensions. Mr. Ussery stated that technically, the Planning Commission is only being asked to approve the zoning.

Mr. Nevill asked if final plat approval had been granted. Mr. Phillips stated that the original subdivision is platted but there has not been a re-subdivision or modification of lot lines. He stated that the roads, cul-de-sacs and utilities are in.

Mr. Ussery stated that the technical issues concern him. When the developers take the planned development and overlay it on top of the subdivision, there will be some drastic changes in the lot lines in order to make this work. He feels that there may need to be some adjustments in the development text in order to make the plan work better, especially with the flag lots because of the minimum 25 ft. access. He stated that if the flag lot were turned into a stub street there would be a minimum width of 40 ft. Mr. Nevill stated that he is not aware of anything in the subdivision requirements that would allow you to go beyond 25 ft. (which would be a flag lot)

Ms. Pam Drury stated that they have shown two dwelling units on each lot; however, if they need to cut it back in order to meet the regulations they will. She explained that they merely tried to show the most at this time and then later make adjustments as needed.

Chairman Fields stated that the applicants are asking for 5 lots to have a 10 ft. setback, but he has never voted for a 10 ft. setback. He stated that Lots 16, 17 and 18 are all in a cul-de-sac, which might convince him, but he's concerned about the traffic flowing through the subdivision in that Lots 22 and 24 are also in a cul-de-sac and service a lot of circular traffic. Ms. Drury stated that she understands the concerns and would have no problem changing the setback to 20 ft. if the Planning Commission deems necessary.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to recommend approval of this Planned Development with the stipulation that Lots 24, 22, 18, 17 and 16 have a 20 ft. front setback rather than a 10 ft. setback. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jay Kaufman and unanimously adopted.

GC-2004-23

Consider a request to rezone from R-12 One-Family Residential to Planned Development, property located on the east side of Frederica Road and containing 15.43 acres with 738.14 feet of frontage on Frederica Road. The request will permit a church use (without requiring a special use permit) and will establish development standards specific to this property. Larry Bryson, agent for James Bishop, Executor for the Robert J. and Margaret B. Mills Estate, and Angela and Lee Dobson, owners.

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

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

This is the site of a large single-family residence with several outbuildings. The property was divided into three parcels by a minor plat in 2003. This is a proposal to recombine the three parcels and redevelop the site. Tract "A," consisting of 8.13 acres along the Frederica Road frontage (the western portion of the site) would be used for a church. The eastern portion of the site would be developed as a residential one-family subdivision under the planned development zoning, but consistent with the existing R-12 zoning. A preliminary plat is pending approval under the R-12 zoning.

Church use is permitted in R-12 as a conditional use. Under the proposed planned development, a church would be a permitted use. The planned development text allows for use of unpaved parking for a portion of the church parking. To the north, west and south are single-family developments, with marsh being located to the east.

The county's adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area for residential 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.

Yes.

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

No.

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

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

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

No.

The use is consistent with the comprehensive plan and is compatible with surrounding residential uses. The church site (Tract "A") is sufficient in size to accommodate the use. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Larry Bryson, representing the applicant, stated that he had received several phone calls about the number of curb cuts in this development and the amount of traffic that it would generate. He pointed out that there are three curb cuts from Frederica Road to the property and this number will not increase. "It will remain the same." He stated that one of those curb cuts would be relocated. "Mills Estate Lane" currently serves four lots. It will become the main entrance to serve the additional 17 lots that are located on the marsh side of the property. Located midway of the property is a single small lane that enters the property and they would like to maintain that as "in only" for egress to the church side. "Mills Estate Lane" will be eliminated and shifted to the far northern section of the property to create an entrance and egress for the main parking lot for the church facility.

Mr. Bryson stressed that at this time he is only presenting a general layout to give an indication of where the church and the parking lot would be located. The church facility itself would come back to the Planning Commission under site plan review at a later date.

Mr. Nevill stated that the text does not define the center entrance as "egress only." Mr. Bryson stated that it should, but if it doesn't, he would make that adjustment. Mr. Ussery stated that the center entrance does not line up with the Wymberly entrance and this should perhaps be worked out in some way. Mr. Bryson stated that it is currently located between the two lakes and the intent was to keep it intact. He was hoping that as long as they kept it as "in only" it would work and would allow access to the canopy entry to the church facility. Again, this footprint of the church may not be the footprint that would be used in actuality. Mr. Ussery stated that even though it would be ingress only it would still generate a fair amount of traffic, which would then create a conflict with Wymberly when church services are being conducted. Mr. Bryson pointed out that at a future date when a site plan is submitted for review, there would be an opportunity to make adjustments.

Chairman Fields wanted to know the number of people that the church is anticipating to seat. Mr. Bryson stated that the proposal is estimated roughly to be 1000 to 1200 people at some future date. Chairman Fields asked if the church would remain under one owner or would there be two owners. In other words, he asked if the church would acquire all of the property and then sell lots. Mr. Bryson replied yes.

Mr. Steve Schoettle of 304 Wormslow Court was present to speak in favor of this request. He stated that the church would make a great neighbor to Wymberly. The other option would be to develop the entire property as R-12 and have a lot of traffic all of the time, as opposed to having a church with a lot of traffic just at certain times.

Mr. Dick Wiederhorn of 315 Wymberly Road was present to speak on his behalf and for 48 other Wymberly residents opposed to this request. He also presented several petitions from the residents of Wymberly in opposition to this request.

Mr. Wiederhorn pointed out that the application states that "churches are characteristics favored in residential communities." He stressed that this may be the opinion of the applicants but there is no validity to it. The application also states that "churches are low impact due to the hours of service and usage." However, this zoning application does not list the hours of service or information on usage; i.e., daycare center, school, etc., and further, there is no mention of the trip count projection. Mr. Wiederhorn stated that this church will be substantially large; it will seat 1000 people and park 250 cars and it will not operate just on Sunday mornings. According to this application, "it is generally preferred to abut church property rather than another residence." Again, he stated that this is the opinion of the applicant and it has no validity.

Mr. Wiederhorn pointed out that the 30 ft. landscaped buffer indicated in this application would only be provided along the north and east property lines of the church portion of the property. The original zoning text has already been changed to include a 6 ft. high privacy fence, which also will be provided only on the north and east property lines of the church portion of the property.

In conclusion, Mr. Wiederhorn stated that the main problem is the very dangerous stretch of road that will be created along Frederica Road in the vicinity of the proposed PD district. It is a heavily traveled road and this development would make a bad situation worse. He is asking that this application be denied.

Mr. John Pittman of 106 Tolomato Trail stated that he is not in opposition to the idea of having the church as a neighbor, but the circulation of this proposal is not well thought-out. The area is very dangerous and should be taken into consideration relative to this proposal.

For clarification, Chairman Fields explained that the proposed church may not be what is approved. This is just a general concept plan.

Mr. Aspinwall stated that he is inclined to agree with Mr. Schoettle's comments that the use of the land as a church is probably better suited, as opposed to a residential development, which would exacerbate traffic during peak hours. He stated that when this proposal comes back to the Planning Commission, they could then take care of the traffic situation. But right now, they have to look at the overall picture of what is best suited for that particular piece of land, not just from the traffic standpoint but also the quality of the neighborhood and the quality of the island. Mr. Aspinwall stated that he would personally endorse this proposal.

Mr. Ussery asked Mr. Bryson what would be the likelihood of having a school on the premises. Mr. Bryson stated that it is not the intent of the church to do a school. Their intent is to leave the door open in case that were to become something the church felt the need for. Currently, the text leaves the door open for a school associated with the church, not as an independent school. Mr. Ussery stated that a school would put this in another category in terms of traffic and hours of operation.

Mr. Vernon Martin of 206 Wymberly stated that residents already have a difficult time getting in and out of Wymberly. He stated that the Planning Commission indicated that they could address the traffic issues. He would like to know what kind of design could be recommended to remedy the traffic problems. He doesn't think that there is a way to lessen the impact of traffic if the church is permitted or if the school is later permitted. Traffic is terrible now and it is only going to get worse. He stated that if the church is permitted, most of the residents would like for the ponds to remain from an environmental standpoint to handle some of the runoff. He would also like to know what kind of covenants could be required of the developers, i.e., pavers on the parking lot so that it absorbs water and not generate a lot of water run-off, along with other things that would be environmentally sound. Finally, Mr. Martin stated that if the developers don't intend to do a school, they should say so right now and not be permitted to do a school later.

Chairman Fields explained that when a site plan is submitted for approval, one of the considerations would be traffic flow, in and out of the area, which is reviewed by staff. The Planning Commission relies upon staff's recommendation. He stated that paving rings for the parking is certainly something they would consider. This Board has taken steps to ensure more greenspace and reduce paving requirements. Chairman Fields stated that he is definitely in favor of looking at anything that would be better than asphalt especially for a "sometime Sunday use."

Mr. Martin stated he is sure that the church would be designed to be very attractive, but what about the buffers around the edge to limit the visual impact of an unsightly parking lot and other things. Chairman Fields stated that the Planning Commission could look at some type of screening when this comes back for site plan review.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff could assist with the technical aspects to address some of these issues by suggesting that the following stipulations be added to the PD text.

- 1) The PD text to be revised to eliminate the school as a use. If in the future the applicant wishes to add a school, the request would have to go through the same process for review.
- 2) Entrance locations and circulation to be established at the time of site plan review.
- 3) Buffers to be established at the time of site plan review.

Mr. David Yarborough of 409 Colley Lane and Pastor of St. Simons Community Church pointed out that they have no intention of looking to have a school, and he would be very comfortable with that particular stipulation. It does not interfere with their vision because a school is not on the front burner. Mr. Ussery noted that the plan also shows a very large gymnasium. He asked Mr. Yarborough if he felt the same about the gymnasium as with the school. Mr. Yarborough replied that the gymnasium was just a preliminary building to indicate the general vicinity of where the building would be. He stated that their needs have been to find a piece of land and then construct something on the land. He stated that they are really just in the initial phases to see what kind of building is actually needed. They don't have any particular plans for a gymnasium at this time.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to recommend approval of the concept of this Planned Development with the following stipulations: 1) no school, gymnasium, or daycare center to be permitted for this site at this time; and 2) the number of access points to this PD be limited to two rather than three. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Discussion continued.

For clarification, Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Ussery if the intention of his motion is that the location of access points be a matter for determination at the site plan stage. Mr. Ussery replied yes. Chairman Fields stated that this would probably come in at two different times. There would be a site plan for the church structure, and a preliminary plat for the subdivision. He feels that the two access points for the property should be determined by the applicant as to when the Planning Commission considers them.

Mr. Jonathan Williams asked, rhetorically, "how can we separate the government from the church by regulating what can be done in the church." He stated that personally, this concerns him.

Chairman Fields stated that perhaps the motion should be amended to include buffers in the site plan review. However, during the course of discussion, Mr. Ussery asked if it would be appropriate for the applicant to amend the text and bring it back before a vote is taken due to the substantial changes suggested. Mr. Bryson stated that he would not have a problem revising the text and bringing it back for review.

At the end of discussion, Mr. Ussery withdrew his motion and Mr. Aspinwall withdrew the second. The applicant then requested a deferral until the November 1st meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. The Planning Commission concurred.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10-minute recess. The meeting resumed at 7:15 p.m.

GC-2004-26

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agriculture to Planned Development, property located on the west side of Chanslor Road and containing 44.3 acres with 2,179.46 feet of frontage on Chanslor Road. The request is for one-family attached residential development. Sundown Properties, owner.

Mr. Ron Sluder was present for discussion.

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

This application is a request to rezone 44.3 acres from Forest Agriculture to PD-R Planned Development Residential for the purpose of developing a 74-lot, attached single-family subdivision. Each lot will contain two dwelling units. The property is located on the west side of Chanslor Road approximately 1,000 feet south of its intersection with SR 99.

The surrounding property to the west, north, and east is zoned FA. The adjacent property to the south is zoned PD-R and is located within the Golden Isles Gateway Tract. Another PD is located approximately 600 feet to the east of this location and has an approved Preliminary Plat (Tanglewood).

The county's adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area for agricultural and forestry use. This development and other developments in the surrounding area will necessitate the improvement of Chanslor 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, residential development is rapidly occurring along SR 99. This property is located adjacent to a residential portion of the Golden Isles Gateway Tract to the south, and a PD-R named Tanglewood to the east.

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

No, the adjacent property is becoming residential in nature. The proposed use is consistent with the proposed uses for the surrounding area.

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

Yes, the property is currently being used for timber management.

- 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.

County water and sewer are proposed to be used on the site. Chanslor Road is a two-lane paved road with an 80' right-of-way. Staff recommends that access to individual lots be limited to internal roadways, and onto Chanslor Road to decrease the likelihood of burdensome use on existing roadways. In addition, it is likely that Chanslor Road will need to be improved to support the development of the area.

- 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 agricultural and forestry use. The proposed development is consistent with development that is rapidly occurring in the area.

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

Yes, the surrounding area is a growing residential node. Water and sewer service is being provided to the area, which is resulting in an increase in residential uses for property nearby and adjacent to SR 99.

The SR 99 area is seeing a dramatic increase in residential growth for several reasons. County water and sewer service is being provided to the area, Canal Road has recently been paved, and the Golden Isles Gateway Tract is continuing to develop. This application is consistent with recent growth trends in the area and is in harmony with the proposed surrounding residential uses.

Staff recommends that the request be approved subject to the following condition: Access to individual residences will be limited to internal subdivision roadways, and will not be permitted onto Chanslor Road.

During the course of discussion, it was determined that several technical issues needed to be resolved before proceeding with this application. Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this request until the November 1st meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Sluder concurred.

PP-2004-0917-1030 Mills Estate

Application by Angela and Lee Dobson, owners, for approval of a preliminary plat for property located on the east side of Frederica Road approximately 2,500 feet south of its intersection with Sea Island Road. The proposed subdivision contains 17 lots on 15.431 acres. The property is zoned R-12.

Mr. Larry Bryson and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this property is part of a planned development rezoning currently under consideration. The preliminary plat meets the standards of the existing R-12 zoning, as well as the proposed planned development.

Staff has reviewed this proposed preliminary plat and has no significant comments that cannot be addressed during the construction plan review phase. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval subject to meeting all requirements.

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

Variance Request - Captain's Cove
Request for variance to Section 602.2g of the Glynn County
Subdivision Regulations for Permanent Dead End Streets

Mr. Ernie Johns and Mr. John Hunkele were present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff received a request for a variance from the requirement under Section 602.2g for a turnaround at the end of a cul-de-sac. The proposal is for a "T" or "Hammerhead" style at the end of the street, which is now a private street that serves approximately 11 lots.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff has reviewed this request with the Engineering Department and with the Fire Department with the essential issue being that if the configuration of the street pavement is sufficient along with the applicant's willingness to apply a no parking requirement for portions of the street to ensure proper maneuvering for emergency vehicles, this request is acceptable. He stated that based on those conditions and with the small number of lots and expected small volume of traffic, staff's recommendation is for approval of the variance subject to meeting all requirements. It was noted that staff would finalize the construction plan review to ensure that all standards are adequately met.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jay Kaufman to grant the variance for Captain's Cove. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill and unanimously adopted.

PP-2004-0121-1610 Captain's Cove

Application by Atlantic Survey Professionals, agent for Nina Lewis, owner, for approval of a revised preliminary plat for a property located on the west side of George Lotson Avenue approximately 120 feet south of its intersection with Cummings Lane and 300 feet north of its intersection with Johnson Street. The proposed subdivision contains 13 lots on 2.595 acres. The property is zoned R-6 One-Family Residential.

Mr. Ernie Johns and Mr. John Hunkele were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this project received preliminary plat approval from the Planning Commission on February 17, 2004. Subsequently, the proposal received a variance from the Board of Appeals to allow reduced front yard setbacks. The proposed plan changes the street from public to private and introduces a "T" or "hammerhead" in lieu of a conventional cul-de-sac at the west end of the internal street. This change was necessitated to accommodate the retention pond, which in turn was added to provide adequate drainage.

Staff has reviewed this proposed preliminary plat and is currently reviewing the construction plans, particularly with reference to the drainage system and the "T". In addition, GIS has concerns over the name of the street and the subdivision.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan subject to: 1) changing the name of the street and the subdivision to meet requirements of the addressing ordinance; and 2) meeting all requirements.

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

Height Limit Exception

Request by Marshall Davis, agent for Glynn County, owner, for an exception to the height limit under Section 617 of the Zoning Ordinance. The exception would permit a cupola on a new fire station to exceed the 35 ft. height limit. The proposed cupola would be 41.5 ft.

Captain Jerome Johnson, Glynn County Fire Department, was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips explained that this project has been in process for many months. There have been some details worked out relative to off-site drainage, etc. The design has reached the point where it is appropriate for the Planning Commission to consider. The fire station is located at the corner of Demere and Airport Road and it replaces fire station #2, located on Demere Road near Proctor Lane.

Mr. Phillips stated that this request meets all of the requirements with the exception of the height issue, and therefore staff's recommendation is for approval.

After a brief description of the proposed cupola followed by a general discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Ussery to approve the request for the height limit exception. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

SP-2004-1012-1030 New 4-Bay Fire Station

Application by Marshall Davis, agent for Glynn County, owner, for site plan approval of a new 4-bay fire station. The project is located on Demere Road within the McKinnon Commercial Park. The property is zoned Planned Development.

Captain Jerome Johnson, Glynn County Fire Department, was present for discussion.

During the course of discussion, it was determined that the Planning Commission did not have an adequate site plan to review parking tabulations, loading/unloading zones, trash facilities, tree survey, general location map, etc. Chairman Fields stated that this request does not meet the technical requirements of the ordinance. Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item until the November 1st meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting: October 5, 2004

The Minutes of the October 5th Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted subject to any necessary corrections.

Under **Staff Items**, Mr. Phillips pointed out that the Board of Commissioners received the report from the Planning Commission concerning parking in the GC-Core District. The Board is requesting that the Planning Commission consider an ordinance amendment to this affect. Mr. Phillips advised that he is in the process of drafting the amendment and will present it to the Planning Commission at the November 16th meeting, and subsequently forward it to the Board for action at their November 18th meeting.

As a reminder, it was noted that due to Election Day being Tuesday, November 2nd, the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 1st at 6:00 p.m.

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