

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

AUGUST 5, 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
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

July 1, 2008 Regular Meeting

July 22, 2008 Workshop

A motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby to approve the Minutes of the July 1st Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts. Voting Aye: Messrs. Bill Brunson, Jason Counts, Eric Croft, Buck Crosby, Buddy Hutchinson and Gary Nevill. Mr. Wayne Stewart did not attend the July 1st Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Buck Crosby and seconded by Mr. Jason Counts, the Minutes of the July 22nd Workshop were approved and unanimously adopted.

Agenda - Changes, Additions, Deferrals, Postponements

Deferral: Upon a written request by Mrs. Benfield for deferral, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to grant the deferral of *Application ZM1287*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted. (This request is expected to be heard by the Planning Commission at its November public hearing.)

ZM1270 Northwest Quadrant Planned Development

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural, Conservation Preservation, Freeway Commercial, and Planned Development to Planned Development, property consisting of 7,820 acres located generally west and northwest of the SR 99/I-95 interchange (Exit 42). A small portion of the proposal lies on the east side of I-95. Approval will include approval of a Planned Development Master Plan and Planned Development Text. Parcel ID 02-00210, 02-00211, 02-02358, 03-05050, 03-12846, 03-17032, and 03-19223. A portion of the property is within the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development and a portion is within the Satilla Forest Planned Development. All of the property is within the Gateway Glynn Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Ryan Thompson, agent for Sea Island Company, Satilla Forest Development Company, and DMR Investments LLC, owners.

Attorney Jim Gilbert, Mr. Bill Foster, Jr., Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

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

This site is largely undeveloped and forested. A portion of the property site (approximately 1,955 acres along the Altamaha River) is marsh, and about 1,070 acres of the site is in jurisdictional wetlands or other preserve areas. A few buildings are located on the site.

The proposed land use is for a mixed use development, with residential, neighborhood and community commercial, support public facilities (schools, etc.) and employment uses. There is a large area (approximately 708 acres) near the SR 99 and I-95 interchange (Exit 42) designated for commercial uses, which could also support institutional and/or industrial and employment uses. Data submitted with the application indicate a potential for 17,495 dwelling units on approximately 3,800 acres of the site, along with approximately 286 acres of neighborhood and community commercial areas.

This site makes up much of the northern part of the Gateway Glynn DRI, and anchors the northern end of the development corridor running northeast and southwest through the center of Glynn County. This area includes much of the new development in

the county, and is receiving commensurate attention in terms of infrastructure expansion. Development in this area will support and in turn will be supported by major employment centers and transportation infrastructure.

Development in this area also offers the opportunity to use design techniques to produce quality living environments supported by efficient use of infrastructure. For example, more compact development patterns well served by appropriate transportation modes (including bicycle and pedestrian, as well as various forms of public transportation) produces increased mobility at lower cost. In a similar manner, including distribution systems for treated wastewater ensures maximum potential for its use for irrigation, which reduces the need to discharge into streams or wetlands and reduces demand on the potable water supply.

A revised proposed PD Text has been received, following several discussions between the staff and the applicant and reflecting comments of staff and the Mainland Planning Commission. Two minor changes need to be made to this document:

1. A note needs to be added clarifying that the terms “townhouse,” “townhome,” and “row-house” are synonymous.
2. Item 19 on pages 26 and 27 addresses signage by referencing Article VIII (Signs) in the Zoning Ordinance. Since Article VIII in turn simply references the PD Text, additional language should be added. Staff suggests that this language provide for signs in residential areas based on the regulations applicable to the R-12 district and for signs in commercial and industrial areas based on regulations applicable in the HC district. In addition, billboards should be allowed along I-95 based on the billboard regulations. Signs over 35 feet in height should be permitted only in the Freeway Commercial area and subject to the regulations applicable to the FC district in the sign regulations.

Engineering raised a number of questions about the supplemental information received with the application. Because of the size of the project, attention was given in the application to the future development of infrastructure. A conceptual plan for drainage was submitted, demonstrating one method for providing drainage infrastructure. The eventual drainage system, however, will also be influenced by the countywide drainage master plan, now under development, as well as more detailed land use plans and new technologies that are not yet available. Engineering issues will continue to be researched and addressed during the development review process.

A traffic study was submitted along with the application, and has been provided to Georgia DOT as well as staff for review. As with other infrastructure, most issues will be addressed through the development review process. The principal that will be applied is the same as has been applied to other major developments: roads in the area will continue to be monitored to ensure that they maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” and improvements to maintain that standard will be required. The county is already aware that

planned improvements to SR 99 will be necessary and is striving to obtain state assistance for this.

A water and sewer plan was submitted along with the application and has been forwarded to the Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Water and Sewer Commission (JWSC) staff for review. The JWSC is also working with a consultant to prepare a sewer and water master plan for the mainland. While specific water and sewer solutions will continue to evolve, it is clear that there will be capacity to serve the proposed development. A potential site for a wastewater treatment plant is included within the project area.

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 other development in the area. Planning of this development at a large scale will improve efficiency and quality of design.

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

No, most other land in the vicinity is vacant and either being developed or undergoing plan for development.

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

Yes, residential development is possible under the current 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.

Yes; however, facilities can be planned and provided through the development process.

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

The Plan did not contemplate development of this area so soon.

- 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 pattern of development in this part of the county has evolved and is driven by the overall growth of the county and the coastal area.

Mr. Phillips stated that development of this area is consistent with the overall growth of the county and is being supported by expansion of infrastructure. He stated that staff recommends that this request (including the proposed Planned Development Text and Master Plan) be approved, subject to the following:

1. The developer and staff shall work together with the Glynn County School Board.

2. Traffic:

The applicant shall maintain the level of service in place at the time a site plan or subdivision is submitted for all proposed roads within the development and intersections of proposed streets or driveways with SR 99. The lowest Level of Service within the development shall be “C”. Due to the size of the development, it is anticipated that it will have a significant impact on SR 99, adjacent to the development and for some distance to the intersection with state routes, which provide an east/west connection. The county shall take traffic counts on at least an annual basis when the development begins to establish a proportional division of the increased traffic on these routes from the development. When a roadway improvement project is defined, the applicant shall be responsible for their proportional share of the required improvements, including any additional built capacity that accrues, benefiting the applicant.

Should the county adopt impact fees for transportation improvements, the applicant may request credit for expenditures made to SR 99 associated with adding capacity but not associated with required improvements for entrances or intersections. The amount of the credit shall not exceed the cost to construct the improvements as long as the cost is of equal or greater value than that which would have been collected through the payment(s) of the road component of the impact fees as determined by the County Engineer. Once the sum total amount of the credit exceeds the cost of the improvements, as determined by the County Engineer, the applicant shall thereafter commence paying the impact fee as set forth in any adopted Impact Fee Ordinance. For the purposes of this condition, the costs, as approved by the County Engineer, shall include, but not be limited to, the cost of right-of-way acquisition, engineering costs, costs of relocating utilities and actual costs of construction (including labor, materials, and overhead) (“Work”). Before any Work is performed, the applicant shall receive prior written approval by the County Engineer and County Administrator for the improvements and any credit amount.

3. A recommendation is required for the Water and Sanitary Sewer Master Plan from ATM, consultants of the Brunswick-Glynn County Water and Sewer Commission (JWSC) while addressing the following criteria with regards to water and sewer provision:

Water System:

The developer shall be responsible for the design and phased construction of a water system that will provide 1000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure at the most remote fire hydrant in any phase of development. As a part of preliminary plat approval, the applicant shall demonstrate the compliance with this performance standard. The method to demonstrate modeling compliance shall be mutually agreed upon by the applicant and JWSC. No preliminary plat or site plan shall be approved without demonstrating compliance with this requirement.

Sewer System:

The developer shall be responsible for the design and construction of a sewerage system that will meet applicable standards. As a part of preliminary plat or site plan approval, the applicant shall demonstrate the compliance with these standards. The method to demonstrate compliance shall be mutually agreed upon by the applicant and JWSC. No preliminary plat or site plan shall be approved without demonstrating compliance with this requirement. The applicant should also consider alternative technologies for sewage treatment and disposal.

During a brief presentation, Attorney Jim Gilbert explained that with staff's assistance along with the Planning Commission, they have had several advertised public work sessions and have worked through most of the complexities of this project. He pointed out the marsh areas and the wetlands as outlined in the staff's report. He also pointed out the portion of the property that is already zoned Conservation/Preservation and stressed that the owners never want there to be any use for this portion of property other than its current zoning. He stated that they want to do everything possible to protect the river corridor and have added restrictions within the zoning text for this reason. He further stated that the Sea Island Company has already given a portion of the land in fee simple to the Nature Conservancy. Also during his presentation, Mr. Gilbert introduced three of the property owners, Mr. Richard McKinna, Mr. Ray Richard and Mr. Terry Driggers and stated that they are available to answer any questions from the Planning Commission or the general public. In addition to the property owners, Mr. Ryan Thompson with Thomas & Hutton Engineering Company was on hand to answer questions.

At this time, the floor was opened for public comments beginning with Mr. James Holland, the Altamaha Riverkeeper, who stated that he has no objection to this project at this particular time, but he is asking the developers to protect as much of the wetlands as possible. He stated that he cannot put enough emphasis on how critical the wetlands are for stormwater drainage. He also cautioned the developers to be mindful of erosion control and stated that there are already enough problems with silt in the Intra-Coastal

Waterway. Mr. Gilbert assured Mr. Holland that the developers intend to do this project in an environmentally sound manner.

Mr. Wayne Stewart praised the property owners and stated that they have done a “magnificent job of putting everything on the table.” He pointed out that three companies working together to do a development is a new idea in Glynn County and a lot of information was shared between the developers and the county. He thanked the owners for the information and commended their efforts. Chairman Nevill agreed and added that if all other developments were handled as thoroughly as this one, the Planning Commission’s job would be a lot easier.

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

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that this request (including the proposed Planned Development Text and Master Plan) be approved subject to the text revisions clarifying that the terms townhouse, townhome and row-houses mean the same, incorporating language to provide for signage based on R-12 zoning along with specific provisions referencing the FC provisions in the Sign Ordinance and incorporate the rules about billboards. Approval is also subject to the following conditions:

1. The developer and staff shall work together with the Glynn County School Board.
2. A recommendation is required for the Water and Sanitary Sewer Master Plan from ATM, consultants of the Brunswick-Glynn County Water and Sewer Commission.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby. Voting Aye: Messrs. Bill Brunson, Eric Croft, Buck Crosby, Buddy Hutchinson, Gary Nevill and Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Jason Counts.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.