

**MINUTES**  
**MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**SEPTEMBER 2, 2008 - 6:00 P.M.**  
**Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street**

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Gary Nevill, Chairman  
Bill Brunson, Vice Chairman  
Jason Counts  
Eric Croft  
Buck Crosby  
Buddy Hutchinson  
Wayne Stewart

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Hainley, Director  
York Phillips, Planning Manager  
Kristina Wright, Planner I  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

-----

Chairman Gary Nevill 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**

**August 5, 2008 Regular Meeting**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Buck Crosby and seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson, the Minutes of the August 5<sup>th</sup> Mainland Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Agenda - Changes, Additions, Deferrals, Postponements**

A motion was made by Mr. Eric Croft, seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted to change the order of the agenda as follows: **1)** ZM1319; **2)** PP1308; **3)** SP1307; **4)** SP1336; **5)** ZM1322; **6)** SP1323; **7)** SP1325; and **8)** TA-2008-008.

-----

## **ZM1319 Satilla Sands**

Consider a request to change the Planned Development Text for the Satilla Sands Planned Development in order to allow signage. The property consists of 27.985 acres located on the west side of US 17 South, approximately 1,000 feet south of its intersection with Buck Swamp Road, and has 1,556.67 feet of frontage on US 17. Parcel ID: 03-14304. James A. Bishop Esq., agent for RWG Properties, LLC, owner.

Attorney James Bishop was present for discussion.

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

A provision for signage was discovered to be lacking upon review of this request in association with a sign permit application, therefore the sign could not be allowed until the PD Text for the property were to be revised.

**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, adjacent and nearby property are allowed to have signs so it is a suitable use for Satilla Sands Subdivision to have signs.**

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

**No adverse effect is anticipated.**

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

**Yes.**

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

**No, the addition of a sign provision to an approved PD Text will not affect existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities or schools.**

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

**Yes, it is anticipated that signs would be allowed to direct the public or inform the public of the names of subdivisions.**

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

**No, there are none.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of **ZM1319 (M)** Satilla Sands amended PD Text to allow signage.

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval of **ZM1319 (M)** Satilla Sands amended PD Text to allow signage. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **PP 1308 Plantation Isles Boulevard Extension**

Consider a request for approval of a preliminary plat for a 3.385 acre right-of-way and a 3.180 acre amenity center for property located approximately 5,000 feet north of the intersection of Highway 99 and Golden Isles Parkway. The property is zoned Planned Development and is located within the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development.

Mr. Ron Sluder was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips as follows:

This proposal is for an extension of Plantation Isles Boulevard. There are three residential developments in different stages of development that will have frontage on this road. One development will use this road as its primary access (*The Retreat at the Golden Isles*) and two other developments will use this road as a secondary access (*The Estates* and *The Plantation at the Golden Isles*). The proposed road will have two phases and a total of 3.385 acres.

Also included in this proposal is a 3.18 acre amenity center which is intended to be shared by the surrounding developments listed above. When the applicant is prepared to develop the amenity center he will be required to submit for approval a Planning Commission Site Plan.

The applicant must construct the street as a collector and work with the County Engineering Department on the type of construction to be used based on the right-of-way width at the time of construction.

The site in question will serve as a secondary access to *“The Estates”* (87 du) and *“The Plantation at the Golden Isles”* (155 du), and will be the primary access for *“The Retreat at the Golden Isles”* (138 du). The Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) data suggests that these projects will generate approximately 3,700 daily trips based on the number of dwelling units.

Additionally, the site and the surrounding subdivisions will be served by public water and sewer. Fire and Police have found this proposal to be compliant as submitted.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for Plantation Isles Boulevard Extension subject to meeting all requirements.

Chairman Nevill expressed concerns about a portion of the property being owned by DMR. Mr. Phillips explained that the DMR property, under the ownership of Terry Driggers, Richard McKinna and Ray Richard, is included in this portion of the first phase. However, it is in the process of being transitioned from DMR to Mr. Sluder and is limited by that fact. Mr. Stewart stated that Mr. Sluder could act as agent for the other owners while the property is being transitioned and some type of stipulation to that affect could be included in the motion.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the preliminary plat for Plantation Isles Boulevard Extension subject to a letter being provided to staff verifying ownership of the adjacent property, and subject to meeting all other requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SP1307 128 Newman Drive**

Consider a request to approve a site plan for a project consisting of a total of 6,000 sq. ft. of office and storage space on 0.64 acres. The property is located at 128 Newman Drive, generally located to the southwest of Community Road, west of Rose Drive and to the east of Habersham Street. The property is zoned Highway Commercial. Parcel ID: 03-14736. Korb Engineering of Florida, agent for Carl Brown & Associates, owner.

Mr. Andrew Korb and Mr. Carl Brown were present for discussion.

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

The site is currently vacant; however, the proposed use is for commercial. Water and sanitary sewer service will be provided to the site via public water, while sewage treatment will consist of an on-site septic tank. The total square footage of the building will consist of 6,000 sq. ft. with 1,500 sq. ft. of office space and 4,500 sq. ft. of storage

The Engineering Department has indicated approval of this site plan as submitted with the understanding that drainage calculations and construction detail will be addressed during the construction plan submittal stage of development. Environmental Health, as well as the Fire and Police Departments have also indicated approval of this site plan as submitted.

According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, this development will generate an average of 16.5 trips per day (1,500 sq. ft. of office space X 11 trips per 1000 sq. ft. = 16.5 trips per day).

Ms. Wright stated that staff recommends approval of the site plan request for 128 Newman Drive, subject to meeting all requirements.

Mr. Jason Counts wanted to know if all of the septic tank issues, as previously indicated by staff, had been resolved. Ms. Wright replied yes.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby for approval of the site plan for 128 Newman Drive, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SP1336 Millhouse Restaurant Addition Holiday Inn**

Consider a request for site plan approval for a 790-square foot addition to a restaurant located on the south side of Glynco Parkway, east of its intersection with Golden Isles Parkway. The application includes a request for reduction of required parking to 139 spaces with an equivalent increase in open space. The property consists of 3.047 acres and is zoned Planned Development. The site is within the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-14291. Korb Engineering, agent for Dixon Management Group, Inc., owner.

Mr. Don Hutchinson of Korb Engineering was present for discussion.

Mr. Phillips reported that the proposed site plan is consistent with the uses and layout originally approved for this site. The required parking is 157 based on the proposed uses (103 hotel rooms at 1.1 spaces per room requires 114 spaces, and 3,052 square feet of patron service area at 1 space per 72 square feet requires 43 spaces). The request for parking reduction is 18, for a total of 139 spaces provided. This represents a reduction of 11.5%. The Planning Commission may approve a reduction of up to 25%

when an area of at least 450 square feet per space is set aside for open space (or 8,100 square feet for 18 spaces). The site plan shows an area of 9,725 set aside near the Glynco Parkway entrance.

Engineering has reviewed the plans and determined that the extent of the proposed changes would not be significant with respect to the drainage system or traffic circulation.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) data suggests that this project will generate an average of 1,120 daily trips based on the hotel rooms and restaurant. The proposed change (i.e. addition of 790 sq. ft. to the restaurant) will generate approximately 70 trips of that total. Glynco Parkway carries 4,300 daily trips (2002 data) and is projected to carry 6,300 trips in 2030.

The site is served by county water and sewer. The proposed change will not be significant in terms of utility demand.

In conclusion, the proposed change is consistent with the uses and layout shown in the approved plans. In addition, the reduction in the parking spaces apparently will not affect the overall parking based on actual experience. An open-space area has been set aside to off-set the reduced parking.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that this request be approved as being consistent with the existing approved project and further recommends that the request for reduction in the parking be approved.

Following a brief discussion regarding parking, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to approve *SP1336 (M)*, the site plan showing proposed changes to the Millhouse Restaurant and to approve the request for reduction in the required parking by 18 spaces (from 157 required to 139 provided) in consideration of the additional open space of at least 8,100 square feet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

**ZM1322 Goodbread Road Project**

Consider a request to rezone from Highway Commercial to Planned Development for property consisting of 12.393 acres located south of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25) at the end of Center Drive. The property has 405.73 feet of frontage on Spur 25 and 70.43 feet of frontage on Center Drive. Approval will include approval of a Planned Development Master Plan and Planned Development Text. Parcel ID: 03-03993. Property owned by Glynn County.

Mr. Dave Hainley, representing Glynn County, presented the following report from staff:

The proposed site plan layout in related site plan applications *SPI325* and *SPI323* indicate that Parcel A will serve as a residential complex while Parcel B will serve as the administrative complex of this 12.393 acre site, situated just off of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25) and accessed via Center Drive.

According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, the rates used in the determination of average daily trips for the following uses are:

**Clinic:** *31.5 trips per 1,000 square feet (5 peak hour trips)*

**Pharmacy:** *90 per 1,000 square feet*

**Care facility housing:** *2 trips per dwelling unit*

**General office building:** *11 trips per 1,000 square feet*

The applicant has indicated that the use of vans is integral to their operational procedures and, as a result, will significantly limit the amount of traffic.

The site will be served by public water and sewer and is found to be compliant with the understanding that water and sewer demands for this project will be provided for the determination of available capacity.

The Fire and Police Departments have both approved this request as submitted.

**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 zoning proposal is a blend of residential and commercial uses, representing a synthesis of the zonings and uses of the surrounding properties**

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

**The zoning proposal will not adversely affect the existing use or usability of the adjacent or nearby properties since access will be limited through one point, Center Drive. In addition, the applicant is proposing a 50 ft. buffer as a boundary surrounding the existing residential development.**

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

**Yes, the property is zoned Highway Commercial in a concentrated area of commercial use and could be developed as such.**

- 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.

**While any development is likely to increase the number of trips per day, the proposed development will utilize vans and is proposing to limit access to one point, Center Drive.**

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

**The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this area as commercial, and the majority of this development is proposed to be developed in conformance with this designation.**

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

**The rezoning of this property would allow for greater flexibility in meeting the needs of this residential/administrative complex.**

The residential portion of this site will feature 24 family units and has allowed flexibility for the possibility of adding an additional 8 units in the future. As a result, the maximum proposed density will be 8 du/ac (32 units maximum / 3.992 acres  $\approx$  8 du/ac), which is less than the 10 du/ac maximum outlined by the Planned Development Text.

In conclusion, the proposal represents a mixture of residential facilities, a treatment clinic and an administrative complex that will serve to transition the development between the surrounding commercial and residential areas.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff's recommendation is for approval of rezoning request **ZM1322** Goodbread Road.

Chairman Nevill had questions about the buffer along Terry Drive. Mr. Hainley stated that the applicant is proposing a 50 ft. buffer as a boundary surrounding the existing residential development in addition to a 30 ft. drainage easement. Chairman Nevill asked if there were any other type of buffers required in the site plan, such as a fence or a wall. Mr. Hainley stated that there is a provision that allows for a fence within the buffer area as part of the PD Text, but not as part of the site plan at this time. However, there has been some discussion with the neighbors regarding a fence, but nothing has been confirmed.

Regarding Tract A of the PD Text referencing "government owned or operated facility or land" as a permitted use, Chairman Nevill asked if this is being listed in case the county decides to put an office building on the property. Mr. Hainley replied yes, but

there is a specific exclusion that would not allow a juvenile detention facility or drug court facility. He stated that there are other county offices that would be acceptable under the provisions of the PD Text, i.e., the Community Development Department or a maintenance facility. Chairman Nevill stated that his concern is what “government facility” actually encompasses. Mr. Hainley stated that if this restricts the ability for approval, staff would recommend striking that reference and revert back to the HC zoning request. Chairman Nevill suggested that staff state specifically that it would be a government operated facility related to a residential or commercial use. He stated that he would like to avoid a more negative connotation. Mr. Buck Crosby agreed and added that he would not want anything undesirable in the area, including a juvenile detention center. He stated that the language should be more specific to avoid any kind of confusion.

Regarding the buffer along Bel Air Circle, Mr. Stewart asked if the proposed fence or wall would be located on the inside of the buffer closest to the county’s property or would it be located outside, closest to the neighbor’s property. Mr. Hainley explained that there is a provision to allow a fence or a wall within the buffer but it is not specified. However, under the buffer requirements the wall would be placed on the outside adjacent to the neighborhood with the vegetation on the inside. He pointed out that the location of the wall or fence is a site plan issue and has not been resolved.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to delete the word “juvenile” and add the word **any** to the language under *Prohibited Uses in the Development* to read as follows: “**any juvenile** detention or drug court facilities are prohibited on Tract A and Tract B of the property.”

Ms. Barbara Myers, Administrative Director for Gateway Behavioral Health Services, gave a brief presentation. She stated that Gateway has been working closely with the county for the past year and a half with regards to identifying appropriate acreage to be able to provide a therapeutic campus structure for the citizens of Glynn County. She then gave a brief overview of the history of Gateway since its existence 30 years ago.

Ms. Myers stated that in locating a site for their patients and identifying their needs, they have to take into consideration appropriate safe housing away from some of the influences of other neighborhoods. They also want a safe area that would be easily accessed by any citizen in Glynn County. The plan that they have established is through participation with the neighbors. They have conducted a series of three meetings, and have invited the neighbors to tour Gateway’s current facilities.

Ms. Myers stated that housing will be funded through a grant by way of the Department of Community Affairs and its purpose is to provide residential apartments. The apartments are very nice with plenty of space and will house women with children. She stressed that they are not like the typical public housing facilities or Section 8 housing. Ms. Myers stated that one of the most important things that they believe is that these women and children need to continue to have access to Gateway services in order

to be able to become successful and productive members of society. She then elaborated on the number of services that Gateway provides.

Ms. Myers stated that Gateway is sensitive to the concerns of the neighbors, which is why they agreed to do a 50 ft. buffer and keep as many of the trees as possible. She stated that there are only 11 residences that are up against the proposed facility. There will be at least 80 ft. of buffer space between the back yards of the neighbors and the facility. With the trees in place, the neighbors won't notice the facility. She stated that they have always been good neighbors and try very hard to blend in with the community.

Ms. Myers pointed out that they have on-staff maintenance, as well as landscaping contracts on all of their facilities. In this particular development they will also have on-site security 24 hours a day to aid in the protection of the women and children by keeping undesirables out of the facility and to help ease the minds of the adjacent neighbors. She further stated that they are proposing a single access onto the property, a fence and natural barriers.

There was a lengthy discussion among the Planning Commission members regarding the location of the proposed fence/wall, buffers, and access onto the property. Afterward, the floor was opened for public comments.

Mr. Robert Gilleski of 132 Bel Air Circle stated that he is in favor of this request. He pointed out that what Gateway is proposing is better than what is actually taking place in the area now, i.e., sand and debris from the dirt bikes, and problems with people dumping trash in the area. However, he is concerned about the type of fence, the location of the fence and the buffers.

Mr. Bob Kanaley of 135 Bel Air Circle stated that he would like to have more definition of where the fence will go, as well as the buffers. He also complained about the 4-wheelers and stated that he would prefer a solid fence as oppose to a chain linked fence.

Mr. Bob Wendel of 167 Terry Drive suggested closing Goodbread Road to deter drug traffic, etc. He stated that he is also concerned about drainage in the area. Chairman Nevill stated that the engineering plans have not been done for the project, but the applicant is proposing to have detention ponds. They will also be required to follow the guidelines of the Glynn County Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mrs. Annette Gilleski and some of the other neighbors complained that not enough advertising was done to inform the residents of the meetings. Some of residents stated that they had not even seen the site plan or had any input as previously promised.

Mr. Glenn Henderson of 122 Bel Air Circle stated that he is adamantly opposed to this request. He stated that the traffic situation would be horrible, as well as drainage conditions and flooding. He pointed out that there are already two daycare centers in the

area with at least 100 children. They don't need another one. He stressed that he does not want to live near convicted felons or drug addicts and stated that he would rather see a commercial development in the area as opposed to having the Gateway facility near him and his family. Mr. Henderson also expressed dissatisfaction about not seeing the plans and not being informed of the meetings. He strongly urged the Planning Commission to deny this request.

Mr. Bill Brunson stated that he cannot comment on the traffic situation but he assured Mr. Henderson that the stormwater drainage will be improved. Mr. Stewart agreed. He stated that there are very strict new guidelines in place regarding drainage. However, he is concerned about the uncertainties surrounding the location of the fence and buffer, but what concerns him the most is the fact that the majority of the neighbors have not seen the site plan. Mr. Stewart stated that a PD Text is the best protection for the neighborhood, but most of the issues expressed pertain to the site plan. He suggested that action on the site plan be deferred until the neighbors have had a fair chance to review the plans. Mr. Buck Crosby agreed. He stated that the neighbors were promised that they would have input into the plans and it looks like that has not happened.

At this time, Chairman Nevill stated that the site plans for the Administrative Complex and the Residential Complex would be read into record and discussed but action will be deferred. In the meantime, discussion continued on the rezoning. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval to the Glynn County Board of Commissioners of application **ZM1322** Goodbread Road, to rezone from Highway Commercial to Planned Development subject to the language under *Prohibited Uses* being changed to read that “**any juvenile** detention or drug court facilities are prohibited on Tract A and Tract B of the property.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SP1323 Goodbread Road Administrative Complex**

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for 51,500 sq. ft. on property consisting of an 8.401 acre tract (Tract B), a portion of the total 12.393 acre parcel. The property is located on the western side of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25), north of Scranton Road, east of Terry Drive and to the south of South Goodbread Road. Access will be provided from Center Drive. The property is in the process of being rezoned from Highway Commercial to Planned Development subject to the approval of ZM1322. Parcel ID: 03-03993. Gateway Behavioral Health Services, applicant.

**SP1325 Goodbread Road Residential Complex**

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for a residential complex with a total area of 23,600 sq. ft. and with a total building footprint of 20,474 sq. ft. on property consisting of a 3.992 acre tract (Tract A), a portion of the total 12.393 acre parcel. The property is located on the western side of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25), north of Scranton Road, east of Terry Drive and to the south of South Goodbread Road. Access will be provided

from Center Drive. The property is in the process of being rezoned from Highway Commercial to Planned Development subject to the approval of ZM1322. Parcel ID: 03-03993. Gateway Behavioral Health Services, applicant.

(It was noted that the staff's report for these two items is the same as previously transcribed for rezoning application **ZM1322** Goodbread Road.)

At this time, there was a debate regarding the access to the property. Mr. Buddy Hutchinson stated that the plans indicate a possible loop to Terry Drive as an access point. However, Mr. Mike Riley, the architect with Martin Riley Associates, explained that the loop, as depicted on the sketch, has nothing to do with street access. It refers to a waterline, which they access from Center Drive. If ever there is a waterline on Terry Drive, he stated that they would connect to it to increase the water pressure. Again, he stated that it has nothing to do with street access to the property or construction. It was also pointed out that there is an 80 ft. buffer and drainage easement along Terry Drive.

Mr. Riley stated that the project will be accessed through Center Drive. A cul-de-sac will be built at the end of Center Drive and everything relative to the compound will be accessed from that particular cul-de-sac. The only way to access the homes in the back is through the loop drive with security cameras. There is a small alley way to access the homes but there will not be a lot of vehicular circulation around the apartments. He stated that Gateway's primary concern for the residents is security.

Mr. Riley stated that they are providing a 50 ft. buffer along Goodbread Road and have had many discussions on this subject. He stated that they want to be good neighbors and will be working with the county to see what can actually be done with Goodbread Road. He pointed out that they have a ditch that serves as a natural barrier against anyone coming in from Terry Drive, but felt that they needed even more security. Therefore, they will be putting a 30 ft. buffer between the ditch and any development in the back of the property. Mr. Riley stated that they are planning to fence the residential area and also along the back of the administrative area. He explained that the fencing is needed to secure the complex as well.

Regarding the drainage issues, Mr. Riley stated that they have identified at least five areas for detention. They have not completed the engineering but they do have a topo and they do know the drainage directions. He stated that they will handle their responsibilities for the drainage on the property. Elevation studies for the facilities can be viewed via the internet. Mr. Riley gave a brief description of what the residential apartments and other buildings would look like.

Referring back to the proposed fence, Mr. Stewart asked if the applicant and the neighbors reached a consensus as to the type, height and location of the fence. An audience member replied that the neighbors were never consulted. Ms. Myers confirmed that they have not reached an agreement or had any discussions with the neighbors regarding the fencing, but they are willing to listen to their suggestions. She stressed that Gateway doesn't want the facility to resemble an institution or prison with barbed wire,

guard towers, etc. However, they do want something that would be aesthetically pleasing to the neighbors. Regarding the location of the fencing, Ms. Myers stated that they would prefer to have it on the outside of the buffer for access and maintenance purposes.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that this request is scheduled to be heard by the Board of Commissioners on October 2<sup>nd</sup>, but in the meantime the applicant needs to meet with the neighbors for additional discussion on the buffer and fencing issues. It was pointed out that a joint meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 9<sup>th</sup> and this item could be added to the agenda. Mr. Buck Crosby stated that until the neighbors get a chance to have input as promised, he would not be able to render a positive vote on this item.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to defer action and discussion on *SPI323* and *SPI325* until the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the Harold Pate Building, 1725 Reynolds Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

**TA-2008-008**

Consider an amendment to Article XI of the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to provide for an amendment to replace Article XI in its entirety, to provide for procedures and requirements for amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and other zoning decisions for map and zoning text amendments, and for other purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this proposal clarifies and streamlines procedures, as well as distinguishes between map amendments for rezonings and text amendments. It also creates procedure for making corrections to the zoning map on the computer and provides for map amendments involving many properties. Mr. Hainley pointed out that the Islands Planning Commission submitted a recommendation for approval. He stated that staff also recommends approval of this proposed amendment.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson recommending to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the regulations and procedures for amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart and unanimously adopted.

For the record, Mr. Stewart clarified that this is not just a spontaneous action on the Planning Commission's part. He stated that several meetings have been conducted with lots of discussions regarding this amendment.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.