

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

AUGUST 4, 2009 - 6:00 P.M.

Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gary Nevill, Chairman
Bill Brunson, Vice Chairman
Jason Counts
Buck Crosby
Buddy Hutchinson
Julie H. Martin

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

June 2, 2009 Regular Meeting

July 7, 2009 Meeting Cancelled

For clarification, Ms. Julie Martin suggested amending the June 2nd Minutes to include the phrase “*worship center*” in Mr. Alan Dixon’s comments at the top of page 5, line 2. The amendment was accepted and a motion was made by Mr. Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Martin and unanimously adopted to approve the Minutes of the June 2nd MPC Regular Meeting as amended.

As noted for the record, the July 7th MPC Regular Meeting was cancelled due to lack of a quorum. The minutes were approved by the Chairman.

ZM1543 (M) Lord Eye Center (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 northwest corner of Altama Avenue and Suburban Drive. The property to be rezoned has 265.64 feet of frontage on Altama Avenue, and 161.20 feet of frontage on Suburban Drive. Parcel ID: 03-02506. Melissa Green of Prudential Georgia Intercoastal Properties, agent for Ruth Hampton, owner.

Mr. Robert Driggers and Ms. Melissa Green were present for discussion.

This request was heard by the Mainland Planning Commission on June 2, 2009 and received a recommendation of denial. The applicants appeared before the Board of Commissioners on July 16th and requested to return to the Mainland Planning Commission in an effort to overcome neighborhood objections discussed at the June 2nd meeting. Since that time, two neighborhood meetings were conducted. This request is scheduled to be heard at the August 20th Board of Commissioners meeting pending the outcome of tonight's meeting.

The following report has been updated to reflect new information and stipulations offered by the applicants believed to provide resolution to issues not previously explored prior to the June 2nd MPC meeting.

The proposed rezoning at first glance looks like spot zoning within an R-12 area. Upon looking further, it 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.

The proposed eye clinic appears to be a suitable low intensity commercial zoning use considering surrounding uses that parallel these intersecting roads-Altama Avenue and Spur 25.

Because of concerns expressed by the neighbors protesting the zoning request at the first Mainland Planning Commission meeting, the applicants met with neighbors to discuss new analyses of the zoning request. An attempt was made to address each concern expressed by the neighbors. A main concern was an increase in predicted traffic, which staff originally based on estimates from the Transportation Engineer's Manual.

The applicants held two neighborhood meetings during which they presented actual traffic count numbers from another Lord Eye Clinic located elsewhere, which is the same business proposed to be at this location.

Actual trip counts are preferred because they can be a more accurate method to determine traffic counts. Actual counts supplied by the applicant and not verifiable by staff were acquired, based on patient appointment logs covering a five month period. They showed an average of 15.3 patient vehicles, plus vehicles for 6 staff persons, daily. Patient vehicles were multiplied by 2 trips each per day to account for one trip to the clinic and one trip from the clinic. Staff vehicles were multiplied by three trips each per day to allow for leaving, returning and a lesser number of trips midday from the clinic (averaging every other day) for lunch, as customary at the business.

The outcome based on actual data from the eye clinic currently in operation summed 48.6 vehicle trips per day. The applicant pointed out that 48.6 vehicle trips daily distributed over a nine and one-half hour business day predicts 1.53 vehicles per hour that could possibly enter the neighborhood. That would be if patient vehicles entered from the southern leg of Suburban Drive off of Altama Avenue, or if patient vehicles exited the clinic by making a right hand turn when leaving, traveling the length of Suburban Drive to get onto Altama Avenue. Predicting 1.5 vehicles per hour per day entering the neighborhood is conservative giving the benefit of the doubt to the neighborhood's concern about increased traffic, since although both routes described are possible, neither is likely.

The applicant further explained that the reason this is liable to be so, is that the majority of their patient base resides north of the clinic. Using that fact, an estimated 70% of patients would be approaching on Altama Avenue traveling southward from north of the clinic, thus making a right hand turn onto Suburban Drive and directly entering the clinic, not traveling along the entirety of Suburban Drive to its southern end. Likewise, the applicants believe that in addition to the fact that the natural traffic flow predicts that most entries will be made onto the northernmost leg of Suburban Drive off of Altama Avenue, patients would be deterred from entering or traveling the length of Suburban Drive by the posting of a sign "No Right Turn" at the clinic's driveway exit point.

The applicant has done a careful examination of the proposal in response to neighbors' expressed concerns about the rezoning of the property and the fears about its possible negative impact. The applicant has attempted to address and offset each issue identified as a potential problem by proposing the following stipulations, as part of their rezoning request:

1. Use of the property is limited to professional, business and/or medical office.
2. Building(s) on the property will not exceed 4,500 sq. ft. and will not exceed one-story in height.
3. Where the property abuts any residential lots, a 25 ft. undisturbed landscaped buffer will remain.
4. Where the property abuts any residential lots, an 8 ft. privacy fence will be installed and maintained.

5. Owner of the property will install and maintain signage, signifying “No Right Turns,” at the parking lot exit on Suburban Drive.

In proposing to adhere to the above stipulations, the applicant volunteers to limitations exceeding those inherent to the requested Office Commercial zoning as follows:

1. Uses proposed are voluntarily reduced to fewer uses than usually allowed, compared to the general list established in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance for the Office Commercial Zoning District;
2. The size of the building is capped slightly above the square footage proposed in the site plan of 4,050 sq. ft. This means that site coverage is less than what could be achieved using residential or even commercial setbacks. Also, the height of the building is limited to a lesser height than allowed for a residential dwelling unit of 35 ft.;
3. The 25 ft. natural vegetated buffer offered is in excess of the 20 ft. wide buffer required by ordinance by 5 ft. of width. The requirement can be reduced to only 12 ft. wide when combined with a “landscape wall” [Section 613.2(2) and the landscape wall can consist of a 6 ft. high pressure treated board fence. The 8 ft. privacy fence proposed to be stipulated exceeds ordinance buffer requirements in two ways: (a) a privacy fence is not required, and (b) the proposed fence is 2 ft. higher than required by ordinance of a fence used as a buffer;
4. The signage to prohibit right-hand turns out of the driveway to the clinic is not required, but when installed, would likely be observed by drivers as though it were imperative, thus limiting the possibility of occasional unintended trips on Suburban Drive by patients inexperienced at visiting the clinic.

Staff notes a few additional issues, some of which the applicant discussed and demonstrated to the neighbors in presentations using comparisons of their proposal for the Eye Center with development of the lot for residential use.

An increase of 48.6 vehicle trips per day, especially if limited to a portion of the north leg of Suburban Drive from the property driveway to Altama Avenue, is not a significant impact that would negatively impact Suburban Drive residents because few vehicles would enter the subdivision.

The current traffic estimate for Suburban Drive in its entirety is 160 Average Daily Trips, based on 16 lots. Under current zoning, the subject property could possibly be subdivided into three residential lots, increasing traffic generation by 30 trips per day, increasing the ADT’s to a potential 190 total. This compares favorably with the expected increase in traffic based on data provided by the applicant, in that a difference of only 18.6 added trips is minimal. The proposed stipulations would limit trips for the most part

to the section of northern Suburban Drive between Altama Avenue and the proposed clinic's driveway.

Regarding the setbacks compared to buffers to be observed, there are narrower setback widths required adjacent to neighbor's properties under residential zoning, and no provision of buffers of any type. The applicant made a genuine effort to demonstrate at neighborhood meetings that the impact of noise, light, or visibility of the property or building from neighboring properties, if developed as Lord Eye Center, is less, comparing favorably to what might happen if the property were developed under its current zoning as three residential houses.

Engineering made recommendations to restrict access location no closer than 100 ft. from the centerline of the entrance driveway to the right-of-way of Altama Avenue. If the rezoning is granted, additional street width will be contributed as required for Suburban Drive along the front of the property due to a minimum collector street standard for commercial property. A collector street is required to serve a commercial facility, so Suburban Drive would need to be widened.

Staff originally looked at and reported traffic estimates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip General Manual, 7th Edition, for a 4,000 sq. ft. clinic, use #630, which predicted an estimated trip generation of approximately 126 average daily trips (ADT's). Based upon the applicants' research, this number should equal 48.6 ADT's.

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

The proposed medical office will not place a demand on school facilities and no comments about fire or public safety issues were made with respect to the requested rezoning.

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 inch 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.

The applicants have offered to comply with additional stipulations beyond what is required by ordinance for the Office Commercial zoning district, including a 25 ft. vegetated buffer as depicted in the accompanying site plan, 5 ft. wider than the minimum required. The applicant has also included a stipulation to provide an 8 ft. high privacy fence, which is not required with the 20 ft. wide required buffer, and is 2 ft. higher than the minimum 6 ft. fence when a fence is required.

Lighting overspill is not allowed into adjacent property in any zoning district per Section 622 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed site plan, although conceptual, is in this case an actual proposal offered for the Lord Eye Center, and not merely an illustration of a possibility for purposes of rezoning. If the zoning is approved with stipulations as requested by the applicant, a site plan closely adhering to the one submitted for rezoning will be submitted for separate approval and will have to meet the approved stipulations in order to be approved.

- 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 48.6 average daily trips per day based on actual data from the existing Lord Eye Center at a location elsewhere. This is not burdensome or excessive in relation to the 160 existing average daily trips per day generated by existing residences on Suburban Drive. An analysis in conjunction with stipulations which would predict that the increase in trips would, in their majority, be confined to the northern section of Suburban Drive between Altama Avenue and the Lord Eye Center

driveway. If subdivided into three lots under current zoning there would be a similar, slightly less increase in traffic of 30 average daily trips. In either case, a negligible impact on the remainder of Suburban Drive would be expected, with a difference of only 18.6 average daily trips overall [Lord Eye Center 160 + 48.6 = 208.6 vs. three more residences 160 + 30 = 190].

- 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 the Altama Avenue/Spur 25 intersection, are supporting grounds for approval of the requested rezoning. Additionally, five stipulations are proposed to decrease both traffic and visual impact on the residential neighbors.

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, subject to meeting all requirements, and with the following stipulations:

1. Use of the property is limited to professional, business and/or medical office.
2. Building(s) on the property will not exceed 4,500 sq. ft. and will not exceed one-story in height.
3. Where the property abuts any residential lots, a 25 ft. undisturbed landscape buffer will remain.
4. Where the property abuts any residential lots, an 8 ft. privacy fence will be installed and maintained.
5. Owner of the property will install and maintain signage, signifying “No Right Turns,” at the parking lot exit on Suburban Drive.

Mr. Robert Driggers, representing Dr. Lord who is the prospective buyer, gave an extensive power point slide presentation substantiating the staff’s report (all of which is contained in application file *ZM1543 M*). He also expounded on Dr. Lord’s history of

having a reputable clinic in the Brunswick area for 10 years. Mr. Driggers stated that this is a “win-win” situation for Dr. Lord who is looking for a better location for his clinic and it is a “win-win” situation for the Suburban Estates neighbors because it is the least offensive and the least intensive type of use that could potentially go on this piece of property. He reiterated comments made at the last MPC meeting that “this is not the last rodeo for this property.” It is ultimately going to be some sort of commercial use and it will continue to be proposed as such largely due to the surrounding commercial uses as well as the amount of traffic on the frontage roads.

Mr. Jason Counts asked Mr. Driggers if he was able to do any creative curbing work in the parking lot to help facilitate the no right turns. Mr. Driggers stated that Bill Smith’s office is investigating the possibility of angling the curb but they’re not certain about whether or not this can be done. However, they can definitely paint striping on the exit that would divide the entrance and exit lanes as well as direct everybody to a left turn.

Mr. Bill Brunson asked Mr. Driggers if he had explored any possibility for signage on the southern egress of the area, which he feels is the most controversial section. Mr. Driggers replied no but he would be happy to do so.

Ms. Melissa Green with Prudential Properties and agent for Ruth Hampton, owner of the property in question, agrees that this parcel is best suited for Dr. Lord’s Eye Clinic. She stated that she has had several inquiries about this particular property being a liquor store or a convenience store, but she has actually deterred potential buyers away from such uses explaining to them that the property is attached to the neighborhood and would require a rezoning. Ms. Green reiterated that when Dr. Lord inquired about the property she felt that the clinic was best suited for the property in that the office building would basically have the appearance of a home and it is the least offensive use for the parcel. She is soliciting the Planning Commission’s approval of this rezoning request with the stipulations.

At this time, the floor was opened for public comments beginning with Ms. Betty Anderson who submitted the following on behalf of approximately 22 residents of Suburban Estates present to oppose this request:

“Suburban Drive is a narrow street with no sidewalks or curbing...Many of our residents have retired, but there are still children and grandchildren in our subdivision to be considered and protected...Major egress and ingress of lot 5 can only be facilitated by driving the entire length of Suburban Drive. Previous petitions to rezone have been rejected based on the increased volume of traffic through our subdivision. To allow a commercial venture to be built in our residential neighborhood will markedly increase the flow of traffic and create major safety concerns for everyone. The peace and tranquility of our subdivision will be disturbed forever...”

Ms. Anderson asked the Planning Commission members to maintain their previous action of denial.

Mr. David Hayes was also present to oppose this request on behalf of the Cypress Run homeowners citing increased traffic problems and overall safety concerns for the residents.

Ms. Beth Whitten of 202 Suburban Drive stated that if this rezoning is approved for the clinic, could it possibly be gated. Chairman Nevill stated that the area is within a public right-of-way and would not be allowed to be gated. He pointed out that the applicant has made quite a few concessions and he agrees that this is probably one of the lowest impact uses for the property.

Mr. Counts also agreed that a lot of concessions were made, i.e., increased buffer with a fence, etc. and this use does not appear to be as large of an impact as some other commercial developments could be. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Counts recommending approval of application *ZM1543 (M)* Suburban Estates, Lot 5, to rezone from R-12, One-Family Residential to Office Commercial, subject to meeting all requirements and with the following stipulations:

1. Use of the property is limited to professional, business and/or medical office.
2. Building(s) on the property will not exceed 4,500 sq. ft., and will not exceed one-story in height.
3. Where the property abuts any residential lots, a 25 ft. undisturbed landscape buffer will remain.
4. Where the property abuts any residential lots, an 8 ft. privacy fence will be installed and maintained.
5. Owner of the property will install and maintain signage, signifying “No Right Turns,” at the parking lot exit on Suburban Drive.

The motion died for lack of a second. A motion was then made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson recommending denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson. During discussion, several members of the Planning Commission agreed that the applicant’s proposal with the stipulations is the least intrusive commercial use, and they cautioned the residents on future uses that would have a more intense impact on the neighborhood. At the end of discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for denial: Voting Aye (in favor of denial): Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Buck Crosby, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Ms. Julie Martin and Mr. Gary Nevill. Voting Nay (against denial): Mr. Jason Counts.

ZM1616 (M) Pecan Pointe

Consider a request to revise the Planned Development Text for Pecan Pointe South, consisting of 16.821 acres located on both sides of Touchstone Parkway, north of its intersection with Old Cate Road. The proposed change will allow individual one-family dwellings rather than one-family attached dwellings, will provide for division of the lots before construction of the units, and will change the setback requirements. The property is zoned Planned Development and is part of the Pecan Pointe South Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-03130. Atlantic Survey Professionals, Inc., agent for Pecan Pointe South Development Company, LLC.

Mr. David Hornsby 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 on June 6, 2005 (*ZM-2005-012*) to allow single family detached or single family attached dwellings. The expectation was that the lots would be divided after the attached units were completed, as is the practice in several other similar developments. The project has been acquired by a new owner who is interested in developing single family units on the lots as they would be configured after the lot splits. The use is permitted, but a few changes would need to be made in the development standards, including setbacks. The revised wording also allows steps to be located in the setbacks. Finally, the revised PD Text addresses allowed signage.

A plat was recorded in December 2008, again based on the assumption that the lots would be split after construction of the units. The new owner plans to have the plat modified, primarily to split the lots now rather than later.

The Engineering Department commented on the number of driveways into Touchstone Parkway and the arrangement of access to some of the internal lots. The issue concerning access to Touchstone parkway can be addressed through the PD Text.

The proposed changes will not affect overall traffic in comparison to the existing approved 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 proposed zoning is consistent with development 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 Central Glynn Future Development Area. This designation is appropriate for development of residential uses. The site is shown as Medium Density Residential on 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.

No.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application *ZM1616* to amend the PD Text to modify the development standards, subject to a requirement that lots fronting on Touchstone Parkway have provisions for shared access.

During a brief presentation, Mr. David Hornsby stated that he has done several developments on the mainland as well as on St. Simons and he is very concerned about what he sees for Glynn County. He explained that he purchased this particular tract not for greed, but with the thought of improving the quality of life and creating a better atmosphere that would benefit everyone. He is asking the Planning Commission to agree with staff's recommendation for approval.

Mr. Counts asked Mr. Hornsby if he considered the possibility of not splitting the lots and perhaps using a larger lot for a single family residence, which would be more in-keeping with the area. Mr. Hornsby replied no, he is trying to provide affordable housing.

Mr. Crosby asked Mr. Hornsby if this project will, in the long run, become a duplex development. Mr. Hornsby replied no, the project will not become a duplex

development. However, Mr. Crosby was not convinced and stated that he is concerned about setting a precedent. Mr. Hornsby stated that if a precedent is set it would not be for change sake, it would be change for improving a project.

Mr. Brunson also expressed concerns about this becoming duplexes and later developing into rental units. He pointed out that as the original zoning was written, the applicant could build the duplexes without any on-going maintenance. It appears to him that what Mr. Hornsby is proposing is that if this request is approved for 45 ft. wide single family lots he would maintain the landscaping and yards until such time as the project is 80% complete. Mr. Hornsby stated that the proposal is that all yards would be maintained with irrigation and “mow and blow service” every week for the remainder of the buyer’s life and later becoming part of the homeowners’ covenant. Mr. Brunson pointed out that this should be the responsibility of Mr. Hornsby’s company until such time as the homes are 80% built. Mr. Hornsby concurred. Mr. Brunson stated that the covenants would be addressed at the site plan approval stage.

Mr. Crosby asked if there is a market for this type of development. Mr. Hornsby replied yes. He elaborated on the market survey that he conducted for the area. Mr. Counts stated that currently there is no product like this in the market place, which is what concerns him about setting a precedent for 45 ft. lots. He stated that this may be a good thing for now, but what about in the future.

Chairman Nevill suggested the following changes in the PD Text:

Item C:

...Each lot shall be a minimum of 4,000 sq. ft. and ~~38-ft.~~ **40 ft.** width **with an allowance of three lots at 38 ft.** Steps may be up to ~~4 ft.~~ **2 ft.** into ~~front and~~ side setbacks.

Also add:

The restrictive covenants for the subdivision will be recorded in the Glynn County Clerk of Courts office prior to the sale of any buildings **and be recorded with the final plat.**

The developer shall be responsible for maintenance of the common area as well as for each property until 80% of the property is sold.

It was noted that Mr. Hornsby agreed with these changes. There was no one present to oppose this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson and seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to recommend approval of application **ZM1616** to amend the PD Text to modify the development standards, subject to a requirement that lots fronting on Touchstone Parkway have provisions for shared access, and subject to the following changes in the PD Text:

- 1) Each lot shall be a minimum of 4,000 sq. ft. and 40 ft. width with an allowance of three lots at 38 ft. Steps may be up to 2 ft. into side setbacks.
- 2) The restrictive covenants for the subdivision will be recorded in the Glynn County Clerk of Courts office prior to the sale of any buildings and recorded with the final plat.
- 3) The developer shall be responsible for maintenance of the common area as well as for each property until 80% of the property is sold.

During discussion, Mr. Crosby reiterated his concerns about setting a precedent. Mr. Counts agreed and added that it goes against the grain in that they were working toward having larger lots and a minimum residential zoning of R-6. Chairman Nevill feels that they are improving the situation from duplexes and rental properties. In addition, the property will have continued on-site maintenance. Mr. Hutchinson views this as a test project and stated that it will be watched very closely.

At the end of discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for approval:
Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and Mr. Gary Nevill. Voting Nay: Mr. Jason Counts, Mr. Buck Crosby and Ms. Julie Martin.

Chairman Nevill advised that this recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners as a tie vote and the application will be reviewed by the Board at its August 20th regular meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m.

ZM1638 (I) Canal Crossing

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agriculture, Highway Commercial, and Planned Development to Planned Development, property consisting of 44.135 acres located on the south side of Canal Road east of its intersection with Golden Isles Parkways (SR Spur 25). The property has approximately 1,800 ft. of frontage on Canal Road and 1,000 ft. on SR 25. The proposed project consists of a shopping center. Parcel ID: 03-03569 through 03-03572, 03-03576, 03-03583, 03-16941, and 03-20031. The property also includes a portion of the right-of-way of the abandoned railroad which served Glynco Air Station. Ussery/Rule P.C., Architects, agent for Brent Holdings, LLC, Geneva L. Jacobs, Rees 514, Olan J. Chancy, Betty Joyce Chancy, and Glynn County Board of Commissioners, owners.

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

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

This site is proposed for a 44 acre commercial shopping center. The proposed uses can be a mixture of retail, service, restaurants, hotels, and other commercial uses.

This development will necessitate the improvement of Canal Road as shown on the master-plan. The improvements include the widening of Canal Road, the dedication of future right-of-way, the limitation of access points, and other infrastructure. These improvements will have to be complete before any business is to be given a Certificate of Occupancy.

The Engineering Department had a number of comments specifically with regards to the improvements to Canal Road. The applicant has agreed to complete the road construction prior to any business opening at this location

According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers, a typical shopping center generates 43 daily trips per 1000 sq. ft. of floor area. A typical restaurant or drive-through service generates 90 daily trips per 1000 sq. ft. of floor area.

Given the assumptions above this project could generate approximately 17,000 daily trips. This increase in traffic is the basis for the improvements to be completed on Canal Road and the Canal/Spur 25 intersection.

Utilities will be provided by the Joint Water & Sewer Commission (JWSC).

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 development in the area. The Exit 38/Golden Isles Parkway intersection is a rapidly growing node that has experienced several new commercial developments.

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

The proposed zoning will have an impact on the surrounding properties. This area is changing from mixed residential to an emerging commercial node. This type of change has been expected given its proximity to the interstate and Golden Isles Parkway.

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

Yes. The property is currently being used for mixed low density residential 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 proposed use will have an impact on existing county infrastructure as the nature of the development will change. However, the applicant has agreed to provide these improvements prior to the completion of any business on the property.

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

This site is located in the central Glynn future development area. The adopted Future Development Map and Text classifies this area for a Regional Development Center, which is compatible for this type of 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.

Yes. The designation of this area as a Regional Development Center and the recent construction of a number of commercial facilities in the area.

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application *ZM1638* to rezone from Forest Agriculture, Highway Commercial and Planned Development to Planned Development subject to the following conditions as modified by the County Attorney's office.

1. The road improvements to Canal Road and the intersection of Canal and Spur 25 will be complete prior to a certificate of occupancy for any building on this site.
2. Right-of-way will be provided for the entire length of the property to allow for future road improvements as needed to make necessary road improvements. Right-of-way may be provided by a land exchange with Glynn County.
3. The infrastructure for the new traffic signal shown on the master-plan shall be installed. This signal shall be operational when the structures on this site meet or exceed 80,000 sq. ft. of development. The Certificate of Occupancy will be held until the signal is operational once the square footage threshold is met. The signals timing shall be synchronized with the existing signal at Canal and Spur 25.

4. There will be a maximum of three access points to this project (including the Rac Trac entrance).
5. No outparcels will be allowed direct access to Canal Road.
6. Buffers will be required as specified in the Zoning Ordinance for commercial development adjacent to residential and PD text, but planting materials and fences will not be allowed in drainage easements.
7. An access easement for Glynn County to access the Altamaha Canal will be required for maintenance.
8. GDOT approval will be required for any work within their right-of-way.

Ms. Julie Martin had several questions about the first access point in relation to the Rac Trac entrance. Mr. Landon stated that there have been some negotiations about a possible solution for the access, but the applicant would have to address those concerns.

Mr. Robert Ussery, representing the applicant, clarified that there are some tenant names listed on the conceptual site plan; however, there are no commitments for any tenants in any of the structures at this time. Regarding the entrance, he explained that the design contemplates that it would be a right-in/right-out only, which would ease some of the issues with the intersection between Canal Road and the Spur. They are currently in negotiations with Rac Trac to see if this could possibly work for them. He stated that they are also working with County Engineering staff to try to come up with a final design that they feel would work better for the intersection.

Chairman Nevill pointed out that the zoning text did not allow for any minimum lot areas or lot widths. Mr. Ussery suggested a minimum lot size of 3,000 sq. ft. and a minimum width of 30 ft. He stated that the minimum lot size allowed for General Commercial is 1875 sq. ft. Most of the out-parcels depicted on the conceptual plan will be an acre.

Ms. Julie Martin had questions about the tree save areas and buffer areas. She stated that the only tree save area that she noticed fronts on Golden Isles Parkway. Mr. Ussery stated that the ordinance requires buffers to be around the outside of the property. They are working with the tenants on the tree save areas which may not be in any particular configuration. Also, according to the development text there is a certain requirement for a minimum amount of greenspace within the parcel. Ms. Martin had additional questions about elevation and stormwater issues; however, Mr. Ussery explained that they are required to present site plans at every phase of the project and will have more information available for review to ensure that they are in line with their commitment. He stated that currently they are in the first thrust of the project and he is not prepared to address some of the issues at this time.

Mr. Counts wanted to know the significance of the 4.5 parking spaces per 1000 sq. ft. relative to the current ordinance. Mr. Ussery stated that the current ordinance requires 5 parking spaces, which is too many in his opinion. In discussing this with some of the potential tenants, they feel more comfortable with 4.5 but he would not have a problem reducing the number of spaces to 4.

It was noted that Sharon and William Lovin of 212 Rosewood Drive were present to oppose this request due to traffic problems. Mr. Lovin stated that Canal Road is already overloaded and he feels that this development will add to the problem. He is also concerned about the buffer zone and whether or not there will be a buffer. Chairman Nevill explained that this is a PD text and as such, the applicant is required to come before the Planning Commission for site plan approval each time a structure is proposed. He stated that buffers, fencing, additional vegetation, etc. will be addressed at that time and the plans will be advertised. He also stated that the multiple lanes being proposed for each direction will hopefully improve the traffic problems at the Canal Road intersection.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts, seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted to recommend approval of application **ZM1638** to rezone from Forest Agriculture, Highway Commercial and Planned Development to Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

1. The road improvements to Canal Road and the intersection of Canal and Spur 25 will be complete prior to a certificate of occupancy for any building on this site.
2. Right-of-way will be provided for the entire length of the property to allow for future road improvements as needed to make necessary road improvements. Right-of-way may be provided by a land exchange with Glynn County.
3. The infrastructure for the new traffic signal shown on the master-plan shall be installed. This signal shall be operational when the structures on this site meet or exceed 80,000 sq. ft. of development. The Certificate of Occupancy will be held until the signal is operational once the square footage threshold is met. The signals timing shall be synchronized with the existing signal at Canal and Spur 25.
4. There will be a maximum of three access points to this project (including the Rac Trac entrance).
5. No outparcels will be allowed direct access to Canal Road.
6. Buffers will be required as specified in the Zoning Ordinance for commercial development adjacent to residential and PD text, but planting materials and fences will not be allowed in drainage easements.

7. An access easement for Glynn County to access the Altamaha Canal will be required for maintenance.
8. GDOT approval will be required for any work within their right-of-way.
9. The minimum lot width will be 30 ft. and the minimum lot size will be 3,000 sq. ft.

PP1631 Eastgate Commerce Park, Phase I

Consider approval of a preliminary plat for a seven-lot subdivision on 31.651 acres located on the north side of Jack Hartman Boulevard, approximately 350 ft. west of its intersection with US 17 north. Parcel ID 03-00010. Brunswick & Glynn County Development Authority, owner.

Mr. Nathan Sparks, representing Brunswick & Glynn County Development Authority, was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Landon explained that the proposed subdivision is located directly adjacent to the Commercial Drivers License (CDL) facility that is currently under construction. The proposed lots are approximately one acre in size and are accessed from Jack Hartman Boulevard. The property is to be served by JWSC for water only. The applicant is in the variance process for sewer to use septic tanks. This application has been recommended for approval by the Capital Improvement Coordinating Committee (CICC) and is on the next Finance Committee agenda. It will ultimately have to be approved by the Board of Commissioners.

Engineering raised some concerns that can be addressed during the construction plan review phase. Staff comments included GDOT approval for the intersection given its proximity to Highway 17, and the location of access points for the proposed lots.

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **PP1631**, preliminary plat for Eastgate Commerce Park Phase I, subject to the following:

1. Approval of a sewer variance from the Board of Commissioners;
2. Approval of the proposed intersection by GDOT; and
3. The Final Plat for this project will not be recorded until the completion and dedication of Jack Hardman Boulevard.

Mr. William Jenkins, Director of Glynn County Environmental Health, commented that they have received the level for lot evaluations and they do not have a problem with what's being proposed relative to utilities and the minimum requirement standards with the restrictions on the lot flow.

Chairman Nevill asked if the access to the three lots from US 17 would be restricted, to which Mr. Sparks replied yes. Mr. Bill Foster of Thomas & Hutton Engineers added that it would also be stated as such on the final plat.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson, seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted for approval of application **PP1631**, preliminary plat for Eastgate Commerce Park Phase I, subject to the following:

1. Approval of a sewer variance from the Board of Commissioners;
2. Approval of the proposed intersection by GDOT; and
3. The Final Plat for this project will not be recorded until the completion and dedication of Jack Hardman Boulevard.

It was noted that the next two agenda items were read into the record and discussed simultaneously, but required separate action.

SP1489 DePratter Landing

Consider approval of a site plan for single family attached townhouses with associated roads, drainage, and public utilities. The 6.52 acre project is located west of US Highway 341 at the end of McKenzie Drive and consists of sixty-four 1,200 sq. ft. dwellings with rear patios and single car garages at a density of 9.82 units per acre. The property is located to the east of and adjacent to McKenzie Gardens and is zoned Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-10789. Gene Brockington, owner of Quality Development & Rentals, Inc., Merritt Construction, Inc.

SP1493 McKenzie Gardens

Consider approval of a site plan for single family attached townhouses with associated roads, drainage, and public utilities. The 16.43 acre project with 10.78 acres of upland is located west of US Highway 341 at the end of McKenzie Drive and consists of ninety-eight 700-1,300 sq. ft. dwellings with rear patios and single car garages at a density of 8.18 units per upland acre, to be built in up to seven phases. The property is located to the west of and adjacent to DePratter Landing and is zoned Planned Development. Parcel ID: 03-07364. Gene Brockington, owner of Quality Development & Rentals, Inc., Merritt Construction, Inc.

Mr. John Hunkele and Mr. Gene Brockington were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the two applications for site plan approval are combined in one report because they have been submitted by the same owner/applicant and due to the close proximity of the two properties.

The applicant is proposing to construct 64 dwelling units at DePratter Landing and 98 dwelling units at McKenzie Gardens, for a total of 162 dwelling units at the two sites combined.

The applicant will be working with the Engineering Department and the JWSC regarding water and sewer, drainage, and access during the permitting and construction process. Both development sites will be accessed from McKenzie Road.

The site will be served by public utilities. A letter of commitment regarding utilities has been received from the Joint Water and Sewer Commission.

DePratter Landing as well as McKenzie Gardens is anticipated to generate approximately 88 students at full build-out.

Mrs. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of *SP1489 (M)* DePratter Landing and *SP1493 (M)* McKenzie Gardens, subject to meeting all requirements.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson and unanimously adopted to approve *SP1489 (M) DePratter Landing*, subject to meeting all requirements.

A motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Julie Martin and unanimously adopted to approve *SP1493 (M) McKenzie Gardens*, subject to meeting all requirements.

SP1595 Spanky's Portside

Consider approval of a site plan for two restaurants on approximately 5.7 acres. The project consists of a 6,300 sq. ft. restaurant and a 1,780 sq. ft. restaurant for property fronting on both Palisade Drive and Candler Road in the Southport area. The property is zoned Planned Development. Parcel ID 03-12669, 03-12670, 03-12679, 03-12681 and 03-12680. Tidewater Engineering, agent for Portside Investments, LLC, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this request is for the first phase of a commercial development. This phase will consist of two restaurants and some utility infrastructure for future development. The total acreage of this property is approximately 5.7 acres; however, this property could be subdivided to provide for 4 additional lots for future development. The applicant is showing proposed future access and service roads in later phases.

Engineering, fire and police staff found this project compliant.

Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers guidelines, the proposed project will generate 727 average daily trips on a weekday (90 trips per 1,000 sq/ft).

The site will be served by JWSC for water and sewer.

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.**
- 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: There are no trees on this site.**
- 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: All utilities are to be provided by JWSC during the building process.**

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application *SP1595*, Spanky's Portside, subject to meeting all requirements.

Mr. Buddy Hutchinson wanted to know what is proposed as the second restaurant for this project. Mr. Schoenauer stated that the second proposed restaurant for this project will be similar to the Tokyo Joe's Restaurant located at the Mall Side Spanky's.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to approve application *SP1595*, Spanky's Portside, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

SP1619 Busta Crab Oyster Shack

Consider approval of a site plan for a restaurant on approximately 1.53 acres. The project consists of a 6,500 sq. ft. restaurant for property fronting on Highway 341 approximately 350 ft. south of its intersection with Glyndale Circle. The property is zoned Freeway Commercial. Parcel ID 03-04119. Tidewater Engineering, agent for Coastal Investments, LLC, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this request is for the development of a restaurant on the site of an existing vacant gas station. This site has exiting access from Highway 341 and a driveway to Glyndale Circle. The access on Highway 341 will require new permitting prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Engineering, fire and police staff found this project compliant.

Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers guidelines, the proposed project will generate 585 average daily trips on a weekday (90 trips per 1,000 sq/ft).

The site will be served by JWSC for water and sewer.

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; additional permitting from GDOT will be required.

- 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: There is one tree to be removed from this site as shown on the plan.**
- 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: All utilities are to be provided by JWSC during the building process.**

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application *SP1619*, Busta Crab Oyster Shack, subject to meeting all requirements.

Mr. Hutchinson had questions about removal of the gas tanks. Mr. Schoenaur stated that the tanks have been removed but the monitoring wells are still in place and may remain in place because the architect has designed around them.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jason Counts to approve application *SP1619*, Busta Crab Oyster Shack, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

SP1630 Southland Waste Systems

Consider approval of a site plan for a solid waste management facility, including public drop-off center, on a site consisting of 4.52 acres located at the north end of Young Lane, approximately 1,600 ft. north of Glyndale Drive. The property is zoned Limited Industrial. Parcel ID 03-03674. Charles Creveling, agent for Gary Middleton, owner.

Mr. Charles Creveling was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this request is to replace an existing construction and metal fabrication company with a facility to support a solid waste management operation. The site will change through the addition of an office trailer and a public drop-off center. The solid waste facility is currently located on Perry lane Road, east of US 341.

Engineering, fire and police staff found this project compliant.

The property has access by way of Young Lane. The site will be served by JWSC for water and sewer.

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.**
- 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: There are no trees on this site.**
- 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.**

- 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 has been met.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application **SP1630**, Southland Waste Management, subject to meeting all requirements.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin to approve application **SP1630**, Southland Waste Management, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted.

SP1639 Southwest Middle School

Consider approval of a site plan for a public middle school facility with associated access roads, parking, sidewalks and recreation fields on a site consisting of 21.74 acres located in the general vicinity north of I-95 and south of US Highway 17 on Southport Parkway. The property is zoned Forest Agricultural. Parcel ID: 03-20020. Al Boudreau, agent for Glynn County Board of Education, owner.

Mr. Al Boudreau, Ms. Karen Schmitt and Mr. John Hunkele were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the applicant is proposing to construct a large school with a campus that includes parent and staff parking areas, school access and delivery vehicle access, driveways, roads, a network of 6 ft. wide concrete sidewalks, and athletic fields for football, soccer, baseball and softball.

Engineering issues were resolved in response to staff comments.

A separate curb-cut is proposed for ingress/egress to public parking lots 3 and 4, the school loading area, and athletic fields, all off of Southport Parkway. A horseshoe drive is proposed as access for buses and staff parking lots 1 and 2. Two driveway curb cuts are standard; however, a third curb cut for the one-way horseshoe driveway will require a variance approval by the Mainland Planning Commission. Staff finds the third curb cut justifiable because the frontage allows adequate separation and the driveway use is one-way, limited to staff and bus use.

The site will be served by public water and sewer utilities.

Southwest Middle School is anticipated to serve students of middle school age. Other students in the area are served by Satilla Marsh and Glynn Academy schools.

An access road is to be provided on the back side of the building at the time of construction plan submittal.

No other issues were identified for this site plan. Therefore, Mrs. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of application *SP1639 (M)*, Southwest Middle School Site Plan, to include approval of a third curb cut for the proposed one-way u-shaped driveway.

After several inquiries about placing a buffer between the school property and the adjacent residential property for the protection of the children, specifically on the west side, Mr. Al Boudreau, agent for Glynn County Board of Education, agreed to consider the installation of a fence to buffer the two properties.

Ms. Karen Schmitt, architect, pointed out that they have actually revised the plans to include two entrances. Therefore, the third curb cut is no longer needed.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby to approve application *SP1639 (M)*, Southwest Middle School Site Plan, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jason Counts and unanimously adopted.

SP1642 Coastal Alloy

Consider approval of a site plan for a building for metal fabrication on a site consisting of 1.65 acres located on the west side of Young Lane, approximately 600 ft. north of Glyndale Drive. The property is zoned Limited Industrial. Parcel ID 03-03677. Peter Schoenauer, agent for Gary Middleton, owner.

Mr. Schoenauer and Mr. Middleton were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this request is to develop an industrial building on a parcel on the west side of Young Lane. The property was recently subdivided into two lots - this is one of the two.

The proposed structure is 6,000 sq. ft. with parking and a loading area. The building has been reoriented in the latest submittal of the plan. The reorientation raised a question about the door locations and the adequacy of the loading dock. This issue has been discussed with the applicant's engineer and with County Engineering staff, and has been resolved. The applicant proposes that the loading area be permitted to have a gravel surface due to expected limited use. Staff concurs with this request.

Engineering commented on some technical points that have been resolved in the revised plan and/or can be addressed during the review of the building permit plans. During the recent review of the subdivision, it was pointed out that some provision will

need to be made for a drainage easement. This is being addressed and can be reviewed during the building permit plan phase. The site will be served by JWSC for water and sewer.

Fire and police staff found this project compliant.

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.**
- 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 obtaining an off-site drainage easement.**
- 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.**
- 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 has been met.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application *SP1642*, Coastal Alloy, subject to meeting all requirements and subject to 1) meeting the requirements of the Water Resource Protection Ordinance; and 2) approval of the gravel loading area.

Ms. Julie Martin wanted to know if waste material is involved in the metal fabrication process. Mr. Gary Middleton stated that they have been in business for approximately 12 years. He gave a brief description of the operation of this facility and explained that waste is kept in 55 gallon drums and is sold to recycling plants.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to approve application ***SP1642***, Coastal Alloy, subject to meeting all requirements and subject to 1) meeting the requirements of the Water Resource Protection Ordinance; and 2) approval of the gravel loading area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.