

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 6, 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

April 1, 2008 Regular Meeting
April 8, 2008 Workshop Meeting
April 22, 2008 Workshop Meeting

Upon a motion made by Mr. Buck Crosby and seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson, the above listed Minutes were approved and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer action on the **November 6, 2006** Minutes until the June 3rd Mainland Planning Commission Meeting in order to allow additional review of the video tape. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

Agenda - Changes, Additions, Deferrals, Postponements

Changes: Upon staff's request, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to change the order of the agenda by moving Rezoning Application **ZM-2008-018 (M)** to be discussed simultaneously with Site Plan Application **SP-2008-008 (M)**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

Deferral: Upon staff's request, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to defer Application **ZM-2007-037(M)** until the August 5th Mainland Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the applicant to do additional research. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

Deferral: Upon the applicant's request, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to defer Application **ZM-2008-009(M)** indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted. At the appropriate time, staff will re-advertise this application, re-post the rezoning sign, and notify adjacent property owners.

ZM-2008-010 (M)

Consider a request to rezone from General Commercial to General Residential, property consisting of 0.47 acre on the west side of Harris Farm Road 450 feet north of its intersection with Cypress Mill Road. Parcel ID: 03-03026. Lynn Anderson, agent for Larry Rentz, owner.

Ms. Lynn Anderson was present for discussion.

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

This request is to allow the construction of a single-family residence on the lot. The street is a short stub street off of Cypress Mill Road adjacent to Spur 25. Originally, this was along the west side of Carteret Road, but that road was re-routed when the Spur was constructed.

In 1966 the properties along the south end of Carteret Road were rezoned (Application Case GC-07-66A) to commercial to reflect the rearrangement of the road network. Areas to the west are zoned and developed as residential, but have no access to this road. To the north and south are existing homes and a church is located to the east of the property.

Engineering has indicated that easements may be needed if street drainage crosses this property. According to transportation staff, a single-family dwelling will generate 10 trips per day. This will not adversely impact the street network.

This site is served by public utilities, and the Joint Water & Sewer Commission (JWSC) has indicated that the proposal is compliant.

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 use is similar to the use and development of nearby properties.

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

No.

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

The Comprehensive Plan designates this site for low-density residential use.

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

No.

Again, the area was changed to commercial at the time of the re-routing of Carteret Road but was not subsequently redeveloped for commercial. The proposed zoning change would be consistent with the existing land uses. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Stewart stated that General Residential allows a great deal of latitude. He wanted to know if any other category had been considered, i.e., R-12. Mr. Phillips stated that R-12 is an option, and so is R-20. When the applicants approached staff and asked what their choices were, he suggested that because of the nature of the area, it is separated from the single-family area to the west by a drainage ditch and oriented to a street that serves commercial and institutional uses, that it might be to their advantage to consider some ability to have higher density residential. If the applicant is willing and if the Planning Commission concurs, the area could be placed in a single-family zoning district, i.e. R-12 or R-20. Mr. Stewart stated that the R-12 zoning would still allow the applicant to build a house. He then asked the applicant, Ms. Lynn Anderson, if she would have any objection to rezoning the property to an R-12 classification. Ms. Anderson indicated that she would not have a problem with the R-12 zoning.

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

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval to rezone Application ZM-2008-010 (M) from General Commercial to R-12. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

ZM-2008-016 (M)

Consider a request to rezone from R-20 One-Family Residential to Highway Commercial, property consisting of 2.66 acres located generally east of US 17 North and having 475.2 feet of frontage on Peek Road. The property addresses are 128 and 142 Peek Road. The purpose of the request is to allow outside storage of rental equipment in conjunction with a business conducted adjacent to the west. Parcel ID 03-00546 and 03-00550. Max B. Emery, owner and agent.

Mr. Emery was present for discussion.

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

The Glynn County Future Land Use Map depicts this property as Low Density Residential. It is noted that the property adjacent to the subject property to the west that fronts on Highway 17 is also depicted as Low Density Residential, while it is currently zoned Highway Commercial.

The property is currently being used to store equipment for the company on the adjacent property to the west, which is zoned Highway Commercial. The owner submitted a request to rezone to correct a discrepancy in the zoning district and existing use.

Engineering commented that the drainage on the site should be addressed, in that it is currently in use to store equipment. Further, the question was raised as to whether the current improvements were going to be approved by the county, which relates to the site already having improvements that have not undergone a site plan review and approval process, prior to the zoning request being submitted.

Engineering also commented that Peek Road was not intended for highway commercial traffic and suggested that a way to limit allowable use be explored.

The Department of Environmental Health had no objections to the rezoning request for the subject 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.

Yes, the use is suitable next to the existing site adjacent to the west and should be properly rezoned so that the existing use complies with the zoning permitted uses.

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

No it is not believed that it will adversely affect adjacent or nearby property; however, the issue about the ability of Peek Road to withstand heavy duty traffic has been raised by staff.

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

Yes, however the current use is not in compliance with existing zoning.

- 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, overall it will not; however, it is possible the road pavement associated with the subject property should be reinforced, which is a site plan issue.

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

No, as stated previously, the adjacent property to the west is not in conformity with the Future Land Use Map designation of Low Density Residential, either.

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

Yes, the property is currently used to store equipment. The zoning to HC to allow the zoning to be consistent with the adjacent use and current use is reasonable. The fact that the use precedes rezoning prompts the requirement that if rezoned, a site plan for the property such as would normally be submitted for review and approval must be submitted.

In conclusion, this business is operating with no apparent problems; however, it is not consistent with the zoning and must be either appropriately rezoned, or must cease. The owner has responded accordingly by submitting the rezoning request. Staff supports the rezoning request for the reasons stated previously. Also, a site plan must be submitted for the existing improvements to ensure they meet the requirements for site plan development, the same as undeveloped properties must.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that the Mainland Planning Commission recommend approval of the rezoning request to the Glynn County Board of Commissioners, and that the applicant further submit a site plan and undergo site plan review for approval of the improvements so that they may be revised as needed to meet Glynn County development standards.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Max Emery stated that he has been a good neighbor in this location for 38 years. He spoke with several of his neighbors who expressed concerns about parking trucks on Peek Road for loading/unloading purposes. He explained that there won't be any more traffic on the road than there is now and whether he rezoned the property or not, he would continue conducting the same business with the same amount of traffic. However, rezoning the property to commercial would allow him to conduct business more efficiently and safer.

Mr. Edmond Poppell and Mr. Chris Cain, adjacent property owners, were present to speak in favor of this request.

Mr. Glynn Bennett of 167 Peek Road stated that he has lived in the area for 46 years and he is not necessarily opposed to this request, but he is concerned about the likelihood of his property value decreasing if a commercial zoning is allowed. Mr. Stewart explained to Mr. Bennett the benefits of the site plan review process of which the owner will have to abide by if stipulated by the Planning Commission. He stated that the site plan is a tool designed to protect the neighbors. It allows staff, the Planning Commission as well as the neighbors a means to ensure that buffers, setbacks, access, etc. are adhered to even if the property changes ownership. Mr. Bennett thanked Mr. Stewart for this explanation.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson recommending approval of this rezoning with the stipulation that a site plan for the subject property be submitted for review in order that the property improvements demonstrate compliance with Glynn County development standards. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

ZM-2008-017 (M)

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agriculture to Highway Commercial, property consisting of 3.323 acres located on the west side of New Jesup Hwy. (US 341), approximately 780 feet north of its intersection with Crispen Boulevard, and with 205.47 ft. of frontage on US 341. The property address is 5463 New Jesup Hwy. The purpose of this request is to allow for future commercial development. Parcel ID: 03-06094. Ray P. Richard, agent for Robert F. Chapman, owner.

Mr. Richard was present for discussion.

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

In support of this rezoning, the applicant proposes to utilize the existing structure as an office, and will include a 20 ft. buffer on the west side of the property adjacent to Stately Oaks. The applicant has requested to remove the 50 ft. buffer outside of the property boundary to the south; however, since this involves a different property, this cannot be processed with this application. Furthermore, the buffer to the north must remain until the adjacent northern property is rezoned. Staff supports the request to rezone because the proposed zoning will contribute towards a greater sense of conformity throughout the corridor.

Georgia Department of Transportation approval/agreement is required for the change in use for the access to this site. Access to this parcel should be combined with access to the parcel to the north (planned for similar re-zoning). This would help limit the number of driveways on Highway341. Note: Drainage may be an issue for this site. State approval is needed for the use of the drainage system on Highway 341 and the county does not have drainage to this site sufficient to support the development.

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 area is primarily characterized by commercial development; however, the property to the west is residential and as a result, a buffer is proposed.

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

No, development of this site is not likely to adversely affect the use or usability of the development in the area.

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

Yes. The property is currently zoned Forest Agriculture and could be developed as such; however, rezoning the property to Highway Commercial would allow for commercial development that could increase the economic use, allowing for greater conformity of use within the corridor.

- 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 the project could produce an increase in average daily vehicle trips, at this time a commercial use as an office utilizing the existing structure is being proposed.

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

The Future Land Use Map shows the area as being used as Low Density Residential.

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

Yes. U.S. Highway 341 features a concentration of commercial development.

Ms. Wright stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Stewart wanted to know why the applicant did not pursue a PD rezoning as opposed to Highway Commercial. Mr. Richard explained that the site is very narrow and deep and in all likelihood it is going to become part of the site located to the south, which is already zoned Highway Commercial. Therefore, he is seeking a Highway Commercial zoning to be consistent with the property to the south of this site. Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Richard if he would submit a site plan with this project, to which he replied yes.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to recommend approval of this request subject to site plan approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

SU-2008-002 (M)

Consider a request for a special use permit for a drinking establishment in addition to the allowed use for a restaurant on a .697 acre property zoned Highway Commercial located on the west side of New Jesup Highway (US 341) approximately 600 feet north of its intersection with Oak Grove Road. The property has 282 feet of frontage on New Jesup Highway. The property address is 6461 New Jesup Highway. The project is known as “Tiffany’s Wine and Gourmet.” Parcel ID 03-05349. Tony Taylor Sr., applicant and owner. *Deferred from the March 3, 2008 regular meeting.*

Mr. Tony Taylor, Sr. was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission’s review and was presented by Mr. Hainley:

The application indicates that the site is vacant; however, county aerial photography and tax records indicate that a single-family structure is located on the property. The applicant proposes to construct a building on the property as a restaurant and drinking establishment.

The property is currently zoned Highway Commercial, which allows a drinking establishment by special use request before the Planning Commission plus approval by the Board of Commissioners.

Alcoholic beverages are allowed in restaurants within Highway Commercial zoning districts. However, both the licensing process and zoning district require a separation distance (two hundred (200) yards, or six hundred (600) feet, and five-hundred (500) feet respectively) from the nearest residential property. The nearest residential property is a mobile home park to the west of the site, which is estimated to be six-hundred forty-three (643) feet from the subject site property line to the mobile home park property line.

During the Mainland Planning Commission meeting of March 3, 2008 the question was raised as to whether the FA zoning district adjacent to the property was residential. The point was that the distance requirement would then not be met as called for in the ordinance. The County Attorney issued a verbal opinion that FA should be considered a residential district.

The site will undergo review at time of building plan submittal. A permit will be required for any access or work on US 341. Utilities review stated that in order to connect to the existing sewer system on Oak Grove Island Road, 1) a low pressure grinder pump station was to be installed; 2) the existing force main be tapped; and 3) a service would be installed from the force main to the pump station.

The Fire Department issued comments that the site is approved for the requested use.

The proposal is for a restaurant and sale of gourmet wines and desserts, which is a use not yet provided in this local and surrounding area. Based upon the County Attorney's opinion, this request does not meet requirements for the special use request under the Highway Commercial zoning. Therefore, staff recommends that this special use request be denied.

Mr. Tony Taylor gave a brief presentation. He pointed out that there is an abandoned house shown on the plat. He stated that he understands what the County Attorney's opinion is, but to his knowledge, a house is not allowed in Forest Agricultural zoning. The abandoned house is for sale for commercial purposes for 1.5 million dollars. Mr. Taylor stated that his property is legally zoned correctly for Highway Commercial and he should not be penalized or prevented from doing what he wants to do on his property when at the same time, the adjacent property is vacant. Chairman Nevill emphasized that this is a request for a special use permit for an alcohol related type use where specific requirements must be met. Mr. Taylor gave an example of another business involving the consumption of alcoholic beverages within the same distance of a residence similar to his proposal.

Mr. Stewart stated that Forest Agricultural zoning under Glynn County's current ordinance is residential. He stated that he does not have a problem with the applicant's proposal, but the Planning Commission has to follow the County Attorney's recommendation. He explained to Mr. Taylor that he is not being singled out. In fact, everyone was looking forward to a nice wine and cheese shop. Unfortunately, there just happens to be a zoning beside his property that is considered to be residential. Houses are built in Forest Agricultural districts all the time in Glynn County. Mr. Stewart reiterated that the Planning Commission has to abide by the County Attorney's recommendation. He advised Mr. Taylor that he has a right to challenge the County Attorney's opinion and appeal the Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Commissioners. Mr. Taylor indicated that he probably will appeal the decision.

There being no other discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart recommending denial of this request as submitted based on staff's findings and the County Attorney's legal opinion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

ZM-2008-018 (M)

Consider a request to amend the Planned Development Text for the Interstate Commercial Park for a property consisting of 8.785 acres located approximately 550 feet east of US 341 at the east end of South Commercial Drive, and approximately 950 feet north of Crispin Boulevard. The property has 60 feet of frontage on South Commercial Drive and 180 feet of frontage on Design Court off North Commercial Drive. The request is to amend buffer, easement, and signage requirements. Parcel ID: 03-09385. P & A Engineering, agent for Fortune 2000, Inc., owner.

Mr. Johnathan Roberts was present for discussion.

This request is to amend a portion (8.375 acres) of a larger planned development. In 2000 this portion of the PD was amended to allow a hospice to be located at this site. At that time, a zoning condition was added requiring a 30 ft. buffer adjacent to certain lots. The zoning of the property was amended again in 2006 to allow a multi-family development in place of the hospice. The zoning condition concerning the buffer was not modified at the time of the 2006 amendment.

This application is a request to amend the PD text for the multi-family site, and to clean-up other language in the text to allow the development to move forward. The requested items are:

1. In lieu of a 30 ft. visual and noise buffer adjacent to lots 6, 7, and 8 a 7 ft. high block wall fence will be built along the property line.
2. The 20 ft. conservation easement along the western property boundary of the tract shall not be required.
3. The signs for the development shall comply with Article VIII, Section 810.1 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

There are some access and drainage issues that need to be clarified during the building permit process. This site will require review as a Planning Commission Site Plan. Also, the site will be served by the Joint Water & Sewer Commission.

Access has been restricted as a zoning condition during the previous amendment to this PD as an attempt to control traffic. The proposed use of the site is not to change access, and therefore will not affect the expected traffic.

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 use is not requested to be changed. The conditions of the site are requested to be amended. In addition there is an existing multi-family development adjacent to this site, which is consistent with the proposed use.

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

No, the proposed use is consistent with the 2000 amendment allowing a multi-family use of the site.

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

Yes, however the existing zoning conditions and PD text restrict the project from developing as stated by the applicant.

- 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 is not requested to be changed. The only proposed changes deal with buffers, easements, and signage.

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

Yes, the proposed use is consistent with the future land use 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 applicant has provided support from the affected adjacent property owners in writing.

The proposed request does not change the existing permitted use of the site. The proposed changes do not appear to have an adverse affect on the property or the development of the planned development. In addition, the applicant has worked with adjacent property owners who support the proposed change. Therefore, staff's recommendation is for approval.

Chairman Nevill stated that in meeting with staff, the applicant and the adjacent landowner concerning this item, they all felt that the 7 ft. high block wall would be a much better sound buffer between the two properties based upon the commercial use next door. A block wall would also provide better security than a chain linked fence.

Mr. Stewart had questions concerning water & sewer issues with the City of Brunswick in relation to the hospice facility. Mr. Johnathan Roberts, agent for the owner, stated that they met with Timothy Ransom of the JWSC concerning these issues, which have now been resolved. He stated that they intend to route the sewer so that it can go into the adjacent pump station.

Mr. Stewart had additional questions regarding previous discussions about routing some of the traffic on Crispen Boulevard to help with the traffic problems on Commercial Drive at Highway 341. Mr. Phillips stated that he doesn't recall anything specific about Crispen Boulevard. However, there was discussion of whether or not this link of Design Court should be tied in. It was also discussed significantly at the Board of Commissioners level to not permit the 57 units. A comment was included from County Engineering that when the building permit plans are actually reviewed that there be an indication from GA DOT as to the impact on the entrance.

Mr. Alistair Hoff stated that he owns property to the northwest, Lots 8 and 9 on Commercial Drive. He stated that he agreed with the owner regarding the 7 ft. block buffer and thinks that it is a good solution. He pointed out that his only concern has partially been addressed, which is that the traffic would not be routed in and out of Design Court. It is a very narrow road with a square intersection. Mr. Hoff indicated that he has no objection to this development as long as Design Court is not used for traffic in and out of the applicant's development.

At this time, Chairman Nevill read the site plan application (*SP-2008-008 M*) into the record.

SP-2008-008 (M) Plantation Oaks

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for a 57-unit multi-family project located at the northeast end of Commercial Drive, approximately 550 feet from its intersection with US 341. The property is zoned Planned Development and is part of the Interstate Commercial Park Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-09385. Jonathan Roberts, agent for Fortune 2000, Inc., owner.

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

This property abuts Design Court off North Commercial Drive, but would not have access from that street. A major Georgia Power transmission line easement crosses the rear (east side) of the property. Properties to the north and west are in commercial and industrial use. An apartment complex is located to the south.

There is also a request for approval of an amendment to the planned development zoning text to modify required buffers and to establish signage provisions. This proposed site plan is subject to the approval of the amendment to the planned development, and any approval will not be effective unless the amendment is approved. The proposed site plan is consistent with the proposed text amendment.

Engineering staff has indicated that there are some issues that can be addressed through the building permit plan review process. There is an opportunity at this time to address the temporary cul-de-sac easement shown at the end of Design Court (referred to as Commercial Drive East on the plans). This would be the appropriate time to vacate the easement, if appropriate. In addition, there are three lots shown as fronting on the private driveway east of the end of South Commercial Drive. These lots are part of parcels that also have access on North Commercial Drive. While no action is required, it should be pointed out that if these lots are separated from the remaining parcel, access may be an issue.

Access has been restricted as a zoning condition during the previous amendment to this PD as an attempt to control traffic. The proposed use of the site is not to change access, and therefore will not affect the expected traffic. Engineering suggests that GA DOT approval be obtained for the added trips entering US 341.

This site will be served by the Joint Water and Sewer Commission.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that the request for site plan approval be approved, subject to meeting all requirements. Note that approval of the site plan is subject to approval of the pending change in the planned development text, and will not be effective unless the text change is approved.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson, seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted to recommend approval to amend the PD text for application **ZM-2008-018 (M)** as follows:

1. In lieu of a 30 ft. visual and noise buffer adjacent to lots 6, 7, and 8 a 7 ft. high block wall fence will be built along the property line.
2. The 20 ft. conservation easement along the western property boundary of the tract shall not be required.
3. The signs for the development shall comply with Article VIII, Section 810.1 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

A motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to approve application **SP-2008-008 (M)** for site plan approval for Plantation Oaks, subject to meeting all requirements and subject to approval of the pending change in the planned development text. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

SP-2008-005 (M) Flanagan's Bluff Phase II

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for a residential development consisting of twenty dwelling units (including single-family attached and detached units). The project is located on the south side of Fancy Bluff Road approximately 800 feet west of its intersection with Boykin Ridge Drive, and is north of the Pilot Travel Center. The property is zoned Planned Development and is part of the Flanagan's Bluff Planned Development. Parcel ID: 02-00830. Turnpike Creek LLC, owner.

Messrs. John Hunkele, Jim Flanagan and Gene Brockington were present for discussion.

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

This proposed site plan appears to be consistent with the uses, layout and density approved for the planned development in 2007. The first phase has been approved as a preliminary plat and consists of 15 single-family dwellings on individual lots.

This project will be served by Fancy Bluff Road. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) data suggests that this project will generate an average of 200 (10 trips per DU*20 DU) daily trips based on the number of dwelling units. The proposed access is private. The site is proposed to be served by county water and sewer.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that this request be approved as being consistent with the planned development zoning.

At this time, Mr. Stewart commended the developers and the neighbors for their accomplishments and thanked them for working together on this project. Afterward, he made a motion to approve the site plan for Phase II of Flanagan's Bluff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

SP-2008-006 (M) MAP International

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for a property located on the south side of Glyngo Parkway west of its intersection with Sidney Lanier Boulevard. The property address is 2700 Glyngo Parkway. The project consists of two adjacent buildings - a 39,820 square foot warehouse and a 15,425 square foot office building - with an aggregate square footage of 55,245 square feet, plus associated parking on 16.483 acres. A portion of the site is zoned General Industrial and a portion is zoned Planned Development. The project is known as "MAP International." Parcel ID 03-09782. W. Michael Smith, representative for Map International, owner.

Mr. Kevin Barber was present for discussion.

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

The property is described on the application as vacant but the proposed use is for an office and warehouse.

The proposed project meets the zoning requirements and the site plan was found compliant with site plan submittal requirements. According to the Planned Development zoning district regulations, all property that is developed within the Brunswick-McBride Industrial Park must be approved by the Industrial Authority in order to be approved by Glynn County.

The application file contains a letter from the Brunswick and Glynn County Development Authority that the plan has been approved with two releases from: 1) requiring they maintain a 35 ft. railroad right-of-way easement; and 2) stipulating that no parking be constructed between the street right-of-way line and the building setback line.

The Development Authority requested of the developer (in the letter) to review the developer's landscape plans in order to ensure a vegetative buffer line of site be adequate to mitigate the visual impact of the main parking area from Glynco Parkway.

Engineering indicated that the plan is compliant for site plan submission.

Public utilities for the site are provided through Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Water and Sewer Commission.

Based on staff comments, no specific public safety or fire protection issues are anticipated for the subject property.

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

Mr. Buddy Hutchinson wanted to know if there are any changes planned for the small lake in the area. Mr. Phillips stated that according to the site plan, the lake will probably get bigger.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve the site plan for Map International. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted.

SP-2008-007 (M) Maloy's Cove

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for property located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifth Street and Habersham Street. The project consists of a total of 15,576 sq. ft. and includes 12 residential duplex units on 1.24 acres. The property is zoned General Residential. Parcel ID: 03-08139 and 03-08140. The property is owned by Mr. Greg Crosby.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer with Tidewater Engineering and Mr. Greg Crosby, were present for discussion.

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

The proposed site plan features 12 residential duplex units (6 buildings); however, the property has not been subdivided into individual lots and is required by ordinance (§706.4) to demonstrate a maximum density of 10 units per acre. This project is proposing 12 dwelling units on 1.24 acres, which equals 9.68 dwelling units per acre, thereby meeting the requirement.

Habersham Street is unopened, and it should be noted that there is to be no direct access from this property to Habersham Street. The details of construction will be reviewed with the Building Permit Site Plan (BPSP). The location of drainage easements, if needed, will also be sorted out with the BPSP. It is assumed that all the work shown on the plans will be completed (no phasing). If that is not the case, the phasing lines should be shown. Also, it may be helpful to the residents to provide some area to use for turning around at the end of the parking.

The Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) data suggests that this project will generate an average of 120 daily trips based on the number of dwelling units.

Utilities find this site plan compliant with the following conditions: the Joint Water & Sewer Commission has requested that in lieu of a saddle manhole, show a note to install a typical manhole. Show the existing sewer mains reconnected at the flexible boot.

Ms. Wright stated that staff's recommendation is for approval subject to meeting all requirements.

Chairman Nevill expressed concerns about the type of ownership associated with this proposal and wanted to know if it is going to be condo development or an apartment complex because it doesn't appear to be a traditional type subdivision. Mr. Peter Schoenauer explained that this development is being proposed as a single ownership by the owner/applicant for rental purposes. It won't be fee simple ownership.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve site plan application SP-2008-007 (M) subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.