

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

JUNE 3, 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

**May 6, 2008 Regular Meeting
Amendment November 6, 2006**

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the Minutes of the *May 6, 2008* Mainland Planning Commission meeting, and to approve the amendment to the Minutes of the *November 6, 2006* meeting which consist of including five conditions that were inadvertently omitted from Application PP-2006-035. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

Agenda - Changes, Additions, Deferrals, Postponements

Deferral: Upon staff's request, a motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby to defer Application **ZM1242 ZM-2007-004(M)** until the July 1, 2008 Mainland Planning Commission meeting to allow for additional review of the site plan in relation to this rezoning. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

Deferral: It was the consensus of the Planning Commission, with concurrence from the applicant, to conduct one (or two if deemed necessary) workshop meeting(s) for an in-depth discussion of Application **ZM1199 ZM-2008-015(M)** due to the number of revisions associated with the PD Text. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart, seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted to defer this request until the July 1, 2008 Mainland Planning Commission meeting. (In the meantime, one or two workshop meetings will be conducted prior to the July 1st Regular Meeting)

ZM1208 ZM-2008-006 (M) Patterson Heights

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural and Mobile Home Park to Mh-6 One-Family Residential, property consisting of 40 +/- acres located at the east end of Cassell Road and west of the Norfolk Southern Railroad. The property is within the Patterson Heights subdivision. Parcel ID: 03-05192. Property owned by Robert G. Boone.

Mr. Bobby Boone and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

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

This site was platted in the 1950's with limited infrastructure, and was zoned partially for mobile homes. The applicant seeks to have the option of constructing conventional homes, thus necessitating the rezoning. A portion of the site is served by streets built according to the platted layout, and drainage improvements were made within the last few years. A private central water system has been permitted for a portion of the project, and will be augmented for the entire development.

Subsequent to its first comments, the Health Department staff has reviewed the site and indicates that the site can be developed, subject to the following:

1. Limit individual unit sizes to 1,000 square feet for both mobile homes and conventional homes;
2. Limit individual units to 1 and 2 bedrooms (60% minimum of 1 bedroom units and 40% maximum of 2 bedroom units); and

3. Establish under drains along lot lines with outfall to ditches to draw down water table overall.

Engineering has expressed concern that development of this area will contribute to drainage problems in the area. Note that the property is already platted and is available for development. Staff will use a version of the construction plan review process to ensure that new infrastructure (including the water system, drainage improvements, and street construction) meets applicable standards.

Traffic Safety indicates no problems. This site is served by Cassell Road, which serves several other developments off New Sterling Road. The current plat indicates that the development could contain as many as 131 dwellings, including those that are already in existence. Based on Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) information, this number of units could produce from 630 daily trips for mobile homes up to 1,254 daily trips for conventional residential structures. 2002 data shows New Sterling Road as carrying approximately 1,800 trips each day.

There are no public utilities available. A portion of the development has been approved for service with a private central water system. The lack of central sewer service, coupled with the poor soil conditions in this area, contributes to a potential for future problems. As a platted subdivision, however, there may be little that can be done other than to mitigate such problems through design.

The Fire Department indicates that a central water system with hydrants will be necessary to serve the site due to the number of dwelling units expected with this 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 characterized by a mix of single family dwellings and mobile homes, although recent development more commonly consists of conventionally constructed homes.

- 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 have a substantial affect on other 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 was platted for single-family use and can 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 the project could produce a substantial increase in average daily vehicle trips, the property has already been platted.

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

Yes. The Future Land Use Map shows the area as being used 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.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that this request be approved subject to 1) development of a private central water system capable of meeting standards for fire protection, 2) each lot meeting the requirements of the Health Department, and 3) review and approval of construction plans for improvements.

Mr. Wayne Stewart stated that Patterson Heights has changed tremendously and the impact of this proposed development could be devastating to the area and to the residents with regard to drainage and environmental issues. He stated that he would prefer to have a workshop meeting with the developers and the adjoining property owners so that everyone fully understands the project. He would also like for Mr. Paul Andrews of the Engineering Department and Mr. O'Brian of the Environmental Health Department to attend the workshop to participate in the discussion and answer questions. Additionally, instead of rezoning the property to Mh-6, Mr. Stewart suggested that the applicant consider converting the property into a PD text.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that during his site visit, he spoke with four neighbors who were not aware of this rezoning. Although the rezoning sign was placed on the property in accordance with the guidelines of the ordinance, he felt that it was not clearly visible enough for the residents. He suggested that additional letters be mailed to the neighbors notifying them of the request, as well as additional ads being placed in the Brunswick News. Mr. Stewart stated that all of the residents have a right to know exactly what is about to take place in their neighborhood, which is why he would rather defer this request and have a workshop meeting before taking action on this application. By a show

of hands (at Mr. Stewart's request) approximately 15 residents were in attendance for discussion of this item.

For clarification, Chairman Nevill explained that the applicant is actually upgrading the property. He could in fact start building houses on the property in its current zoning and put a well and a septic tank on each individual lot.

Regarding the status of this property, Mr. Hainley explained that the GIS map does not truly reflect the recorded subdivision over this particular area as recorded back in the early 50's. There are a number of existing lots and platted streets that were dedicated to the county that were not approved. Mr. O'Brien of the Environmental Health Department is involved with the difficulties of the recorded lots.

Mr. Stewart stated that if this request proceeds, although it is an upgrade, several citizens will complain that they were not properly notified, simply because they did not see the sign. He suggested placing another public hearing sign in a more visible location and advised staff to mail additional letters to the neighbors. Mr. Stewart stressed that Mr. Shupe and Mr. Boone are both honorable men and he assured the residents that they are not harboring secrets. However, he was adamant about conducting a workshop to enlighten the citizens of what is about to take place in their neighborhood.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Bobby Shupe stated that he began working with the applicant, Mr. Boone, on the property in 1989. As previously pointed out, he stated that these are lots-of-record and the applicant can use the property in the way that it is currently zoned. However, it was Mr. Boone's understanding that it would be better to change the zoning in order to be consistent, and the future development of the lots would not create non conforming situations. The applicant's plan for developing the property is going to take it through a process that requires the County Engineering's review. All of the improvements for roads will be done under the current regulations. The applicant has approved plans for the first half of the development and will build per the county regulations for the roads. He does intend to submit the plans for the second half and will do everything relative to drainage and building the roadbeds to county specifications.

Mr. Shupe stated that they have met with Mr. O'Brien of Environmental Health who does not have to approve any waste treatment facilities on any lots unless they meet his requirements. Mr. Boone has actually signed the contract to put in a central water system for the first half of the project. His development for the second half will be done in the same manner. Although this project will not go through the preliminary plat final process, it will have to go through the entire review of the county. As pointed out by Mr. Stewart, Mr. Shupe stated that Mr. Boone is not trying to hide anything, but if this project is creating a problem for the neighbors, he would be willing to withdraw his application and use his property as it is currently zoned.

At this time, Chairman Nevill opened the floor for public comments beginning with Mr. Pobanz of 115 Eagles Nest who stated that he and his wife are in favor of this request. He pointed out that he just received his tax bill and has noticed a 50% increase.

Therefore, the area is growing. He stated that his only concern is staff's comment regarding the 2002 data about transportation and schools, indicating that there are approximately 1800 trips each day in the area. He stated that the growth in the area has caused safety concerns on Castle Road and there is also a tremendous amount of traffic on New Sterling Road. Mr. Pobanz feels that the transportation data needs to be updated. Overall he has no problem with this development and he is soliciting approval from the Planning Commission for Mr. Boone to build the new homes in the area.

There were no other comments from the public and no one was present to oppose this request.

Chairman Nevill reiterated that the applicant could develop the property in its current zoning. The installation of a water system would also offer fire protection. He stated that he is not sure that a PD text would be an absolute solution other than possibly reducing the number of lots. Mr. Stewart stated that perhaps a PD text is not the solution but he still feels that a workshop would give everyone a better understanding of the development.

Mr. Crosby stated that although there is no opposition, he's not sure if the residents fully understand what is actually taking place, and he feels that a workshop would be a great opportunity for everyone to ask questions, etc.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this request and allow staff to set up an informative workshop and invite Mr. Paul Andrews of the Engineering Department, Mr. Mike O'Brian of Environmental Health and the Traffic Safety Engineer to participate in the discussion. Afterward, the item should be placed on the July 1st Mainland Planning Commission meeting agenda for action. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby. Discussion continued. Mr. Stewart suggested that if it could be arranged, perhaps the meeting should take place at the Sterling Elementary School for the convenience of the residents.

Mr. Eric Croft pointed out that the property was already platted but the members have not seen the plat. He then asked if the property is going to be developed as originally platted and if so, could the applicant bring a copy of the plat to the workshop for review. Mr. Shupe stated that the property will be used as platted and a copy of the plat will be provided at the meeting.

Mr. Jason Counts stated that with this property being platted in the 50's he feels that it could be moved ahead without coming to this board. He stated that what the applicant is trying to do is above board and this proposal is an improvement. Therefore, he doesn't really see the need for another meeting. Mr. Crosby explained that he doesn't think another meeting is to deter anything that has come forward. He reiterated that the extra meeting is for the residents to understand what is actually taking place. Mr. Brunson pointed out that in an informative meeting the residents will be able to understand the alternatives and Mr. Boone certainly has an alternative. He can go ahead

and develop his property as it is platted right now. He owns the land, he has property rights and he is a citizen of the United States of America.

There being no further discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for deferral: Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Eric Croft, Mr. Buck Crosby, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Jason Counts and Mr. Gary Nevill.

ZM1190 Crispen Development, LLC

Consider a request to modify a zoning stipulation requiring a fifty (50) ft. buffer on the north side of property located at 309 Crispen Boulevard. The property is located on the west side of US 341 and consists of 8.27 acres with 469.06 feet of frontage on US 341. Parcel ID: 03-06093. Ray P. Richard, agent for Crispen Development, LLC, owner.

Mr. Ray Richard was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting to remove the 50 ft. buffer to the north, since the adjacent property to the north (Chapman Property *ZM1194 ZM-2008-017 M*) is in the process of being rezoned from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial and received a recommendation to approve the rezoning from the Mainland Planning Commission on May 6, 2008, and will subsequently be heard by the Board of Commissioners on June 5, 2008 for final action. As a result, approval of the request to remove the 50 ft. buffer as part of this rezoning, *ZM1190* Crispen Development LLC, shall be subject to the approval of the rezoning of the Chapman Property (*ZM1194 ZM-2008-017 M*), the abutting property to the north located at 5463 New Jesup Highway.

Engineering understands that this request is to remove the 50 ft. buffer along the western property line because of a re-zoning of the site adjacent. As such, has no issue with this rezoning. Note: It may be a good opportunity to try to coordinate the two commercial developments with regard to traffic and utilities. Fewer driveways onto Highway 341 would be a benefit to the area.

There are no existing water and sewer facilities within the buffer area. The Fire Department as well as Transportation 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 area is characterized by commercial development and the property located to the north is in the process of being rezoned from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial. As a result, the applicant is requesting to remove the 50 ft. buffer on-site to expand the opportunities for potential development.

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

No, in fact, the removal of the 50 ft. buffer will advance the potential for development of this site and the adjacent property to the north and is unlikely to adversely affect 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 Highway Commercial and could be developed as such; however, the removal of the 50 ft. buffer will expand the level of opportunities for development.

- 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 removal of the 50 ft. buffer alone is unlikely to result in an excessive or burdensome use of 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.

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 and the removal of the 50 ft. buffer will advance the property's development potential.

Ms. Wright stated that staff recommends approval of *ZM1190* to remove the 50 ft. buffer on the north side of the property, subject to the approval of *ZM1194* by the Board of Commissioners.

In a brief statement, Mr. Richard acknowledged that he is soliciting the Planning Commission's approval of this request.

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of **ZM1190** to remove the 50 ft. buffer on the north side of the property, subject to the approval of **ZM1194** by the Board of Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

ZM1192 Cottage Grove

Consider a request to amend the Planned Development Text for property located on the west side of Chanslor Road and containing 44.3 acres with 2,179.46 feet of frontage on Chanslor Road. The request is to 1) amend the lot width requirement, and 2) allow subdivision signage per the R-6 District. The property is zoned Planned Development and is in the Cottage Grove Planned Development. Parcel ID 03-19242. EMC Engineering, agent for Cottage Grove Holdings, LLC, owner.

Mr. Kip Goodbread was present for discussion.

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

This request is to eliminate the requirement that the lot width be 45 feet at some point on the lot, and to allow signage as provided for the R-6 zoning district.

The site is in an area which is undergoing significant development, and is served by water and sewer. The subject property was rezoned in 2004 to allow one-family attached units. Subsequently, it was determined that there were some discrepancies between the plat and the planned development text, and these were corrected. More recently, the developer discovered some additional issues and has made this application to correct these issues. The proposed corrections will not materially change the character of the development and will facilitate compliance with the overall concept.

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 change is consistent with the use of the property.

- 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; however, the discrepancies lead to confusion which should be corrected.

- 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 Future Land Use Map indicates this site for Agriculture and Forestry 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.

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

Chairman Nevill stated that he has a problem with totally doing away with the lot width. He stated that there is however a 3000 ft. minimum lot size after the splitting that is still in place, but he has a problem with totally doing away with the lot width.

Mr. Kip Goodbread stated that from his understanding there are some lots where each lot has a common sanitary sewer line. In some places it does not hit exactly at a mid point for dividing the lots, but would be alright if there is a lot line that comes down through the center of the house, jogs over and matches up with the sanitary sewer. He pointed out that the county is not really in favor of having jogs in lot lines that may potentially produce problems later. Chairman Nevill stated that he wasn't really sure if there was some sort of easement that could have been done when the lots were split.

Mr. Stewart suggested that this issue be handled through staff on an individual basis, because completely removing the lot width could cause major problems. He feels that if there is just a question of one or two lots with about 42 to 43 ft. it would probably not cause much of a problem. However, completely doing away with the lot width, in his opinion, "is playing with fire." Chairman Nevill agreed that there needs to be a lot width in place but he is not sure if it is just the matter of the sanitary sewer line that is in

question that possibly could not be handled by an easement. Mr. Hainley stated that this is being handled without the benefit of knowing all of the models that are being proposed and the configuration of them. Right now staff has to deal with the 45 ft., which is contained in the zoning text. There has to be 45 ft. on some part of the lot.

Mr. Hainley explained that during recent discussions, they talked about figuring out a magic number and determined that the number should probably be in the mid upper 30's to ensure that all requirements are met. There are a lot of other performance requirements; i.e., separation between units and minimum lot sizes that would also trigger the size of the lot. There is also a cap of the number of units involved.

Mr. Stewart wanted to know the number of lots in question. Mr. Hainley stated he believes that staff is aware of about 10 lots that are problematic from the current configuration and location. Chairman Nevill stated that he would like a confirmation on a number. Mr. Goodbread stated that he could work with 30 ft. lots. Mr. Hainley suggested a minimum of 35 ft. and anything less than that would come before the Planning Commission for approval. He stated that the lots are capped at 10. Mr. Goodbread concurred.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to recommend approval of **ZM1192** to change the PD text by removing the 45 ft. lot width and replacing it with a 35 ft. minimum lot width. Any lot less than 35 ft. is required to come back to the Planning Commission for approval as an expedited subdivision. Also, allow signage as provided for R-6 developments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

SP1197 Fairhaven Assisted Living Center II

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for property located on the southeast side of Glynco Parkway approximately 1,600 feet east of its intersection with Charing Cross. The property consists of 4 acres with approximately 500 feet of frontage on Glynco Parkway. The project involves the expansion of the Fairhaven Assisted Living Center. The property is zoned Planned Development and is in the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development. Parcel ID 03-14372. Gary Moore, agent for Fairhaven Assisted Living Center, owner.

Attorney Gary Moore was present for discussion.

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

This is a proposal to expand an existing facility. A recent amendment was made to the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development Text to allow an increase in the height of the building and to allow a reduced setback adjacent to a wetland area. That amendment was made subject to the 1) applicant's acknowledgement that the current sewer lift station capacity problem might delay issuance of permits, 2) an agreement that the county will be held harmless from consequences of any delay in issuance of a building permit and/or certificate of occupancy due to this capacity problem, and 3) the applicant's assurance that the two properties will be kept together.

There was a concern with the adequacy of the existing parking, with some parking currently occurring on the Glynco Parkway right-of-way. Staff is reviewing this issue with the design engineer and will present additional information to the Planning Commission.

The Traffic Safety Engineering has found the request non-compliant, commenting that the design should include a deceleration lane.

According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Traffic manual, the additional beds would generate a total of 63 additional trips. Note that a very small percentage of these trips occur in either the AM or PM peak hour. The most recent data (2002) shows this segment of Glynco Parkway as serving 2,500 daily trips.

Sewer capacity is not currently available to the site, and not anticipated to be in place for several months. Therefore the applicant is cautioned that building permits will not be issued unless the owner signs an agreement holding the county harmless in the event of delays resulting from this situation, and further that certificates of occupancy will not be issued until the capacity problem is resolved.

The Fire Department has found this request to be non-compliant.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of this request subject to 1) compliance with the stipulations of the zoning change, 2) resolution of the parking issue, and 3) provision of a deceleration lane.

Chairman Nevill wanted to know the basis for the parking issue as to whether the number of required parking is causing the concern. Mr. Phillips stated that staff knows how many parking spaces are required under the ordinance, but what they don't know is if there are any unusual aspects to the project, or whether the ordinance is perhaps outdated as to what the appropriate parking ratio might need to be in terms of the activities for this type of project.

For clarification, Mr. Wayne Stewart asked Mr. Phillips if the applicant needs to increase the number of parking or decrease the parking. Mr. Phillips replied that the parking needs to be increased, but at this point staff is really not sure yet. He stated that they have done some technical research but with this type of use over the course of time

the patterns of activities can change. He explained that staff is not proposing to require a lot of additional parking but the situation does need to be examined closely.

Mr. Stewart wanted to know the current amount of beds in the facility. Mr. Phillips stated that there are 81 beds and the standard in the ordinance is one space per four beds plus a certain number of spaces for staff. The proposed addition with the total at that time will meet the requirement, but he is not exactly sure how many beds there are now.

In addressing the parking, Mr. Gary Moore stated that he is not sure where the 81 figure came from but their calculations indicate that there will be 100 beds and the requirement in the code is one parking space for every four beds, which gives them 25. In addition, the code requires them to have one parking space for every two regular shift employees and there are 16 of those (8 plus 25 which is 33). He stated that they have anywhere from 33 to 35, depending on what the fire lane takes away from them. Mr. Moore stated that they have met the requirements of the code, so there is no parking issue and he is respectfully asking that the parking stipulation be removed.

Regarding the provision of the decel lane, Mr. Moore stated that at present, this facility is not a high traffic volume generator. It is an assisted living center. Most of the people living there do not drive. What is coming soon is the enclave. The starting phase of the enclave has 288 multi-family units. There will also potentially be another phase consisting of 110 units. He pointed out that they have requirements for parking spaces of 576 with this particular development that's coming on line immediately with perhaps another 220 for a possible total of 800 parking places. Therefore, he feels that they are the ones who should build excel-decel lanes or whatever else is necessary.

Mr. Moore stated that the provision of a deceleration lane at this time is not only unnecessary but it causes an undue hardship on the applicant who would in essence have to be subsidizing the oncoming development. Therefore, he is asking that the provision of a deceleration lane also be removed. He stated that they will certainly comply with the stipulations of the zoning change as noted in staff's recommendation. The Planning Commission concurred.

Following a brief presentation by the owner, Ms. Kelly Landford who corroborated points made by Mr. Moore, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve **SP1197**, the site plan for Fairhaven Assisted Living Center, Phase II, with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

SP1211 SP-2008-009 (M) The Retreat at Golden Isles

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for property generally located north of S.R. 99 and east of the extension of Golden Isles Parkway on Racehorse Road. The project is to be built in three phases, and consists of single-family attached condominiums, with four (4) dwelling units in each of thirty-five (35) buildings on 24.57 acres and with public water and sewer. The property is zoned Planned Development. Parcel ID 03-22251. Property owned by Ron Sluder.

Mr. Ron Sluder 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 appears to depict the area within which the site is located as Undeveloped/Unused, Agriculture/Forestry and Low Density Residential. The proposed use is for residential single-family attached.

Distances and bearings as submitted describing the location of the project do not close and must be corrected. The approximate 25 acre site is generally located between recently approved site plan submittals for “The Estates at Golden Isles” to the north, and “The Plantation at Golden Isles” to the south, with which the subject project, “The Retreat at Golden Isles,” shares an amenity center. A mail facility is to be in each of the buildings to serve the four units within them. Trash pick up is to be by individual containers at the curb.

Density of the project is 5.62 units per upland acre, which is within the approved Planned Development Zoning requirements for the property under the Golden Isles Gateway zoning. This Planned Development allows multi-family units that meet Glynn County’s General Residential zoning requirements.

Engineering staff commented that the wetland jurisdiction line will need to be depicted in the construction plans. Also, comments on the proposed phasing were based on the understanding that there would be no future subdivision of the property into individual lots.

The roads are proposed to be private. Parking for each unit is proposed to be provided on building sites, as well as single car garages.

Public utilities of water and sewer for the site are to be provided through Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Water and Sewer Commission. Engineering staff advised that the proposed phasing of the building construction will need to be mirrored for water and sewer utilities so that inspections can be performed on each phase as it is completed.

There were no site plan related problems mentioned for public and fire safety purposes.

Mr. Phillips stated that as noted in the report, this project is indicated in three phases. He then pointed out the following issues associated with this proposal:

- 1) Clarification needs to be noted as to where the phase lines are, which is important because certain pieces of the infrastructure are going to have to be developed ahead of other pieces so that if at some point the project does not get completed, all of the necessary infrastructure to support what is developed will in fact be the case;
- 2) Construction plan review will be necessary and some easements will need to be dedicated for some of the infrastructure; and
- 3) The project consists of some parking in garages and some parking in driveways, but to ensure that there will be an adequate number of parking spaces in accordance with the ordinance, staff is suggesting a deed restriction requiring permanent use of the garages with no conversions, i.e., converting the garage into another room, which would detract from the overall parking provided.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff's recommendation is for approval of *SP2008 009 (M)* The Retreat at Golden Isles.

Mr. Buddy Hutchinson wanted to know what road would be used as an entrance into the development. Mr. Phillips stated that there is a network of roads in the area that are being developed as part of other projects. Mr. Ron Sluder, the applicant, further explained that the road that will connect the two projects will tie in with the main road that goes into the Plantation, which will be completed within three weeks. He stated that they will basically have a temporary cul-de-sac until they tie in with the other project. He pointed out that there are about four projects with one main road that goes through the center to access all four projects. The fourth project will be forthcoming hopefully next month.

Mr. Sluder stated that he was not aware of staff's suggestion about the deed restriction, but the issue of enclosing the garages is not covered in the restrictive covenants. He does not have a problem with this but it is difficult to monitor what people do with their homes after purchasing the property. He just doesn't know how this could be enforced.

Mr. Stewart stated that with the parking situation, and although this is not included in staff's recommended motion, it appears to him that the best way to contain this problem is through a deed restriction. Mr. Sluder explained that the area is not an open parking lot. The driveways are separated and there are individual garages, which is more like a house rather than a duplex. In fact, he stated that it would be cheaper for him not to build the garages, but they give the property a better appeal. He noted that the restrictive covenants have not yet been done.

For clarification, Mr. Eric Croft asked if there could possibly be some units without a garage, yet the unit could be built with a separate room with the same width driveway. Mr. Sluder replied yes. Mr. Croft then noted that the owner could have an extra den and still have one parking space out front. Mr. Sluder replied yes, the owner could actually have the garage and then one parking space and a driveway, similar to a single-family residence.

After this clarification was noted, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to not include the deed restriction. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Eric Croft to approve *SP2008009 (M)* The Retreat at Golden Isles as submitted, with no deed restriction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart and unanimously adopted.

SP1221 Canal Road Plaza, Phase 2

Consider a request for approval of a site plan for property located southeast of the intersection of Canal Road and Glynco Parkway. The original project consisted of 21,000 square feet of retail space on 2.943 acres and was approved in April, 2007. This phase adds a single building measuring 1,891 square feet for a total of 22,891. The proposal also makes slight changes in the circulation and parking, as well as in the utility system. The property is zoned Planned Development and is within the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-12107. RMW Properties, owner.

Mr. Don Hutchinson was present for discussion.

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

The original project (consisted of 21,000 square feet of retail space on 2.943 acres) was approved in April, 2007. This phase adds a single building measuring 1,891 square feet for a total of 22,891. The proposal also makes slight changes in the on-site traffic circulation and parking, as well as in the utility system.

The Joint Water & Sewer Commission has reviewed the request and found it to be compliant. The issues raised by GIS Mapping can be addressed with the Building Permit Site Plan.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of *SP1221* Canal Road Plaza, Phase II.

Mr. Don Hutchinson respectfully asked for the Planning Commission's approval of this site plan request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve *SP1221* Canal Road Plaza, Phase II, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-001 Site Plans

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

The proposed amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this is an updated amendment to replace in its entirety the provision dealing with site plan approval by clarifying the degree of change that is permitted without additional Planning Commission review. It also expands the types of developments for which site plan review is required and upgrades content and review provisions.

Mr. Hainley reported that punctuation and typographical corrections made by the Islands Planning Commission at its May 20th meeting have been included in this proposed version. He stated that staff recommends approval of the proposed updated amendment.

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for site plan approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-006 Buffers

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

The proposed amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this amendment replaces the existing Section 613 and establishes several types of buffers with specifications of each. It also

creates alternatives for certain types of buffers and identifies situations within which buffers are required, as well as identifies the type of buffer required.

Mr. Hainley reported that punctuation and typographical changes made by the Islands Planning Commission have been included in this proposal. He stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for buffers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

TA-2008-007 Exterior Lighting

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

The proposed amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this proposal establishes requirements and limitations for exterior lighting.

Mr. Hainley reported that punctuation and typographical corrections made by the Islands Planning Commission have been included in this proposal. He stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Eric Croft to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of the amendment to change the provisions for outside lighting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

Comprehensive Plan

Consideration of the proposed update of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan, including the Community Assessment, Community Agenda, and Short Term Work Program. The purpose of these hearings is to determine what will be sent to the Coastal Georgia Regional Development Center (CGRDC) and to the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for review. Final adoption of the Plan updates is scheduled for consideration later in the year.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Hainley gave a brief overview of the progress of the Comprehensive Plan including the public workshops in 2006, the first formal public hearing in July 2006, approval of the Community Assessment in 2007, the November 2007 draft Community Agenda, and approval of the Solid Waste Management Plan in December 2007. He then gave a chronological order of continued reviews and subsequent final adoption, which he stated should take place in September or October of 2008.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval for transmittal to the Coastal GA Regional Development Center (CGRDC) and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA).

Mr. Charles Ezelle of Thomas & Hutton Engineering stated that Thomas & Hutton is currently representing Plum Creek Timber Company, a large landowner in west Glynn County, who basically indicated that they want to begin the process of doing a comprehensive look at all of their property in west Glynn County. Their total acreage is approximately 66,400, which makes them the largest landowner in the county.

Mr. Ezelle wanted to know how often a schedule is set for updating the Plan or to incorporate changes. Mr. Hainley stated that the current schedule is to do a minor update in five years and another major update in ten years. However, the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners have the ability to increase the schedule and adopt plans sooner than that. Chairman Nevill stated that the Planning Commission would welcome more outside involvement and participation and he advised Mr. Ezelle that it is possible to incorporate their ideas in the Plan at the next update.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend to the Board of Commissioners authorization for transmittal of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan Update to the DCA and the CGRDC, including the changes, corrections and additions discussed by the Planning Commissions in the workshops. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eric Croft and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.