

# MINUTES

## MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

JUNE 2, 2009 - 6:00 P.M.

Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Gary Nevill, Chairman  
Bill Brunson, Vice Chairman  
Jason Counts  
Buck Crosby  
Alan Dixon  
Julie Hunter  
Buddy Hutchinson

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Hainley, Director  
York Phillips, Planning Manager  
Iris Scheff, Planner III  
Eric Landon, Planner II  
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 5, 2009 Regular Meeting**

A motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby to approve the Minutes of the May 5<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Julie Hunter. During discussion, It was pointed out that Application *SP1549* was represented by Steve Brian and not Brian Thompson as referenced on page 8 of the Minutes. However, after reviewing the audio tape and the sign-in sheet, it was confirmed that Steve Brian was in attendance but was not the representative. Brian Thompson of Reynolds, Smith & Hill was the representative for Application *SP1549*. The following vote was taken on the motion for approval: Voting Aye: Mr. Brunson, Mr. Crosby, Mr. Dixon, Ms. Hunter, Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Nevill. Mr. Counts did not attend the May 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

-----

### **ZM1543 (M) Suburban Estates, Lot 5**

Consider a request to rezone from R-12 One Family Residential to Office Commercial, property consisting of 0.96 of an acre located at the corner of Altama Avenue and Suburban Drive. The property to be rezoned has 265.64 ft. of frontage on Altama Avenue, and 161.20 ft. of frontage on Suburban Drive. Parcel ID: 03-02506. Melissa Green of Prudential Georgia Intercoastal Properties, agent for Ruth Hampton, owner.

Ms. Ruth Hampton and Mr. Robert Driggers were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Iris Scheff as follows:

The proposed rezoning at first glance looks like spot zoning within an R-12 area. The property is located at the only corner of the intersection of Altama and Spur 25 that does not yet contain commercial (Highway Commercial) zoning. The global nature of the Future Land Use Map did not take into consideration specific developed land uses in this area which are primarily commercial.

Zoning to the south is residential but contains a special use "place of worship" which is institutional in nature, while the property to the south of that is zoned LM, a city zoning for Limited Medical facilities, also commercial.

While the statement on the application that "this lot would not be developed for residential use because of its location" may or may not prove true (if left R-12 zoning) the proposed eye clinic appears to be suitable for commercial zoning, considering surrounding uses that parallel these intersecting roads; Altama and Spur 25.

Engineering recommendations were made to restrict access location no closer than 100 ft. from the centerline of the entrance driveway to the right-of-way of Altama Avenue. Additional street width is needed for Suburban Drive due to a minimum collector street standard for commercial property. Finally, differing information as to whether Suburban Street curves or turns should be examined and made accurate as it may affect the eye clinic site plan.

According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip General Manual, a facility such as the 4,000 sq. ft. proposed facility would be expected to generate approximately 126 average daily trips (ADT's). A collector street is required to serve a commercial facility; therefore Suburban Drive would need to be widened in accordance with engineering comments.

The site is to be served by public water and sewer.

**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 requested zoning appears to permit a use that is suitable in view of the use of adjacent and nearby property.**

**A letter from property owners was received stating that a proposal was made to them that the clinic would provide a 25 ft. landscaped buffer consisting of existing landscape, as well as an 8 ft. high privacy fence along the property line. The letter also raised a concern about lighting at night.**

**The county requires a Type (A) buffer for commercial property abutting residential property. Type (A) buffers consist of 20 in. wide landscaped planted strip with specific plantings, or as an alternate a 12 ft. wide planted strip with a landscape wall or solid fence on the exterior property line with specific plantings. There is nothing to prevent making the buffer larger than the minimum required, or the board fence higher than the minimum 6 ft. required. Lighting overspill is not allowed into adjacent property in any zoning district.**

**Note that the proposed site plan is conceptual as an illustration for rezoning, and it is not part of the approval requested for rezoning. Site plans are submitted for separate approval. Some features of the conceptual site plan will need to be corrected at that time, such as buffer size(s) and content(s), separation distance of access/entry point from Altama Avenue right-of-way, sign type(s) and location(s), and other more detailed information than is addressed at this stage.**

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

**The proposed rezoning is not anticipated to adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.**

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

**Yes.**

- 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 property is expected to generate 126 average daily trips per day, based on estimates. The actual usage could be more or less intense, depending on the hours and number of customers that would use the proposed clinic.**

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

**The area is shown as low density residential on the Future Land Use Map; however, as outlined previously, actual uses developed here are commercial or institutional in nature, and are out of synchrony with the Future Land Use Map.**

- 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 above outlined discrepancy regarding low density single family use designation on the Future Land Use Map, compared to actual developed uses that exist to the north, south, and at the other three corners of Altama and the Spur Intersection, are supporting grounds for approval of the requested rezoning.**

Mrs. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of application *ZM1543 (M)* Suburban Estates, Lot 5, to rezone from R-12, One Family Residential to Office Commercial.

Regarding the entrance to the proposed business which would be via the southern leg of Suburban Drive, Mr. Alan Dixon wanted to know if this would force the traffic to go all the way through the residential neighborhood to enter the business. Mrs. Scheff replied yes. She stated that there is a median obstructing a turn onto the northern leg. Mr. Dixon stated that traffic would either be forced to go through the neighborhood to access the business, or go down Altama and make a “U” Turn and come back to use the right-in only access. Mrs. Scheff replied yes.

Chairman Nevill stated that a comment from engineering referenced additional right-of-way being needed for Suburban Drive to provide commercial access to the site; a collector street is the minimum for commercial sites. He then asked for the requirements for a collector street for a commercial site. Mr. Brunson replied that there is a 70 ft. requirement, with a 10 ft. credit for curb and gutter. Mr. Hainley verified that Mr. Brunson is correct.

Mr. Crosby commented about the narrow width of Suburban Drive. Mr. Brunson stated that it is not 70 ft. Chairman Nevill stated that there is about 20 ft. of pavement in the area now. Mr. Crosby asked if the property owners would have to give up some of their property to conform. Mrs. Scheff stated that for site plans, it is the policy of the county to require the applicant to make the characteristics necessary to make the site work. The affect of that is that over time roadways get widened. Mrs. Scheff then pointed out all of the commercial property within the proximity of the proposed

development as well as the parking lot. Mr. Crosby noted that the parking lot is actually with the worship center. Mr. Dixon added that the worship center's parking lot is accessed directly from Altama and does not go through Suburban Drive.

For clarification, Chairman Nevill stated that the proposed property is a corner lot on the Spur and Altama Avenue which seems like a commercial lot, but the problem is the access.

Mr. Dixon stated that he understands staff's comment about it being the responsibility of the applicant making the request to provide the changes being made to accommodate the requirements. He stated that staff also noted that in the future, it is assumed that each additional property, as it's changed, will then make the necessary requirements to also come into conformity. However, Mr. Dixon pointed out that he doesn't think that we can assume that in the future the rest of the residential neighborhood will have the ability to make the necessary contributions.

Mr. Jason Counts asked if traffic could be controlled by signage, particularly in front of the proposed development to possibly require a left-hand turn out of the parking lot so that when the road is brought up to collector road requirements it would minimize the number of right-hand turns and other traffic on the daily trips. Mrs. Scheff stated that staff was informed that the area that Mr. Counts is referring to will be a right-out turn onto Suburban if approved. Chairman Nevill stated that enforcement would be a problem.

Mr. Robert Driggers, agent for the buyer, Dr. Lord, gave a brief presentation. He explained that one of the important points that he attempted to make to the neighbors when he presented information about this development is that this property is going to continue to be brought up for rezoning requests for some sort of commercial use, simply because of the surrounding commercial uses. The property has road frontage on three sides and it has heavy traffic. Therefore, no one will ever want to build a home on the site. He stressed that it is ultimately going to be some sort of commercial use and the most logical thing to do is to choose the least offensive and lowest intensive type of commercial use possible.

Mr. Driggers stated that Dr. Lord would construct a one-story attractive eye clinic. He schedules 16 to 18 patients per day. There would be a small amount of traffic with people picking up eye glasses and contact lenses, but more than 50% of his patient base would come from the north of the property. They would make a right turn into the north leg of Suburban, and an immediate right turn into his parking lot. Mr. Driggers stated that the impact on the remaining portions of Suburban Drive will be minimal. He stated that he doesn't see anything indicating that there is no opportunity to make a left turn coming out of the parking lot. He pointed out that the fencing that will exist will encourage people to make a left turn and get onto Altama quickly, rather than making a right turn and going through the Suburban Estates neighborhood.

Ms. Ruth Hampton, owner of the property, stated that she grew up on Suburban Drive and she thinks that drivers would be forced to go down and make a “U” Turn in front of College Park at the median to avoid going back through the Suburban neighborhood.

Mr. Driggers stated that in addition to the 8 ft. fence, they have allowed for a 25 ft. undisturbed tree buffer all the way around the property where it is adjacent to residential uses, which is in excess of the 20 ft. required buffer. The heavy tree growth on the site would not be touched.

At this time, the floor was opened for public comments beginning with Ms. Betty Anderson of 207 Suburban Drive who presented two petitions of signatures from the residents on Suburban Drive and Ashbrook Drive who are all opposed to this request.

Ms. Kelly Knocks of 217 Suburban Drive asked if the street would be widened to 70 ft. all the way around. Chairman Nevill replied no. He explained that the requirement for the commercial development is that it be a collector street which has a 70 ft. right-of-way requirement, but the applicant cannot make the residents give up any of their property for this requirement.

Ms. Knocks expressed concerns about the safety of the children in the neighborhood with regard to the additional traffic. She stated that she’s not sure if the property was ever marketed for residential, but she thinks that a house could be placed on the lot. She pointed out that when other developments came into the area, the residents were promised a fence, but they never got it. She stated that the residents are tired of having to defend their homes and they don’t need extra cars driving through the neighborhood. She also stated that trying to make a “U” Turn in front of College Park, as noted by Ms. Hampton, is very dangerous. She is asking the Planning Commission to deny this request.

Mrs. Glynn Spaulding of 522 Ashbrook Drive stated that she is opposed to this rezoning. She stated that “when the zoning is changed, it’s changed” and there are no guarantees. Mrs. Spaulding stated that she has already put up a fence but she does not want to live with a stockade around her house. She feels that a house could be built on the property because there was a similar situation at Cypress Run and a house was built. She does not want a commercial building at her backdoor and she is asking that this rezoning be denied. Approving it would destroy two neighborhoods.

Mr. David Hayes, president of Cypress Run Homeowners Association, stated that there is no way that a proposed commercial development will lessen the amount of traffic going through the Suburban neighborhood. This proposal would also have a negative impact on the residents at Cypress Run with respect to traffic because there is no signage. He is not sure if signage would actually correct the problem. Additionally, he would like

to see a nice high fence along the Spur bordering Cypress Run to keep out all of the traffic noise, but just like the residence on Suburban Drive, that probably won't ever happen. If this request is approved, the peace and tranquility of the neighborhood would be severely impacted.

In a brief rebuttal, Mr. Driggers stated that with the 25 ft. undisturbed buffer and the existing drainage ditch, there is no way that Mrs. Spaulding will be able to see the proposed development, which would be positioned up as close to Altama Avenue as possible. Also, in an effort to clarify some misconceptions, he stated that the fence that the residents say they were promised to shelter Cypress Run from Spur 25 is not relevant to this proposal. Mr. Driggers reiterated that what is being proposed at this time is a very low intensity commercial use; 16 to 18 patients a day with more than half coming from the north would not have to loop through Suburban Drive. He stated that this property is the last commercial piece of property in this area fronting on the Spur and fronting on Altama and it will continue to be proposed for commercial usage. No one would want to build a home on the site because the traffic level is intense at the Spur and on Altama as well.

Chairman Nevill noted that because of the roads bordering this particular area, it makes the property appear to be a good use for commercial, but unfortunately the access to the property is a big problem and it would definitely increase the access through Suburban Estates.

Ms. Julie Hunter wanted to know if there is a possibility that signage could be allowed at the ingress and egress on Suburban Drive to mandate a left-hand turn only and that there is no exit to the right coming out from the business. Chairman Nevill stated that enforcement would be very difficult. If somebody wants to go north they'd probably do it the quickest way, and the intersection is not the greatest because there is no stacking room in the median itself once you cross over. Mr. Crosby stated that making a "U" Turn would be very, very dangerous.

Mr. Brunson stated that due to projected traffic counts and the fact that there is no guarantee that the property would remain as the Lord Eye Clinic once it's rezoned, he doesn't see how the egress and ingress can support an office commercial zoning at this time. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Brunson recommending denial of this request as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Driggers was advised that the Planning Commission's recommendation would be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for final action.

-----

## **ZM1545 (M) Pinecrest Logistics**

Consider a request to revise the approved Planned Development Text for a portion of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development. The property consists of 687.82 acres generally lying east of Golden Isles Parkway (Spur 25), south of SR 99, west of I-95, and north of the Glynn County Public Safety Complex. The proposed changes are limited to changes in the standards for allowed signage. Parcel ID: 03-17029. Robert Shupe, agent for Brunswick and Glynn County Development Authority, owner.

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

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

This site was rezoned in 2007 (*ZM-2007-13*) to provide for major industrial and mixed use development in lieu of residential-only development, and was rezoned again in 2008 (*ZM-2008-05*) to make minor changes to the development standards. As planning for the development proceeds, the prospective developer has determined that it would be beneficial to establish a comprehensive package of signage standards. The purpose of this rezoning is to incorporate revised signage standards into the previously approved PD Text. The following are the references to signs as they were set forth in the 2007 and 2008 cases:

“Signs: All signs shall comply with the standards set forth in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.” (PD Text - *ZM-2007-13*)

“Signs: All signs shall comply with standards set forth in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance for General Industrial (GI) zoning for Area “A” and either the General Industrial (GI), Highway Commercial (HC), or General Residential (GR) as appropriate for Area “B”. Maximum height for all signs shall be 35 ft. within 200 ft. of Golden Isles Parkway and Highway 99. Everywhere else, the maximum height for signs shall be 100 ft.” (PD Text - *ZM-2008-05*)

Specifically, the proposed new signage standards in Section IX of the Planned Development Text references sign standards for GI, HC, and GR, and provides for certain additional signs. The proposal identifies particular types of signs and includes graphics to demonstrate how the signs will be designed. Particular kinds of signs include:

“Signature Boundary Marker” signs - These are signs to be placed along the I-95 frontage (not exceeding 4 signs, not closer than 2,500 ft. apart). The diagram depicting this sign shows the project name (“Tradewinds”) in 4 ft. letters, with a triangular shaped logo feature 40 ft. in height and 35 ft. in overall width.

“Primary Gateway” signs - These are to be located at the major entrances to the development along Golden Isles Parkway and SR 99. These signs include a triangular shaped logo with a 20 ft. base and 35 ft. in height. In addition, the section of the development is named in letters up to 3 ft. tall.

“Secondary Gateway” signs - These are to be located at secondary entrances to the development.

The following signs are generally permitted under the current ordinance, but the specifications and standards vary somewhat from the Article VIII (Signs). Generally, these signs are internal to the project and will have only limited visibility from outside the development.

“Vehicular Directional” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Building Monument ID” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Building Business ID” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Park ID” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Garage Entry” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Trail Blazer” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Pedestrian Information Kiosk” - Described in proposed text.

“Pedestrian Directional” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Parking Directional” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Banner” signs - Described in proposed text.

“Temporary Real Estate” signs - Described in proposed text.

The Engineering Department had a number of comments regarding placement of signs adjacent to streets. These issues can be addressed during site plan review and/or the sign permit process.

**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 zoning is consistent with developments in the area.**

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

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

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

**Yes.**

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

**The proposed use will not change the impact on existing county infrastructure as the nature of the development will not change.**

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

**This site is located in the West Glynn Future Development Area. This designation is appropriate for employment centers and large mixed use planned developments.**

- 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 approval of application *ZM1545* to amend the PD Text to adopt specific signage standards for the identified portion of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development.

Mr. Jason Counts wanted to know if a sign is proposed for the front entrance of Timber Ridge. Mr. Phillips stated that there might be a main entrance sign but staff does not have a detail of the design of the internal circulation system of where the actual portions of the development would be. He stated that Mr. Shupe would have to address specific locations.

Mr. Bobby Shupe explained that it is the developer's goal to create a world class industrial commercial development. In doing so, it is important that they create a brand, which is going to be illustrated with the signature boundary marker. It is also the primary Gateway sign as well. What became apparent to the developers is that the proposal did not meet the current criteria for signs. They met with staff and initially spoke about trying to obtain a variance but they discovered that there were other issues, which is why they have submitted tonight's proposal.

In addressing Mr. Counts' question about the sign across from Timber Ridge, Mr. Shupe stated that a curb cut is going to be there for Timber Ridge so at some future date, there will be a primary Gateway sign. The sign will be 35 ft. and will meet the current sign criteria. There will also be a larger sign that will exceed the sign criteria. But right now, they won't put one in until the entrance is actually built. The right-of-way

is about 250 ft. wide. When the entrance is built it will be on the other side. Mr. Shupe stated that the developers are asking for temporary real estate signs and these signs are larger than allowed in the current zoning; two of them would be along I-95, one would be on GA 99 and one would be along the Golden Isles Parkway.

Chairman Nevill asked if there would be a way to prohibit the “for sale” sign from being across from the entrance to Timber Ridge. Mr. Shupe stated that they have agreed to not put a “for sale” sign “right in their face,” but once this development goes in and the roadways have been built and the entrance is actually built, the developers would like to reserve the right to put a “for sale” sign up, but it would be some distance away.

Ms. Julie Hunter wanted to know when the sign would be removed. Mr. Shupe stated that the sign would remain up until the property is sold. If there are other properties for sale along those areas, then the “for sale” sign would be moved to those specific areas.

Mr. Counts stated that if the property is sold and there is another owner of the property, would they then be allowed to put their own “for sale” signs up for their parcel along these requirements of a 14 x 32 sign. Mr. Shupe stated that the developers are not asking for that tonight. He stated that the owner would be allowed to put in a “for sale” sign under the current ordinance, which is 32 sq. ft. If the owner sells half of the property to someone, then the previous owner might agree to allow the new owner to use some of their signs.

Mr. Hutchinson had questions about the signs being placed in the 250 ft. right-of-way. Chairman Nevill stated that they would not be allowed to put a sign in the spur right-of-way. Mr. Shupe concurred. Mr. Hutchinson added that if someone buys a tract of land and wants to put up a sign, the sign would have to be placed outside of the 250 ft. right-of-way. Mr. Shupe replied yes.

Mr. Counts commented that if this project goes through as depicted it will be an asset to our community.

Referring to the last sentence in the text regarding the four temporary non-illuminated signs which states, “Exterior lighting of the sign shall comply with Section 807.3 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance,” Chairman Nevill suggested deleting this sentence since it’s not illuminated.

Mr. Denton Shamburger with Lincoln Property Company explained that the text does say that the signs are to be non-illuminated but he would like to have the ability to light the temporary signs on I-95 only; not on GA 99 or Golden Isles Parkway.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to recommend approval of application **ZM1545** to amend the PD Text to adopt specific signage standards for the identified portion of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development with the specification that the temporary real estate signs only bordering I-95 be illuminated. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SP1486 Coastal Baptist Church Phase I**

Consider approval of a site plan for a church. The project consists of a 1,488 square foot modular building at the northeast intersection of Buck Swamp Road and Good Place Drive. The property is zoned Forest Agricultural (FA). Parcel ID 03-11132, 03-11133, 02-01392, and 03-19947. Jackson Survey, agent for Coastal Baptist Church, owner.

Mr. David Dowdy was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Landon explained that this request is for the first phase of a church project, which will consist of a 1,488 sq. ft. modular building and 18 parking spaces. Future phases of this development include a sanctuary and fellowship hall as shown on the site plan.

The project will be served by a septic system and will connect onto the Joint Water and Sewer facilities located on Buck Swamp Road.

The applicant is also requesting a variance from Section 611 of the Zoning Ordinance for paving. In addition, the applicant wishes to use recycled concrete in some areas.

The property has frontage on both Good Place and Buck Swamp, but the access is shown from Good Place. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers guidelines, the proposed project will generate 55 peak hour trips on Sunday (36.6 trips per 1,000 sq/ft) and 14 average daily trips during the week (9 trips per 1,000 sq/ft).

Engineering staff found this project to be compliant. However, the Fire Marshall will require a new fire hydrant, which is shown on the plan.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission review shall be guided by the following standards and criteria:

- 1) The application, site plan, and other submitted information contain all the items required under this Section. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**

- 3) Adequate provisions are made for ingress and egress, off-street parking, loading, and the flow of traffic, which may reasonably be anticipated. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met; if a variance from paving is provided.**
- 4) Adequate provisions are made to control the flow of storm water from and across the site. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met, subject to review by Engineering as part of the review of the building permit.**
- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets. **Staff comment: No buffer required.**
- 7) Adequate provisions are made to control the location, intensity, and direction of all outdoor lighting so that it will not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met or will be met through the building permit process.**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: N/A**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: This requirement will be met during the building permit process.**

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of *SP1486* Coastal Baptist Church Phase I and the variance to allow recycled concrete for the parking lot, as well as paving for the driveway, handicapped spaces and access from the handicapped spaces to the building.

Chairman Nevill asked Mr. Dowdy if he had any problems with staff's recommendation, to which he replied no; he totally agrees with staff.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve *SP1486* Coastal Baptist Church Phase I and the variance to allow recycled concrete for the parking lot, as well as paving for the driveway, handicapped spaces and access from the handicapped spaces to the building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **SP1587 Needwood Middle School Pavilion**

Consider approval of a site plan for an open pavilion adjacent to an existing middle school. The project consists of a 560 sq. ft. pavilion on property located on the north side of Harry Driggers Boulevard between Needwood Middle School and Greer Elementary School. The property is zoned Planned Development (PD) and is in the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-13678. Glynn County School Board, owner.

Mr. Dave Raczynski, representing the Glynn County School Board, was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that this site is in West Glynn Future Development Area, which supports the necessary provision of public facilities. The site is designated for Medium Density Residential on the adopted Future Land Use Map.

The proposed pavilion is adjacent to a natural area being developed as a nature education facility. Staff was originally concerned about the existence of a large water line in close proximity to the site. More recent information suggests that the water line is not under the building, but that a sewer line may be. This portion of the sewer is owned and maintained by the School Board, so it will not affect the public sewer system.

The site is served by public water and sewer utilities. The proposed pavilion site is located very near to an existing water line which supplies fire protection water and domestic water to the middle school.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance the Planning Commission review shall be guided by the following standards and criteria:

- 1) The application, site plan, and other submitted information contain all the items required under this Section. **Staff comment: This requirement has not been fully met, however the most important issue has to do with coordination of the building with the existing water line and detailed information has been provided relative to that concern.**
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 3) Adequate provisions are made for ingress and egress, off-street parking, loading, and the flow of traffic, which may reasonably be anticipated. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 4) Adequate provisions are made to control the flow of storm water from and across the site. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**

- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 7) Adequate provisions are made to control the location, intensity, and direction of all outdoor lighting so that it will not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met, subject to coordination of the location with the water line.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that *SP1587* be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

Mr. Raczynski gave a brief presentation and a general discussion followed. During discussion, Chairman Nevill stated that this is a great project and he would like to see it go through; however, he pointed out that there are certain requirements that must be adhered to for site plan approval in accordance with Section 619.2. In order to avoid setting a precedent, he would suggest moving forward with this project subject to the applicant submitting an approved site plan to be reviewed by staff. Mr. Raczynski agreed.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve *SP1587* subject to the applicant submitting an approved site plan to be reviewed by staff and meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.