

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 15, 2008 - 6:00 P.M.

The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

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

ABSENT: Preston Kirkendall

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
York Phillips, Planning Manager
Iris Scheff, Planner III
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.

Due to technical difficulties, the recording system (audio and video) failed to operate. Information contained in the Minutes was transcribed from handwritten notes.

Minutes

June 17, 2008 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve the Minutes of the June 17th Islands Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson. Voting Aye: Mr. Paul Sanders, Mr. Robert Ussery, Ms. Desiree Watson and Ms. Joan Wilson. Mr. Dow and Mr. Lawrence did not attend the June 17th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

ZM1196 Sinclair Tract

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Planned Development, property consisting of 82 acres located on the east side of Lawrence Road, approximately 1.8 miles north of its intersection with Frederica Road, and with approximately 1,900 feet of frontage on Lawrence Road. Parcel ID: 04-00206, 04-00207, 04-11033, and 04-12008. Sea Island Company, agent for A.W. Jones III, James Jones, and Sea Island Company, owners.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

Before presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips distributed a copy of the applicant's revised text for the Planning Commission's consideration. He then proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

The proposed use of the property in question is for a residential development, including one-family residences and row-houses, with varying lot sizes. The maximum number of dwelling units is 181. Also permitted are accessory uses such as recreational facilities, clubhouses, and support buildings and activities. The proposed PD text allows dwelling units to be used as interval ownership and/or short term rentals (such as hotel units). The overall density of the project will be 2.25 units per upland acre (overall site is 82 acres, with 1.77 of wetland and 80.23 acres or upland.) The site is also served by public water and sewer on Lawrence Road.

The proposed use is consistent with recent developments in the area. The ability to use the units as interval ownership (time-share) or hotel units might increase the impact of the project and may need to be limited as a percentage of the total units. The applicant may need to explain how this concept will be implemented.

Engineering staff has commented that a secondary access would be advisable, even if it is limited to an emergency access only.

If developed as residential (i.e. no hotel units) a project of this size (181 units) will produce 1,810 total trips per day. Lawrence Road is carrying 2,600 trips (2002 date) and is projected to carry 10,200 in 2030. It is assumed that the other uses (clubhouse, etc.) will not create additional outside traffic. Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) traffic generation studies show that if any units are occupied as short-term tenancy (i.e. hotel units) the trip generation rate for those units would be between 60% and 130% of the rate for typical residential units.

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 development is consistent with recent developments in the area.

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

The proposed development is consistent with developments in the area and will not adversely affect the usability of nearby property.

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

Yes.

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

The 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.

The future land use classification for this site is Agriculture/Forestry and unused; however, the proposed use is consistent with development that has been taking place 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, development of the area has evolved differently from what was envisioned in the adopted plan.

The proposal appears to be consistent with the character of development in the area. Technical issues can be addressed during the subdivision and site plan review stage. Therefore, Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM1196** for Planned Development, including the PD Text and PD Master Plan.

At this time, Mr. Edenfield apologized for the additional comments and the short time frame in which the members received the revised text, but he stated that all of the issues raised by staff have been addressed in the revised text.

Mr. Paul Sanders had questions about how this proposal would affect the infrastructure with regard to the total amount of trips generated per day. Mr. Phillips stated that according to the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), average daily traffic counts on Lawrence Road were 2,600 and were expected to increase to about

10,200 by 2030. The estimated increase was based on the assumption that development of this type would occur in the northern part of St. Simons Island.

Mr. Sanders wanted to know what impact this development would have on the schools, particularly Glynn Academy. Mr. Phillips stated that in this case, the standard ratio is applied to all schools. The School Board would make adjustments in the facilities, such as moving into portables, etc., but at this point, there is no major concern in this regard.

Mr. Sanders questioned staff's comment that "the proposed development will not adversely affect the nearby property." Mr. Phillips explained that notices were mailed to adjacent property owners but staff did not receive any replies or comments from any of the property owners.

Mr. John Dow pointed out that some sections of the text refer to a single-family "residential dock," but other sections refer to a "community dock." He suggested that the language be changed to be consistent with the language indicated on Page 9 of the revised text which refers to a "community dock." Mr. Edenfield explained that the intent was to allow the use of the existing residential dock with regard to standards for parking, etc.; however, he concurred with Mr. Dow's suggestion.

Mr. William Lawrence wanted to know how the proposed zoning change relates to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Hainley stated that the proposed use is consistent with the current guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Ussery noted that there is no particular guide in the Comprehensive Plan for density relative to this type of residential use. Mr. Hainley stated that the current plan does not address this issue but hopefully it will be included in the revised adopted Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Desiree Watson stated that she also had concerns about density but she was relieved when she noticed the amount of green space and that the overall density was capped at 181 units. She did point out however that the cross referenced numbers in the text are inaccurate and should be modified. Mr. Edenfield concurred.

Mr. John Teramo of 110 Linkside Drive, SSI expressed concerns about how this development would impact the way of life on St. Simons with regard to traffic, water and sewer and the preservation of trees.

Mr. John Turbidy of 113 Biltmore, SSI stated that his mind would be more at ease if this project were being developed by the Sea Island Company. He stated that he is concerned about the development being consistent with the character of the north end of the Island.

Ms. Susan Hill of 353 Lantern Walk, SSI expressed concerns about the size of the development and the setbacks relative to a single-family townhome in comparison with Frederica Township.

Mr. Edenfield explained that his comparisons meant that the standards were lifted from those of a townhouse development. He stated that the concept of a patio home is to have a smaller yard, create a barrier or an enclosed courtyard within the neighboring yard. The side yard setbacks may be reduced to zero feet. The minimum rear yard setback in this proposal is 7 ft. As pointed out in the text with regard to parking, he stated that the residential uses will meet or exceed the standards for off-street parking as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, all of the healthy trees in the development will be preserved and protected during construction by mulching, pruning, fertilization, and installation of protective fencing.

Chairman Ussery stated that most patio homes are situated on open space with amenities. He noted that this is addressed in the concept plan but he would like for it to be stated in the text as well. Mr. Edenfield concurred.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow, seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of application **ZM1196** for Planned Development including the PD Text and PD Master Plan subject to the following:

- 1) The patio homes and townhouse units in the development will be designed to back up to open space;
- 2) Language referring to docks is to be modified to uniformly reference “community docks;” and
- 3) The section and item numbers in the PD Text will be corrected and all internal cross-references will be modified as well.

ZM1222 St. Simons Island, North End

Request to amend the Planned Development Master Plan and Text for property located west of Lawrence Road, generally north of the intersection of Lawrence and Frederica Roads. The property consists of 3,543 +/- acres. The purpose of the request is to relocate the public park on the approved planned development master plan, and incorporate an existing out parcel. The approved planned development text is to be amended to allow selective thinning of the Lawrence Road buffer to allow views and to allow encroachment by a proposed public bike trail. The property is zoned Planned Development. Parcel IDs: 04-00206, 04-00218. 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 Mrs. Iris Scheff:

The Glynn County Future Land Use Map designates portions of the over three thousand acres of this property for Low Density Residential Use, Agriculture/Forestry Use, and Undeveloped/Unused. The approved Master Plan Map for the proposed amendment is one controlling document for the property at present, along with the approved Planned Development Text.

The proposed Planned Development Master Plan and Text does not affect the overall zoning in that it will not change any of the types of developments allowed, other than the addition of bike trails. The impacts of development would not change with this proposed revision.

As stated on the application for rezoning - “The proposed amendment continues uses and development standards that are consistent with the existing zoning.”

The out parcel is being added to residential Tract III and is not of sufficient size to affect drainage, circulation, or schools.

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.

Yes, the amendment is suitable with no change of substance that would be different than uses already allowed under the present Planned Development.

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

No, the zoning proposal is a reasonable reconfiguration of the property development possibilities and will not adversely affect the usability of adjacent or nearby property.

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

Yes, it has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

- 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, the proposed amendment could instead slightly relieve the use of streets by providing bike paths as an alternative transportation on the property. Other

uses are not proposed to change therefore utilities and schools would be anticipated to be under the same impact as prior to the amendment.

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

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

- 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, by amending the currently adopted Planned Development Master Plan and Text the owners of the property are working with the Land Trust to accommodate bike paths that are being planned to traverse a portion of the property.

Mrs. Scheff stated that the request appears to be logical and will not change the impacts of the previously approved Planned Development. Therefore, staff recommends approval of application **ZM1222** to amend the PD Master Plan and Text for the St. Simons North End Planned Development.

Ms. Desiree Watson wanted to know the size of the out parcel. Mr. Bobby Shupe stated that the out parcel is 10 acres.

Mr. Paul Sanders asked if the adjacent property owners were notified, to which Mrs. Scheff replied yes; however, staff did not receive any responses or comments.

Ms. Joan Wilson asked if the park would be located in the out parcel. Mr. Edenfield replied no. He then pointed out the area on the site map of where the park would be located.

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 **ZM1222** to amend the PD Master Plan and Text for the St. Simons North End Planned Development. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Dow and unanimously adopted.

PP1261 Frederica Township Phase VI-A

Consider a request for approval of a preliminary plat for property consisting of 22.322 acres located north of Pikes Bluff Road and on the east side of Stirling Lane. The project consists of 11 lots served by public water and sewer and by a private street. The property is zoned Planned Development and is part of the North End Planned Development. Parcel ID 04-13666. Sea Island Coastal Properties, owner.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

According to the staff’s report, this site is shown as Low Density Residential on the Future Land Use Plan. It is currently undeveloped but the proposed use is for single-family lots.

This project is consistent with the overall plan for the North End PD. Stirling Lane itself (along with 4 lots) was recently approved as a final plat.

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

This project will be served by Pikes Bluff Road and Lawrence Road. Total daily trips generated by this project will be 110 (10 ADT per unit).

Fire and Police Departments have found this request to be compliant as submitted.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for **PP1261** Frederica Township Phase VI-A, subject to meeting all requirements.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve the preliminary plat for Frederica Township, Phase VI-A, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Joan Wilson and unanimously adopted.

It was noted that the next agenda item, **SUP1274**, would be discussed simultaneously with **VP1279** but the two items require separate action. Both items were read into the record as follows:

SUP1274 Mallery Street Cafe

Consider a request for a special use permit to allow a restaurant within the General Commercial Core Zoning District (GC-Core). The property is located at 408 Mallery Street, south of Magnolia Avenue and to the north of Ocean Boulevard on the east side of Mallery Street. The property is zoned GC-Core. Parcel ID: 04-04466. Lance Williams, agent for Wells Investments LLC, owner.

VP1279 Mallery St. Café

Consider a request to approve one (1) wall sign and one (1) window sign for property located at 408 Mallery Street, situated on the southeastern corner of the intersection of Mallery Street and Magnolia Avenue. The property is zoned GC-Core. Parcel ID: 04-04466. Lance Williams, agent for Wells Investments LLC, owner.

Mr. Lance Williams was present for discussion.

According to the staff’s report for *SUP1274*, the property is currently zoned GC-Core, which allows a restaurant by special use permit once heard before and approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners. Comments were received from the Joint Water and Sewer Commission, as well as the Fire Department concerning the need for grease trap/interceptor, firewall ratings and the need for a fire extinguisher within the kitchen and will be addressed at the building permit stage.

The Zoning Ordinance provides criteria for consideration of Special Use Permits generally as follows:

904.3 Approval/Denial

The County Commission and the Planning Commission, in reviewing the application for a special use permit, should consider the following:

- a. *The effect the proposed activity will have on traffic flow along adjoining streets;*

The following table has been prepared in accordance with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual:

	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
ADT based on no. of seats:	4.83 <u>X 32</u> 154.56 trips per day	6.21 <u>X 32</u> 198.72 trips per day	5.17 <u>X 32</u> 165.44 trips per day
ADT based on sq. ft.	130.34 <u>X 1.146</u> 149.37 trips per day	158.37 <u>X 1.146</u> 181.49 trips per day	131.84 <u>X 1.146</u> 151.09 trips per day

- b. *The location of off-street parking facilities;*

The applicant is proposing to utilize the existing parking facilities and will preserve the current building footprint. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance §715.4.7 Off-street Parking:

7) Off-Street Parking:

Off-street parking and loading requirements for any use shall be waived except that one-half of the parking required by Section 611 shall be required for any use occupying a new structure erected on or after November 18, 2004 or the addition of square footage to an existing building on or after November 18, 2004. For the purposes of this provision (i.e. waiver of parking requirements only), the erection of a structure or portion thereof as a replacement or restoration of the structure or portion thereof after it sustains damage or is

destroyed due to fire, disaster, or other means shall not result in the requirement for provision of parking as long as the total square footage after reconstruction does not exceed the total square footage before the damage occurred. (*O-2004-19; 11-18-2004)

c. The number, size and types of signs proposed for the site;

The applicant has submitted application VP1279, in support of this application, seeking the approval of one (1) window sign, measuring 10 sq. ft., and one (1) wall sign, measuring 12 sq. ft., for a combined total of 22 sq. ft.

d. The amount and location of open space;

Not applicable

e. Protective screening;

Not applicable

f. Hours and manner of operation;

The café will serve breakfast and lunch only and will operate between the hours of 7 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. only.

g. Outdoor lighting;

Since the facility will not be operational during the evening hours, the only outdoor lighting proposed is the existing flood light on the side of the building abutting the alley.

h. Ingress and egress to the property; and

The building is located on the east side of Mallery St., serving as ingress and egress to the site. There is also an alley situated on the southern side of the building.

i. Compatibility with surrounding land use.

The café concept is compatible with surrounding land uses within the St. Simons Village Overlay District.

Staff recommends approval of application **SUPI274** to allow a restaurant within the GC-Core Zoning District.

The following is the staff's report for Village Preservation Application **VP1279** Mallery St. Café.

This request is for the approval of one (1) window sign, measuring 10 sq. ft., and one (1) wall sign, measuring 12 sq. ft., for a total of 22 sq. ft. The proposed signs do not conflict with the external materials and/or the design of the existing neighboring sites, or signs, within the St. Simons Village Preservation Overlay District.

The Village Preservation requirements provide the following criteria for review of proposed exterior changes, including signs:

- 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 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.

Staff recommends approval of application **VP1279**, subject to the approval of **SUP1274**.

Mr. Lance Williams distributed color brochures demonstrating the actual sign, the menus, and pertinent information concerning his character and his proposal. During his presentation, he stated that the sign would actually be letters painted on the exterior with one flower as shown in the brochure. He stated that he has included in his lease that his café would not be opened at night. He is also in negotiations with the adjacent business owner, Patrick Parker, to share his dumpster (which he vowed to keep clean); thereby eliminating the need for a dumpster in the back of his establishment. He stressed that he wants to ensure that the residents behind him are not bothered by noise, foul odors, garbage, etc. Mr. Williams stated that he lives in this community and plans to retire here, and he would not do anything detrimental to the area.

Chairman Ussery asked staff that if conditions are placed on an application, would the conditions go with the property or with the owner. Mr. Hainley explained that the conditions go with the use. If the property is ever sold, the new owner would have to abide by the same provisions and stipulations. Ms. Watson suggested that the applicant provide some type of buffer if a dumpster is placed in the back of the establishment. Mr. Lance Williams acknowledged that he would not have a problem with that provision.

Staff received a letter of opposition from Ms. Mary Wilson who owns property at 506 Magnolia Avenue. In her letter she states that there is already a great deal of trouble with people parking in driveways and yards, often at the expense of the residents' mailboxes. Ms. Wilson also expressed concerns about noise and disposal of waste via dumpsters, which would not only be unsightly, but would most likely generate unpleasant odors. She stated that if the applicant were to share the adjacent dumpster as indicated, this would perhaps help to relieve some of the problems, but she doesn't think that a buffer would help the parking situation because there is an alley in back that people use for parking as well.

Mr. R. C. Johnson of 630 Dellwood Avenue was present to oppose to this request on behalf of the local homeowners association. He stated that there is not enough parking as it is, and this proposal would compound the problems for the people who live in the area. In addition to the parking problem, he expressed concerns about locating a

dumpster next door to Ms. Wilson with respect to foul odors and everything associated with dumpsters.

Ms. Ann Duke of 510 Magnolia Avenue agreed with Ms. Wilson and Mr. Johnson and stated that she is also opposed to this request.

Mr. George Fry was present to speak in favor of this request and to attest to the applicant's character.

Mr. John Dow had questions about the seating capacity. Mr. Lance Williams stated that he had proposed seating at a maximum of 50 but he could lower the seating to 30 or 40. Mr. Dow asked if he would agree to limit the seating capacity and not provide refuse collection in the rear. Mr. Williams replied yes. However, Mr. R. C. Johnson stated that 40 seats means there would be 40 cars. He stated that there are other uses that would not generate as much traffic. Ms. Watson commented that she doesn't think that traffic and parking would be that much of a problem because due to the proximity of the café, most people, herself included, would opt to walk to the establishment rather than drive.

Chairman Ussery stated that limiting the café to breakfast and lunch would not have a large impact on parking, but he feels that 50 seats might be too much.

It was pointed out that the staff's report indicates 32 seats. Mr. Dow suggested a cap of 35 seats with no dumpster or refuse collection in the rear of the establishment. The Planning Commission concurred; however, during the course of discussion, the members agreed to a maximum of 40 seats.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of application **SUPI274**, to allow a restaurant within the GC-Core Zoning District with a maximum of 40 seats, no refuse collection in the rear, and subject to the stipulations included in the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

At this time, a motion was made by Mr. Dow to approve application **VP1279**, subject to the approval of **SUPI274**. The motion was seconded by Ms. Watson. However, the motion was amended to allow flexibility in the configuration of the sign. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

VP1268 Midnight Blue Sign at 542 Ocean Boulevard

Consider a request for approval of a 2-foot by 8-foot sign for Midnight Blue, a business situated on the south side of Ocean Boulevard between Fourteenth and Oak Street at a physical address of 542 Ocean Boulevard within the Village Preservation Overlay area. The property is zoned General Commercial. Parcel ID 04-11654. Paul H. Asher, agent for Nancy Walter, business owner.

Mr. Paul Asher was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages and was presented by Mrs. Scheff:

This request does not involve the remodeling of a building, and there is no change in building footprint or in height of a structure.

Pictures were taken by staff of newly installed signs for Midnight Blue at the subject address. After notification, a standard sign permit application (vs. Village Preservation request) to include two smaller fascia signs and one larger building sign was submitted by business owner Nancy Walter dated March 25, 2008. Because of the location within the Village Preservation District, a Village Preservation District Conservation Application review and approval was indicated. Research revealed that the two smaller signs had formerly been reviewed and approved through the Village Preservation District approval process by a previous business owner, but the larger sign remained to be reviewed and approved.

An issue to consider with this request regards font and colors employed on the sign. Other signs existing on the building are uniform in font and color scheme, using crème colored block style font on a brown background, while the Midnight Blue sign is different in both font style and color scheme, using a white complex font on a blue-black background. Pictures of the new signs along with the existing signs of other businesses are shown on Exhibit B- Midnight Blue Sign and Existing Signs. (The sign is being brought to the Islands Planning Commission for approval and to decide whether the font and color should echo those of the existing signs, or be allowed to vary as shown in the pictures.)

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.

Mrs. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of **VP1268**.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Desiree Watson to approve application **VP1268**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

VP1278 Dairy Queen

Consider a request for approval of the replacement of an existing wall sign for a property located at 501 Mallery St., on the northwestern corner of the intersection of Magnolia Ave. and Mallery St. The property is zoned General Commercial. Parcel ID: 04-04402. Property owned by Mussainali Momin.

Although the applicant/agent for this request was not in attendance, with staff's guidance, the Planning Commission concluded that this item was not controversial and therefore action could be taken at this time.

Ms. Kristina Wright reported that the proposed sign measures 13.59 sq. ft. and is smaller than the existing sign. In addition, the existing wall sign and the proposed wall sign differ in terms of color, and the proposed sign will feature an updated logo. The proposed sign does not conflict with the external materials and/or the design of existing neighboring sites, or signs, within the Village Preservation Overlay District.

The Village Preservation regulations provide the following criteria for review of proposed exterior changes, including signs:

- 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 widows, color schemes and other building elements which are 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.

Ms. Wright stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP1278** for the following reasons: 1) The proposed sign is a replacement wall sign for a previously approved wall sign for the site; and 2) Like the previous sign, the proposed sign appears to be in harmony with the existing sign and the other signs within the St. Simons Village Preservation Overlay District.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve application **VP1278**, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Dow and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.