

# MINUTES

## ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 19, 2007 - 6:00 P.M. Fire Station #2, Demere Road, St. Simons Island

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Robert Ussery, Chairman  
Preston Kirkendall, Vice Chairman  
John Dow, Jr.  
William Lawrence  
Paul Sanders  
Desiree Watson  
Joan Wilson

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Hainley, Community Development Director  
York Phillips, Planning Manager  
Iris Scheff, Planner III  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

**ALSO PRESENT:** Commissioner Uli Keller, BOC

-----

Chairman Robert Ussery 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.

-----

### **Minutes/May 15, 2007 Regular Meeting**

For clarification, Mr. John Dow suggested adding the following highlighted words in order to accurately reflect what the Planning Commission agreed to regarding Application #VP-2007-02 (I): Page 21, Paragraph 2, Line 5: *To Read* "...the plan **previously approved by the Islands Planning Commission...**" The members concurred. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Dow, seconded by Mr. Sanders and unanimously adopted to approve the Minutes of the May 15<sup>th</sup> Islands Planning Commission meeting as amended.

-----

**Agenda - Additions, Deferrals, Deletions, Postponements**

**Deferral:** Mr. David Hainley stated that a written request for deferral was submitted by James A. Bishop, Jr., agent for application #ZM-2007-011 (I). Chairman Ussery pointed out that several citizens have concerns about this application and have asked if they could speak about the deferral. Mr. Hainley stated that it would be in order for the public to address concerns about the deferral. Chairman Ussery stated that the request for deferral will be treated as part of the public hearing. He then opened the floor for comments, beginning with Mrs. Berthenia Gibson.

Mrs. Gibson stated that she owns property next door to the property that is being proposed for a rezoning; however, her comments at this time are directed toward the public hearing process for deferrals. She stated that this is the third time that this request has been deferred, but this time it has caused her a very upsetting inconvenience; especially since she was made aware of the deferral only after arriving at tonight's meeting. Mrs. Gibson stated that she canceled hotel reservations in Augusta, GA where she was to attend an official meeting as a state officer of the Eastern Stars of Georgia. She did this in order to attend tonight's meeting, only to get here and find that the item of concern is being deferred again.

Mrs. Gibson stated that she has not found anything in the ordinance that allows continual deferrals at this level. She noted however that there is a process at the Board of Commissioners level. She reiterated that this will be the third deferral for this application. It is too much of a strain and an unnecessary burden on the citizens. Mrs. Gibson stated that this is very disturbing and she urged the Planning Commission to move forward and hear this request tonight. Personally, her recommendation would be for denial of the rezoning request.

Mr. Bill Hooker agreed with Mrs. Gibson. He stated that a deferral three times in a row is putting the electorate who comes diligently to speak on the subject at a disadvantage. Perhaps it's privileged, perhaps it's in accordance with "*Roberts Rules of Order*," but if the applicant hasn't put the application together in this time period, it is time to move on without the additional information. Mr. Hooker stressed that it is not fair to the citizens or to the Planning Commission to keep delaying this action to be more favorable perhaps when fewer people are present. He would like for the Planning Commission to move forward with this request tonight.

In response, Mr. Bishop stated that this request has only been deferred twice. The last time it came to the Planning Commission it was presented as a re-subdivision plus the rezoning which was requested by his client. However, on behalf of his client, he is asking for another deferral until the next meeting.

Mr. John Dow asked if there are any procedures or set policies that address an item being repeatedly deferred. Mr. Hainley replied no; the by-laws would have to be amended to reflect this issue. Chairman Ussery stated that the Planning Commission could choose to move on. Mr. Hainley agreed. He stated that the request at this time is for a deferral, and the Planning Commission could choose not to defer. Chairman Ussery

stated that if the Planning Commission votes for another deferral, it will be with the understanding that the application will be heard at the appointed public hearing date regardless to whether the applicant is ready or not. He agreed with Mrs. Gibson that continual deferral is not the thing to do. Chairman Ussery stated that he realizes that problems occur from time to time with projects that may necessitate a deferral, but more than once is probably too much.

Mr. Sanders had questions about the number of times that the application has actually been deferred. Chairman Ussery stated that there have been two prior meetings on the item and one was a deferral. At the last meeting the applicant submitted a request for subdivision action of which there is no public notice requirement.

Mr. Dow asked that if the Planning Commission decides to move forward, is staff, as well as the applicant, prepared to move forward. Staff's reply was yes, but Mr. Bishop stated that his client and his client's engineers are not present at this time.

Following discussion, Chairman Robert Ussery passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Preston Kirkendall and proceeded with a motion to defer application **ZM-2007-011 (I)** until the July 17<sup>th</sup> Islands Planning Commission meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. with the stipulation that this will be the last deferral for this application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson. Voting Aye (in favor of deferral): Mr. Preston Kirkendall, Mr. Robert Ussery, Ms. Desiree Watson and Ms. Joan Wilson. Voting Nay (against deferral): Mr. John Dow, Mr. William Lawrence and Mr. Paul Sanders. The motion carried for deferral.

-----

**ZM-2007-005 (I)**

Consider a request to rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential to LC Local Commercial, property consisting of 25,382 square feet (approximately 0.58 acre), located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Frederica Road and Barnes Plantation Road on St. Simons Island. The property has 110 feet of frontage on Frederica Road and 245 feet on Barnes Plantation Road. The address of the property is 1708 Frederica Road. Parcel ID 04-02466. Larry Bryson, agent for Jasper L. Wilson, owner.

Mr. Larry Bryson and Mr. David Sweat were present for discussion.

Ms. Meredith Trawick pointed out that the application was posted for a proposed zoning change to Local Commercial, but it is noted on the agenda as Highway Commercial. Mrs. Iris Scheff stated that the request is to rezone the property to Local Commercial. She explained that prior to this request the applicant had requested a zoning change to Highway Commercial but submitted a request for a change to Local Commercial to comply with staff's recommendation. Mrs. Scheff then proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

The land use presently designated in the adopted Glynn County Comprehensive Future Land Use Plan for this property is Commercial. Southward along Frederica Road on the same side as the subject property is also Commercial Future Land Use. Commercial Future Land Use is depicted opposite the property and southward along Frederica to its intersection with Demere Road. A substantial area of Medium Density Residential Future Land Use is depicted south and east of the subject property. The existing land use for the subject property is Low Density Residential.

The Jasper Wilson Property is a commercial zoning request for just over a half acre site with ingress and egress proposed on Frederica Road. Adjacent to the rezoning request site is an apparent street entitled “Barnes Plantation Road,” this is actually a driveway used for both (1) the condominium complex located about one hundred and twenty (120) feet away from its intersection with Frederica Road, and (2) ingress and egress for the commercial stores south of the subject site. The request proposes commercial use for a bank- Sapelo Southern Bank.

The application for rezoning was received in the Community Development office on February 5, 2007. The material submitted for review indicates that the bank would be in character with the neighborhood because *“with the exception of the adjoining property to the north, which is zoned R-9, One-Family Residential, all surrounding properties are zoned HC (Highway Commercial) or PD-G (Planned Development, General). The owner to the north has indicated he may request a rezoning at some future date.”*

The application further indicates that the request would not be detrimental to the property or persons in the area because *“businesses surround this property. The proposed bank would be a good neighbor, minimizing impact.”*

It is important to assess the demand that will be placed on public facilities in this location. Characteristics of the site such as traffic counts, density, intensity of use and the design configuration against the backdrop of adjacent properties and uses help determine if fire and police protection, water and sewer, school capacity, and traffic network are sufficient for the property to be developed for commercial use.

The projected traffic impact for a commercial drive-in bank was estimated by various means, including how many employees, square footage of the bank, and the number of drive-in windows. Number of drive-in windows was chosen for the purposes of this rezoning. Ranges were given, with the low end being 207 ADT per window or 414 trips per day [207 trips x 2 windows], and the high end being 802.75 ADT per window, or 1,605.5 ADT per day [802.75 x 2 windows]. An average rate per day per drive-in window was 411.17 trips, times two windows as depicted in the concept plan with the application, calculates to 822.34 trips per day [411.17 x 2 windows] on a weekday.

Also depicted on the concept plan was a building with dimensions of approximately 50’ x 47’ or 2,350 square feet. Using this as a foundation for the calculations results in the following ADT for the 2,350 square feet bank: average rates of

265.2 ADT per 1,000 sf = 2,350 / 1,000 = 2.35 x average rate per thousand square feet of bank of 265.2 ADT = 623.22 ADT for the proposed Sapelo Southern Bank.

An average rate based on an average of the two methods shown above- one based on the number of windows (the first example), and one based on the square footage of the drive-in bank of 2,350 square feet, was used in the chart below as a moderate base from which to derive the approximate average trips per day [822.34 ADT + 623.22 ADT = 1,445.56/ 2 = 722.78 ADT for the proposed Sapelo Southern Bank.

	Schools	Water*
Transportation**		
Drive In Bank (2,350 sf)	N/A	.16 GPD x 2350 sq ft = 376 GPD
		723 ADT

\* Projected water use based upon minimum standards for public water systems, Georgia Environmental Protection Division and estimated number of bathrooms. GPD is gallons per day.

\*\* Projected traffic based upon professional standards in Institute of Traffic Engineering Manual, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. ADT means Average Daily Trips.

The total number of projected traffic trips for the rezoning is 723 Average Daily Trips. Frederica Road currently has in excess of 7,700 ADT and a service level of “C” or better (Georgia Department of Transportation defined level of service). Future estimated traffic shows projected traffic on Frederica is expected to grow to 11,300 ADT by 2030, Level of Service “D”.

Estimated Parking Requirements: Commercial (1 parking space per each 200 sq. ft. of space = 50 x 47 = 2,350 / 200 sf = 11.75 or 12 spaces)

Total Required Parking: 12 spaces                      Total Proposed Parking: 14 spaces.

According to County Engineering, “additional right of way is needed for Frederica Road, which should be similar in scale to the property to the south. Direct access to Frederica Road should be removed given the proximity to the traffic light and the road intersection to the north and considering the existing traffic issues along this section of Frederica...”

Utilities are proposed to be Glynn County Water and Sewer. Utilities staff comments that public sewer, as proposed, is not available to this site. In addition, public water is proposed but is not available to this site. The nearest county owned and maintained water main is located on the west side of Frederica Road. Jacking and boring Frederica Road is not a possibility due to the number of buried utilities underneath Frederica Road. There is no “bury depth survey” of each utility. No one can ensure the boring of steel casing will not cause damage to buried utilities. Before the rezoning is approved, the applicant or agent shall present a notarized agreement with the adjacent land owner permitting them to extend water and sewer facilities to this proposed site.

**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. The use seems suitable but the particular site less suitable for a high traffic facility such as a drive-in bank with two thru lanes, which generates many traffic trips daily.**

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

**Yes. The entrances will adversely affect existing uses due to how “tight” (small, tightly configured for the intense uses that occur) for the subject site. Adjacent sites containing condominiums and various stores are in close proximity and affect this site.**

- 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.

**Yes. As referenced above, vehicles entering and leaving both the condominiums and the adjacent shopping center will conflict as right turns onto Frederica Road further interfere with vehicles moving in and out of the subject site.**

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

**Yes. The Future Land Use is Commercial for this area and for this site.**

- 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, for reasons given above. Previous development, site size, and configuration in relation to adjacent sites, has hindered the ability for the subject site to have flexibility in configuration and to achieve safe or efficient ingress and egress.**

This proposal is consistent with the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map. Yet the existing adjacent uses are already at or near capacity with respect to already in place configurations of site space, ingresses/ egresses, driveways, and adjacent site parking spaces and drive aisles. The proposed bank will add to already occurring congestion.

Staff recommends that the proposal be approved on the basis that it is consistent with the Glynn County Future Land Use Map, but that the applicant shall address the following issues at time of site plan approval in order to provide required utilities, and address potential traffic improvements:

- 1) A notarized letter of agreement with the adjacent landowner to allow connection to and provision of water and sewer to the site be provided to Glynn County Planning staff; and
- 2) Additional right-of-way shall be provided for Frederica Road.

Mr. Dow had questions about staff's comment that "according to water and sewer review, this rezoning will not be placed until a letter of agreement ensuring water and sewer can be brought to the site." He then referred to the above comment regarding the letter of agreement with the adjacent landowner, and he asked if staff had received any of these agreements. Mrs. Scheff replied no, but the project was determined to be allowed to go forward with those comments. Chairman Ussery explained that in order for the applicant to have the project, he would have to have those items in place.

Mr. Dow stated that staff has indicated that before the project goes forward they have to have notarized agreements; they don't have those agreements, yet the project is being presented. Mrs. Scheff explained that the ordinance is time based and staff is required to take things forward at a certain point or else the applicant is allowed to go to the Board of Commissioners without a recommendation from staff. Mr. Dow then asked if it means that the Planning Commission cannot require that certain materials be provided before a rezoning is approved. Mrs. Scheff stated that it is a matter of policy or rather a delicate balance. The ordinance states that an application needs to be processed within a certain number of days or be allowed to go on. Staff has taken the position to incorporate this in its practice.

For additional clarification, Mr. Hainley explained that the comments that Mr. Dow is referring to are entered for enforcement purposes and are basically unedited comments. Quite frequently, things are approved subject to these items being provided.

Regarding the additional right-of-way, Chairman Ussery stated that it appears that the additional footage was given in the front.

At this time, Mr. Larry Bryson distributed a written response to concerns expressed at the last meeting for the Planning Commission's review. (This response in its entirety is contained in the file.) He also noted that a traffic study was conducted by the

bank, and a new revised plan was submitted in an effort to ease some of the burdens on the property. The revisions were shared with the neighbors.

In addressing the water and sewer issue, Mr. Bryson stated that their initial intent was to tie into the Barnes Plantation water, sewer and storm drain. They have since determined through staff that water and sewer is actually available on Frederica Road in front of the development slightly to the north of Hanover Square. On the southwest corner of the property there is a sewer water tap that is available. Mr. Bryson pointed out that there is a drainage ditch located behind the property but he is not sure if they have access to it. He stated that their engineer examined the property and determined that an underground system could be done, with 100% retention on site. Therefore, it is possible that they would not need access to the stormwater drainage system.

Mr. Bryson stated that they have eliminated the curb cut on to the easement to Barnes Plantation. The ingress/egress is currently shown on Frederica Road and has been moved as far north as possible. He stated that they will try to save all of the trees with the exception of one large oak tree, centrally located on the property. He pointed out that a buffer strip is proposed along the north and east border to separate the project from the neighboring properties.

Mr. Bryson introduced Mr. David Sweat, Regional President for Sapelo Southern Bank, who expounded on the traffic study, followed by a general discussion. Afterward, Chairman Ussery opened the floor for public input. It was noted that several property owners were present to oppose this request.

Ms. Meredith Trawick, representing RUPA, (currently consisting of 500 Island residents) stated that they are opposed to this request for a number of reasons. The existing land use is low density Residential-9, adjacent to the north of the property is Residential-9 and Planned Development Residential is located to the rear of the site. The Bank has 3 drive-thru lanes and the piece of property at just over 1/2 acre is too small to accommodate a commercial facility of this size.

Ms. Trawick stated that the new site plan shows only one ingress and egress at Frederica Road. The last time the applicants came before the Planning Commission and again this time, the Engineering Department stated that “additional right-of-way would be needed” and they recommend that “direct access to Frederica Road should be removed...” Ms. Trawick stated that it should also be noted that on the revised site plan the island/median for the access to Frederica Road has now been so designed that it does not prevent customers from turning to the left onto Frederica Road into the traffic... She stated that there should not be a “connect to existing driveway” available on the north side of the property and feels that it would be very dangerous for there to be ingress/egress on Frederica Road.

Ms. Trawick stated that public water and sewer is proposed for this property, but currently it is not available. Since the applicants will not be allowed to bore under Frederica Road to connect to the county water main they would need to have a Notarized Agreement from an adjacent land owner that would permit them to extend water and sewer facilities to this property. It appears that they do not have this agreement.

Ms. Trawick stated that this particular property has more slope than almost any other piece of property on St. Simons and would not be suitable for a high traffic facility such as a bank with heavy daily traffic using 3 drive-thru lanes. Also, the revised plan shows that this property would be covered with asphalt thus having large amounts of water run-off.

Ms. Trawick expressed concerns about the trees and buffer. Instead of a buffer along Frederica Road, the revised plan shows 5 parking spaces. The adjacent property owners to the south have an 18 ft. wide buffer in front of their commercial property from the sidewalk to the parking lot and a grass buffer between the sidewalk and Frederica Road. To be cohesive and help preserve the character and beauty of the Island, she feels that the applicant should also be required to have a buffer along Frederica Road.

In conclusion, Ms. Trawick stated that the property in question is simply too small for a commercial bank, and on behalf of RUPA, she is asking the Islands Planning Commission to deny this rezoning request.

Ms. Diane Haywood, adjacent property owner, stated that she and her family are opposed to this rezoning for the following reasons:

1. They were recently notified by letter that the hearing for this item would be on July 17, 2007 (not tonight). "Was the property properly advertised with sufficient time given to adjacent property owners?" (Had she not been surfing the internet she would not have known about tonight's meeting.)
2. Joint vehicle access is not desired...and they will not be forced to use the applicant's road. Currently, a single driveway connects two single family houses. If rezoned, they will request a new curb cut for their private driveway at the developer's expense.
3. The commercial drive is too close to the stop light.
4. They will not grant permission across their property for water or sewer connection to this proposed commercial property if required by the Sapelo Southern Bank.

Ms. Haywood asked the Islands Planning Commission to deny this rezoning application.

Mr. Bill Hooker and Mr. Billy Baker also expressed opposition to this request. They contend that the use is too intense and it is inappropriate for the area.

In response to the water and sewer connection, Mr. Bryson reiterated that initially when the request was submitted and reviewed, they had actually indicated that they would tie into the sewer/water in Barnes Plantation. Since then, it was determined by Mr. Tim Ransom that there is a connection that could be sought to the north of the property (on the right-of-way) without having to go through Barnes Plantation.

For further clarification, Ms. Desiree Watson asked Mr. Bryson if he is saying that they do not have to go through Ms. Haywood's property to get water and sewer connection. Mr. Bryson replied yes. Ms. Watson also questioned the location of the applicant's driveway access and stated that it appears to be across the neighbor's property. Mr. Bryson pointed out the area of the access and the property line for clarification and stated that the driveway does not go across the neighbor's property. He stated that originally, they had recommended tying into the driveway which would allow the adjacent neighbor to use the driveway, but Ms. Haywood has indicated that she would prefer her own driveway.

Ms. Joan Wilson had questions concerning the affect of the bicycle path in relation to ingress/egress. Mr. Bryson explained that they intend to transition the path back into the curb. It was also noted that the concept plan does not show the decel lane but Mr. Bryson stated that it would be clarified at the site plan approval stage of the project.

At the end of discussion, Mr. Hainley reminded the members that in order to meet the requirements of Section 1105.1 d) *Notice of Public Hearing*, staff recommends that this application be continued until the next meeting. The Planning Commission concurred and unanimously adopted a motion to defer this request until the July 17<sup>th</sup> Islands Planning Commission meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. However, in the interim the applicant must provide the following:

- 1) Prepare new concept plan and indicate location of water and sewer;
- 2) Identify trees being saved; identify trees being removed;
- 3) Show how the 25 ft. access would be affective;
- 4) Address driveway issue for adjoining property owner;
- 5) Provide information for on-site retention; and
- 6) Identify parking (if 25 ft. access is dedicated).

-----

### **VP-2007-003 (I)**

Application by Charles "Ace" Harris for approval to place a 32 square foot sign on the upper level of a business known as "Oasis Seaside Restaurant and Deck" (formerly known as Bluewater Bistro) operating in an existing building located at 115 Mallery Street, on the west side of Mallery Street near the Pier. The property is zoned GC-Core General Commercial-Core. Parcel ID 04-04621. Property owned by Charles Harris.

Mr. Harris was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the applicant submitted illustrative drawings depicting the proposed sign which "will be a 4' x 8' metal painted sign...mounted on the face of the building near the top of the second floor." The face of the building is 800 square feet.

Under Section 709.5 (Village Preservation), alterations to existing construction of a principal building must be looked at to determine the harmony and appropriateness lot coverage, height increases, materials, color schemes, and building elements for the structure itself and neighboring structures.

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.

This request is for a sign to replace the existing one. It does not include any changes in lot coverage, building footprint, building height, materials, color schemes, building elements, or landscaping. Having stated that, signs and their size, type and placement are a minor part of the visual impact of a building. Signs are not dealt with in the Village Preservation Overlay District Ordinance. Instead, the Glynn County Sign Ordinance, Article VIII, contains a section regarding signs allowed in the district. Excerpts of the section that apply to this case are as follows:

*Section 814. Signs Permitted in the St. Simons Village Preservation District. The following regulations shall apply to all signs in the Village Preservation District in addition to the requirements of this Ordinance...*

*...814.1 Approval Requirements. All signs in excess of six (6) square feet are subject to the prior approval of the Planning Commission with regard to material, size, construction, color, face type, location and setback. The Planning Commission is to encourage signs, which are harmonious with the existing signs and overall character of the Village Area signage and architecture...*

*...814.5 Signs Attached to Improvements. There shall be no signs painted on any exterior finishes of a building except in General Commercial- Core, when the exterior front foot dimension exceeds thirty (30) feet... All other signs attached to improvements shall be individually painted, cut, and mounted letters or raised letters or panels with painted, routed or sand blasted lettering. No sign attached to the improvement shall exceed ten percent (10%) of the building front wall area...*

Plans were submitted in 2005 to review proposed alterations and a 2nd floor addition to the former Bluewater Bistro Restaurant under Village Overlay application VP-2005-004. Those plans were examined to verify the size of the building face, which was stated on the application to be 800 square feet. According to the building elevation, the building has a 20 foot width and 31.5 foot height, which calculates to a building face of 630 square feet. The ordinance allows signs up to a maximum of 10% of the building face therefore the current request falls within a threshold that meets the requirements.

Other commercial zoning districts on St. Simons Island outside of the Village Preservation District generally restrict sign size to a maximum of 24 square feet, the Village Preservation section of the ordinance replicated above specifically allows increased sign size for properties zoned GC-Core relating to building face size.

Although a request for thirty-two (32) square feet is larger than twenty-four (24) square feet, it is less than by about one half the ten percent (10%) or sixty-one (61) square feet than the maximum sign size that might be allowed for this building based on the ordinance. Also, according to the elevations submitted in the Village Preservation Application from 2005, the existing sign to be replaced is a four foot (4') by eight foot (8') or thirty-two square foot (32 sq. ft.) neon sign, while the current request is for a thirty-two square foot (32 sq. ft.) painted attached sign. The request would result in a sign of the same size, but more subtle materials in terms of its visual impact, than previously existed at this location.

Staff's recommendation is for approval of this application subject to there being no neon lighting.

Mr. Dennis Beachum, representing RUPA, stated that this proposal is in-keeping with the ordinance and would not be out of character with the area. Therefore, RUPA has no objections to this application. Mr. Bill Hooker also spoke in favor of this application.

It was noted that no one was present to oppose this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to approve this Village Preservation Application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

In other business, Mr. William Lawrence stated that traffic projection by the year 2030 is 13,600 and we are currently approaching 12,080. He stated that if we continue at the same rate of development for the Island we will exceed the projected number within the next few months. He stated that it is really becoming critical and he urged everyone to seriously take into consideration the total maximum number of vehicles that Demere Road can accommodate.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.