

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 20, 2008 - 6:00 P.M.

The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

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
Kristina Wright, Planner I
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 procedures and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

Minutes

April 15, 2008 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to approve the Minutes of the April 15th Islands Planning Commission meeting (as amended by Mr. Dow by inserting additional language to a sentence for clarification). The motion was seconded by Mr. John Dow and unanimously adopted.

Agenda - Changes, Additions, Deferrals, Postponements

Changes: Upon staff's request, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to change the order of the agenda by moving Site Plan Application *SP1210-SP-2008-010 (I)* to be discussed simultaneously with Village Preservation Application *VP-2008-002*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall and unanimously adopted.

In order to avoid a conflict of interest with the next agenda item, Chairman Ussery turned the gavel over to Vice Chairman Preston Kirkendall and joined his colleagues in the audience.

SP1210 - SP-2008-010 (I) Neptune Park

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for improvements to Neptune Park, including relocation and redesign of the putt-putt golf course, the swimming pool, the picnic area, a concession stand and pool equipment structure, and miscellaneous changes to the walkways and other facilities. The proposal also changes the parking and drop-off areas adjacent to the St. Simons Pier. The project is located generally between Beachview Drive and St. Simons Sound in the vicinity of The Casino, and at the south end of Mallery Street. The property is zoned General Commercial and General Commercial-Core. Parcel ID: 04-04650. Property owned by Glynn County.

Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Brian Euell of Ecoplan were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips who also incorporated points from the Village Preservation Application:

The site currently includes The Casino, along with a swimming pool, a putt-putt golf course, a picnic area, a playground, and parking. The proposal does not change the mix of uses, but re-arranges the uses along with their reconstruction and modernization. In addition, the parking and road pattern at the south end of Mallery will be rearranged in order to create a drop-off to serve the Pier.

This proposal constitutes a re-arrangement and modernization of the accessory facilities in the vicinity of The Casino, including the swimming pool, the playground, the picnic area, the miniature golf course, and adds a concession stand. The proposal also changes the parking and drop-off areas adjacent to the St. Simons Pier.

Engineering indicates that the proposal is compliant for Planning Commission review, but that there are some issues that will need to be addressed in conjunction with the building permit site plan review.

The area is served by several streets, including Mallery Street and Beachview Drive. The changes proposed should not significantly change the traffic demand or the circulation.

The Joint Water & Sewer Commission (JWSC) indicates that the proposal is compliant. Additional information will need to be submitted in conjunction with the building permit site plan review. Fire/Police have also indicated that the proposal is compliant.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of this request (*SP1210-SP-2008-010 I*) as being consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and with applicable regulations. Approval is subject to meeting all requirements, including approval of the building permit site plan and approval under Village Preservation regulations.

Mr. Phillips explained that the Village Preservation Regulations, in Section 709 of the Zoning Ordinance, generally address height, bulk, and design issues. The height and bulk issues do not apply in this particular case. The design issues deal primarily with the compatibility of the design to the surrounding areas, which are the open spaces and The Casino building.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that the Village Preservation request (*VP-2008-002*) be approved as being consistent with the regulations.

Ms. Desiree Watson stated that several Palm Trees are scheduled to be removed. She would like to know if the trees are going to be relocated. She also wanted to know where the Trolley would be located, and if there would be any type of signage to let people know about the different outdoor activity areas. Mr. Phillips stated that he would have to defer these questions to the designers, but he suspects that there would be some directional signage in the area.

Mr. Paul Sanders stated that a lot of work has been put into the plans for this project. He then asked if the county provided any cost figures, etc. Mr. Hainley replied no; staff is only reviewing the project in accordance with the regulations stipulated under Section 619.

Mr. William Lawrence had questions concerning the parking drop-off and the road changes. Pointing the areas out, Mr. Phillips stated that the main southbound side of Mallery Street is one-way. It would appear that the one-way southbound would loop to allow the drop-off area and then the cars would exit out through the parking lot. Basically, the change consists of the modification of the parking to allow the circulation.

Mr. Brian Euell of Ecoplan gave a brief presentation. In addressing the drop-off area, he stated that they are planning to eliminate some parking spaces to create a plaza in front of the pier to give a more pedestrian friendly activity center for seating while creating a better drop-off. Designing a distinctive drop-off also creates a more traffic friendly environment. Mr. Euell stated that the Trolley would be moved more to Beachview Street on the south side in front of the large parking lot. Regarding Ms. Watson's comments about the extensive amount of Palm Trees being removed from the site, he stated that they have indicated new Palm Trees in and around the new pool location. Trees that are in good condition will be relocated with precaution. Mr. Euell stated that most of the Palm Trees were removed from the area of the existing putt putt golf course and will be replaced with Live Oaks and other native plant materials that would thrive in a salt air condition.

Ms. Wilson wanted to know how removal of the parking spaces would affect the parking for the existing businesses in the Village. Mr. Euell stated that they are going to add five or six spaces back along the service drive near the Casino to off set the spaces that were lost in the drop-off area. He then pointed out the area where they plan to take out the parking spaces.

Ms. Watson stated that the area where the putt putt golf course is currently located appears to be open space. Mr. Euell stated that it is open space. He explained that they were trying to create a more active part of the park by creating a huge event lawn area to hold open concerts near the existing Cedar Tree, which will be kept on site. He stated that they wanted to create a more visual impact of an open view back to the ocean. Ms. Watson wanted to know how the size of the existing picnic area compares to what is being proposed. Mr. Euell stated that it is basically the same size. He stated that they were just trying to clean and even things up. He pointed out that they are going to use the existing benches and the seating. They will lay down the new paved area which will be a concrete unit and then set the tables back in place. The horseshoe grill will remain but it will be resurfaced and secondary grills will be added on the outskirts of the new paved area.

Mr. Dow asked if the walkway will stay in place. Mr. Euell stated that it will basically remain in the same proximity that it is now; however, it will be expanded by 2 ft. in width for a total of 10 ft. in width. They also plan to provide a walkway in between the Pier and the existing walkway near the Lighthouse. Mr. Euell stated that there are three seating areas and benches along the promenade. The middle seating area will have a boardwalk down to the beach and the seating areas will be covered by shade trees and Palm Trees. There will be no covered seating toward the ocean due to the complexity of a permit.

Ms. Watson wanted to know what type of material will be used for the benches. Mr. Euell described the benches as powder coated metal, silver in color. Mr. Dow was concerned that none of the seating areas would have any kind of cover for inclement weather. He then asked if they could pursue something other than a tree canopy for shade. Mr. Brian replied yes; there are a lot of things that they would have to look into. He stated that covered structures have to meet a minimum finished floor elevation, which might be difficult being so close to the rip rap and the water. Ms. Watson suggested that they leave what is already in place. She stated that she would like to see some kind of cover and the one already in place has character. Mr. Euell stated that he would give the

suggestion some consideration. Ms. Watson stated that the beach access is very much needed and is an excellent idea.

Mr. Dow pointed out that considerable effort was made to incorporate the existing pool into this proposed design, but it just would not work for a variety of reasons. He also noted that in an effort to make everything more user friendly, the developers are proposing to replace the sand and dirt in the playground area with carpeted synthetic flooring.

After a brief presentation by Mr. Ussery, who elaborated on points made by Mr. Euell, Vice Chairman Kirkendall explained that although this is not a public hearing item, the floor is now open for public comments.

Mr. Rich Elliott, a retired swimming pool consultant, wanted to know the water capacity of the swimming pool in gallons. Mr. Euell stated that the capacity has not yet been defined. They do however have a pool mechanic working on the plans. The slopes for the beach entry are around 3500 square feet in area, but the volume has not yet been determined. He stated that they are still trying to determine whether the lap pool will be a consistent depth the entire length of the pool or if it would be deeper on one end for diving. Mr. Elliott stated that all pool codes have standard formulas for the amount of deck space, which is based on how ever many square feet there is of the pool. He stated that it appears that there is not very much deck space, and therefore he is concerned about the pool meeting the code.

Mr. Robert Ussery stated that as a member of the review committee, they have hired a consultant from North Georgia who has designed most of the pools in this region. The consultant has taken the initial layout and has given us a code response. Basically, the pool is in compliance with the layout. They are still in discussions with the recreation department as to how they want to do the depths, and also with the consultant as to how he wants to treat that much water. Mr. Ussery stated that it may be a little deceiving as to the area of the pool because the wade-in area appears to be deeper than it actually is. He pointed out that the target that the committee was looking for was a pool that would comfortably handle approximately 200 people.

Mr. Elliott wanted to know how the developers arrived at this particular design. Mr. Ussery stated that they sorted through a number of designs with some of the deciding factors being where the zero entry would be located in relationship to the building, and how the water park and swim lanes worked. He stated that the committee recognized early in the process that this is a recreation department pool. Therefore, it was important to provide all of the functions that the recreation department currently provides, i.e., swimming lessons, lap swimming, water aerobics, and other features. He stated that they wanted to be able to provide a water feature, which will be a big attraction for the children. They also felt very strongly about the beach entry which would allow people to feel more comfortable around water.

The following is a verbatim transcript as presented by Ms. Meredith D. Trawick, St. Simons Island resident and Chairman of the Tree Advisory Board:

“The Village Area and Neptune Park are THE Downtown for St. Simons Island. Across our nation when downtown areas have been torn down and replaced with new buildings and modern facilities the towns and the people who live there have lost a sense of history and of place. And I feel like that is what is happening to OUR Downtown area. I'm all for change, but ALL change is not necessarily good.

“I have probably attended every Public Meeting concerning the Village Master Plan and have never seen a group of people who said that they wanted the Existing Pool torn out and replaced with a new Pool or who wanted the Children's Playground and the Putt-Putt relocated away from The Pier/Retail Area. But I have heard the Public say that they want Neptune Park preserved much the same as it now exists and not reconfigured - ONLY spruced up, fixed up, and maintained which would save the taxpayers a huge amount of money.

“The powers that be seem to believe that this SPLOST money just falls from Heaven, but it doesn't. It is our hard-earned taxpayer money that we contribute each time we purchase an item in Glynn County. The cost of updating the existing Pool, which would surely be only in the 10's of thousands of dollars, is certainly a far cry from a new Pool and other facilities that would cost at least \$4,000,000. Worthy Pools & Spas Inc. was asked to make a survey of the Existing Pool just last year. They show that only \$113,740 would be necessary to bring the Pool up to date and \$70,000 of that work could be done over the next 10 years. I believe that some of that updating was done in order for the pool to be opened last year. Their final Recommendations state and I quote: “The pools overall integrity is sound and shows no visible signs of major structural flaws.” So I say; if it's not “broke” - why are we trying to fix it?

“Since the current pool cannot seem to be properly managed, what steps have been implemented to keep a larger and more maintenance intensive new Pool in repair and financially solvent? The cost of constructing a Bath House Facility should be the same whether for the existing Pool or a new Pool. RUPA had a local architect design a lovely Bath House Facility that could be built parallel to the Existing Pool. We have right now a gorgeous, classic, gutter-style swimming pool and I would like to see it preserved.

“There is plenty of room near the existing Baby pool for an elaborate Children's Water Park. The Water Park is going to have its own water and filter system so it could be easily added to the Existing Pool area.

“THE latest word I've heard concerning the new Children's Playground was a statement by Commissioner Keller that the area would now be covered in "Astro Turf." I am FOR leaving the Playground where it is (adjacent to The Pier and Retail Shops) and keeping a sand surface that the kids love - after all it is the Beach. All new, exciting, play equipment could be put in the present location just as it could be installed in a new location. And why do we want to move the residents & tourist away from spending money in our Retail Downtown.

“I have some serious questions concerning installing Artificial Turf on a new Children's Playground:

“1) TEMPERATURES - Artificial Turf has the same temperature problems as Rubber Matting. Temperatures have been documented on Artificial Turf upwards of 86.5 degrees hotter than natural grass under the same conditions. Example: 93.5 degrees on Natural Grass vs. 180 degrees on Artificial Turf. At what temperature would the Play Area become a health hazard and at what temperature would the Area need to be closed? I am the Glynn County Tree Board Chairman and I have talked with arborist Don Gardner. Excessive heat produced by such a large surface of Artificial Turf would be a detriment to the nearby, very old, Live Oaks and their root systems.

“2) MAINTENANCE/SANITATION - This would be an everyday concern and would need fulltime management. Knowing the county's past maintenance record, has a maintenance field sanitation program been set-up to chemically remove human body fluids (spittle, blood, sweat, vomit, urine) as well as animal (including dog) urine and feces, and bird droppings from the Artificial Turf? Continuous chemical sanitation would surely shorten the life-span of the Artificial Turf. All of this area for new development is in the DNR Shore Protection Zone. The Existing Pool in this area would have to be dug out and a huge hole dug for a new Pool. The Artificial Turf to be put on the Children's Playground is also in this Shore Protected area. When chemicals are used to clean the Artificial Turf surface, the run off would be flowing into our Shore Protection Zone and into the surface water which would be very hazardous. This chemical runoff could also kill the very fragile, old Live Oaks which are in close proximity.

“3) LIFE-SPAN & COST - There should be a Cost Analysis done showing the life-span and Cost of Artificial Turf compared to Sand. What is the actual life expectancy of Artificial Turf and is it financially feasible for the county to be replacing it every few years? How would the areas that get the most wear (example: end of a slide) be replaced without having to replace the whole surface?

“4) HEALTH HAZARDS - The ground tire rubber infill materials used in most Artificial Turfs contain toxic materials, which is why landfills prohibit the dumping of tires. What are the short-term and long-term health effects to children and spectators who would inhale the ground rubber dust? What are the health concerns related to the ingestion by children of ground rubber particles? What about abrasive wounds associated with Artificial Turf? These are all certainly serious questions that need to be addressed before Glynn County decides to incorporate Artificial Turf into the Village Master Plan.

“Finally, I think that the Commissioners need to listen to the Public. Instead of trying to reinvent the wheel and turn us into a Hilton Head South, please stop wasteful spending and SAVE the character of St. Simons Island by just sprucing up, fixing up, and maintaining our DOWNTOWN Area.”

Mr. Tom Packard, a local SSI merchant, stated that he agrees with Mr. Ussery’s descriptive word “deceiving.” He stated that the picture, as presented tonight, is very beautiful and wonderful, but it is deceiving. He compared this proposal to the re-constructed pool in Brunswick, which he stated is not open often; staffing is a nightmare, as it would be for what is being proposed tonight. He then asked, how often would this proposed pool be open, how much would it cost in taxes to have a full-time staff, and how much would it cost a family to use the facilities. Mr. Packard stated that if this did not work in Brunswick, it won’t work on St. Simons Island. He also noted that the current location of the putt putt golf course and the playground area is ideal because as a family man he can watch his children play.

Mr. Packard stated that parking in the Village is already a big issue and the proposal to remove the front corner lot of parking would only exacerbate the problem. Also, handicap parking as it is now does not appear to be up to code. If parking is taken away, as proposed, and the surface is re-done, larger handicap parking will have to be provided as well as additional handicap parking, which will take away even more parking spaces. As a merchant he stated that he does not need any more parking spaces taken away.

Mr. Packard stated that other issues need to be considered, such as the Trolley business and the location of the festivals, both of which bring a lot of people and a lot of money to St. Simons. He stated that there are so many other needs that could be done to improve the Village, but this proposal is not one of them.

Mr. Bill Gusman of St. Simons Island stated that he does not want to critique the plan or speak in terms of the zoning requirements for the plan. His issues should be addressed to the Board of Commissioners. He reminded everyone that the school term for this year will end in two weeks and he’s concerned that there won’t be anything to offer the children who use to go to the existing pool. He suggested that this item be forwarded for action by the Board of Commissioners in January so that the children will have a place to swim for the summer. Mr. Gusman stated that if this plan is executed within the next few weeks, there won’t be a pool for the children to swim in.

There being no further comments from the public, discussion continued among the commission members regarding parking, the playground area relative to turf vs. sand, its life expectancy and maintenance, which prompted Mr. Dow to inquire about additional review before final approval of this plan. Mr. Ussery explained that what the developers are asking the Planning Commission to consider at this time is everything pertaining to Section 619 of the Zoning Ordinance, which is what they have presented. Mr. Kirkendall agreed and added that the Planning Commission is not approving the design of the building or types of material; it is the Planning Commission’s goal to approve the site plan as it pertains to the criteria of Section 619.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve *SP1210* as being consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and with applicable regulations. Approval is subject to meeting all requirements, including approval of the building permit site plan and approval under Village Preservation regulations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

Vice Chairman Preston Kirkendall read the Village Preservation Application into the record as follows:

VP-2008-002 Neptune Park

Consider a request for approval of a Village Preservation application for improvements to Neptune Park, including relocation and redesign of the putt-putt golf course, the swimming pool, the picnic area, a concession stand and pool equipment structure, and miscellaneous changes to the walkways and other facilities. The proposal also changes the parking and drop-off areas adjacent to the St. Simons Pier. The project is located generally between Beachview Drive and St. Simons Sound in the vicinity of The Casino, and at the south end of Mallery Street. The property is zoned General Commercial and General Commercial-Core. Parcel ID: 04-04650. Property owned by Glynn County.

Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Brian Euell of Ecoplan were present for discussion.

Mr. Kirkendall reminded everyone that staff’s comments regarding the Village Preservation Application were included in the Site Plan presentation. He then opened the floor for public comments beginning with Ms. Meredith Trawick who continued her thoughts about the astro/artificial turf.

Ms. Trawick stated that all artificial turf usually is made of tires, and tires are not accepted at landfills. She pointed out that the reason the developers insist on trying to use either rubber matting or some type of artificial turf in the children’s play area is because once they move the play area from its current location, it then comes under OSHA Law, which stipulates that you have to use artificial turf or some type of matting. Ms. Trawick stated that the developers could change the sand in the play area several times a year for the price that it will cost to install and maintain the artificial turf. She expressed additional concerns about sanitizing the turf for the safety of the children with respect to chemical run off, which will also hamper the growth of the trees in the area. In fact, she reported that the area in question is a Shore Protected Area.

In conclusion, Ms. Trawick stated that she is totally opposed to this plan. She then suggested that the developers put in a gorgeous bathhouse and keep the existing pool, which would save the taxpayers a lot of money as well as save the preservation of the area.

Mr. Dick Justice, St. Simons Island resident, stated that the representatives for this request appear to be unprepared to address issues that would assist in making a concise and accurate decision with regard to the temperature of the turf, the cost, and safety concerns. He pointed out that “just because this is being done in other parts of the country, doesn’t mean that we have to do it here on St. Simons.” Mr. Justice stated that this is a terrible waste of money, a waste of our resources, and it is poorly done.

Ms. Desiree Watson noted that cost is not a deciding factor. As pointed out with the Site Plan, she stated that the Planning Commission has to review this application with respect to the requirements outlined in the ordinance.

There being no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve *VP-2008-002* for Neptune Park as being consistent with the regulations for approval of the Village Preservation request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Joan Wilson and unanimously adopted.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 7:35 p.m. with Chairman Robert Ussery presiding.

ZM1201 - ZM-2008-014 (I)

Consider a request amend the Planned Development (PD) Text for property consisting of 15.442 acres located on the south side of the F.J. Torras Causeway and on the southwest side of Kings Way. The property has approximately 600 feet of frontage on the Causeway and approximately 840 feet of frontage on Kings Way. The request is to amend the number and approval method of wet slips and the parking required for this use. Parcel ID 04-05788 and 04-05821. Sea Island Company, agent for Stewart Atlantic, LLC, owner.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips:

The request is to amend the Yacht Club Tract planned development text. The proposed amendment is limited to the use of the marina; specifically paragraph 3.1(b).

Existing language (ZM-2007-017 (I)) *“b. The maximum number of wet slips shall not exceed thirty-five (35).”*

Proposed revised language *“b. The use of the marina shall be limited to hotel guests and condominium owners and their guests; therefore, marina operations shall not require additional parking beyond what is required for permitted uses, established herein. Accordingly, the maximum number of wet slips shall be determined by State and Federal permitting.”*

The consequence of this amendment is that the permitting and regulation of the marina will be handled by state and federal agencies. The county does not have jurisdiction over the permitting of docks.

As approved by existing zoning, the proposed land use is mixed development with hotel (maximum 100 sleeping rooms), residential units (single family, townhouse or multi-family, not exceeding 110 units), and mixed-use marina and commercial area (not exceeding 30,000 square feet). The overall site coverage is limited to 50%.

The proposed change to the PD is limited to the marina slips. The language removes a maximum number of slips. The new language limits the number of slips based on state and federal guidelines. It is also a request not to increase the required parking associated with the slips due to the fact that their use is limited to residents and guests of the property.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact are to be considered in making a decision on a request for rezoning:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property.

The proposed amendment is not a change in use, but a change in regulatory authority.

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

The proposed use was determined to be consistent with the surrounding uses when rezoned previously.

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

Yes, however the use being amended in this application is not typically regulated by zoning, but by state and federal agencies.

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

The proposed use will not impact existing county infrastructure.

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

Yes, the land use designation for this location is Commercial, so therefore it is consistent.

- 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, this request gives the proper regulatory authority responsibility for the development of the marina.

The proposal does not alter the development of the PD. This application places the responsibility of regulating the marina to state and federal agencies. It also considers the marina as an accessory use to site, and therefore eliminates the need for additional parking requirements beyond what is already proposed.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of this application to amend the PD text for the Yacht Club Tract Planned Development.

For clarification, Mr. Hainley explained that staff included the entire PD text in the report regarding the use of the marina, but the corrected language should state that *“the use of the marina shall be limited to hotel guest and condominium owners and their guest residing in the condominiums.”*

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

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of application **ZM-2008-014 (I)** to amend the PD text for the Yacht Club Tract Planned Development and also to limit the use of guest residing in the condominiums. The motion was seconded by Mr. William Lawrence and unanimously adopted.

PP1233 Ocean Cottages, Phase 9, Lots 29-31

Consider a request for approval of a preliminary plat for property consisting of 4.92 acres located west of Ocean Road, approximately 1,700 feet northeast of its intersection with Oglethorpe Road. The project consists of three lots served by Sea Island water and sewer and by a private street. The property is zoned Resort Residential. Parcel ID: 05-0001 and 05-00688. Property owned by Sea Island Company.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips:

The project consists of three lots on 4.92 acres, and is to be served by private streets, and the Sea Island water and sewer system.

This project was initially submitted as an expedited subdivision. The procedure that would have applied, however, is not available for property zoned Resort Residential.

Engineering has a number of technical comments that can be addressed through the construction plans and/or final plat.

According to transportation staff, this project will be served by Ocean Road and Oglethorpe Road. Total daily trips generated by this project will be 29 (9.57 ADT per unit).

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for PP1233 Ocean Cottages, Phase 9, Lots 29-31, subject to meeting all requirements. Three copies of a preliminary plat will need to be submitted for the Chairman’s signature.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve the preliminary plat for Ocean Cottages, Phase 9, Lots 29-31, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-001

Consider an amendment to Sections 619, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 715, and 716 of the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to provide for revised regulations and procedures for review and approval of site plans by the Planning Commissions and to update references in the regulations for various zoning districts to the requirement for submittal and approval of site plans, and for other purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. David Hainley who reported that this amendment revises Section 619, which is the existing provision for site plans. It expands the types of developments for which site plan review is required and upgrades content and review provisions. It also clarifies degree change that is permitted without additional Planning Commission review. Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of the proposed updated amendment.

Following review, including corrected typographical errors, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow recommending to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for site plan approval with the noted corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-006

Consider an amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions) Section 613 (Landscaped Buffer Strips) by replacing that section in its entirety with a new Section 613 (Buffers) establishing requirements and standards for buffers; and for other purposes.

The proposed amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who reported that this amendment replaces the existing Section 613 and establishes several types of buffers with specifications of each. It also creates alternatives for certain types of buffers and identifies situations within which buffers are required, as well as identifies the type of buffer required

Mr. Hainley stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, including corrected typographical errors, a motion was made by Ms. Desiree Watson recommending to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for buffers with the noted corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders. Discussion continued with a presentation by Ms. Meredith Trawick who stated that Dr. Don Gardner, Arborist and Advisor to the Tree Board, asked her to present the following statement on his behalf since he is attending another meeting: (The following is a verbatim presentation by Ms. Trawick.)

“The Tree Advisory Board commends David Hainley and his staff for producing such a dramatic improvement over the current buffer standard and recommends the adoption of the amendment with one change: the deletion of large deciduous tree planting from the Type “E” Buffer only. Type “E” Buffers are meant to screen parking lots that abut streets. Planting large deciduous trees in such a narrow planting space is not a good idea:

- **Large trees will not have adequate lateral space to anchor themselves and will be unacceptably subject to wind throw;**
- **The narrow planting spaces may not allow adequate setback from public utilities both overhead and underground on adjacent county-controlled property;**
- **Large trees will try to anchor themselves and will quickly come into conflict with both private and public infrastructure, leading to heaved curbing, sidewalks and rippling pavement. These conflicts will be inevitable and costly to repair.**
- **We love the idea of planting trees where they will not interfere with the built environment. All the other buffer types designed by Community Development staff are arbor culturally correct and safe.**
- **The deletion of Line 154 from the proposed amendment will decrease conflicts between trees and built infrastructure while maintaining the main purpose for the buffer.**

“I know it may seem strange to you that the Tree Advisory Board is recommending against planting large trees in Type “E” Buffers, but we do this out of respect for the safety of the public, the wise use of both public and private funds, and respect for the trees. Five feet is just too narrow a space to plant a large tree. It is not good for the tree, it wastes the developers money, will cost the county repair costs down the road for repairs, and puts unstable trees into public spaces.

“If the buffer cannot be made at least 10 ft. minimum in width – and we understand that there may be instances where that cannot be done – then the most reasonable thing to do is not plant the large trees. We should still plant the small trees and hedges, just not the large deciduous trees.”

In conclusion, Ms. Trawick stated that, “planting large species in that narrow of a space adjacent to roadways will likely create a conflict with Glynn County Ordinance #2-16-309.”

Mr. Hainley explained that he would not approve anything that was directly over utility lines and he stressed that the 5 ft. is the minimum standard in a particular area. For additional clarification, Chairman Ussery pointed out to Ms. Trawick that what they are proposing at this time are minimum standards, and obviously the buffer could be wider than 5 ft. He stated that the idea and one of the features of using this buffer standard is that developers could come back and submit modifications. He then pointed out in the ordinance ways that the buffer requirements can be modified, with one of the issues being the size of the piece of property, which means that if for some reason the 5 ft. is not enough for the use, something else more suitable could be proposed.

There being no other discussion, the motion for approval was unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-007

Consider an amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Article VI (General Provisions) by adding a new Section 622 (Exterior Lighting) establishing regulations and standards for exterior lighting; and for other purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this proposal establishes requirements and limitations for exterior lighting. He stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following review, including corrected typographical errors, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for outside lighting with the noted corrections. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

VP-2008-003 Pier Village Market Access Renovation

Consider a request to approve a site plan for access renovation and the exterior repainting of a property located on the northeastern corner of Mallery Street and Beachview Drive, just south of Oglethorpe Ave. The site consists of 7,392 sq. ft. (0.17 acre). The property is zoned General Commercial-Core). Parcel ID(s) 04-10230 and 04-07017. F. Larry Evans, agent for Thomas H. Smoot, owner.

Mr. Larry Evans was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages and was presented by Ms. Kristina Wright:

Originally, the site plan for Pier Village Market was approved with conditions at the January 6, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting, including condition #5: "The two restrooms and their accessibility must be constructed in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations." At this time, the applicant has submitted a new application to advance the level of accessibility through the improvement of handrails, the implementation of a new ramp (centrally located to the north of the site), and new porch floor connectors throughout.

In addition, the applicant is proposing to repaint the exterior (siding) of the structures in varying shades of the following: celery, inspired lilac, banana cream and bubble, while maintaining the existing white trim and Charleston green decking.

The Village Preservation regulations (§709.8) provide the following criteria for the review of any proposed exterior change:

- 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.

In summary, the request is for accessibility improvements to include the improvement of handrails, a new ramp (centrally located to the north of the site), new porch floor connectors throughout the site, and the repainting of the exterior. The proposed changes do not conflict with the exterior materials, colors and/or the design of the existing neighboring structures or sites. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval subject to meeting all requirements.

Following a brief discussion and review of the color samples provided by the applicant, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve application **VP-2008-003 (I)** Pier Village Market Access Renovation subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded Mr. Preston Kirkendall and unanimously adopted.

At this time Mr. Hainley reminded the members to provide their comments pertaining to the update of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan for discussion at the upcoming Joint Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 27th at 9:00 a.m. on the 3rd Floor of the Harold Pate Building.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.