

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 19, 2009 - 6:00 P.M.

The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

MEMBERS PRESENT: Preston Kirkendall, Chairman
Desiree Watson, Vice Chairman
John Dow, Jr.
Patricia Laurens
William Lawrence
Paul Sanders
Joan Wilson

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
York Phillips, Planning Manager
Eric Landon, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Commissioner Tom Sublett, BOC Vice Chairman
Commissioner Don Hogan, BOC

Chairman Preston Kirkendall called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

MINUTES

April 21, 2009 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve the Minutes of the April 21st Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Joan Wilson. Voting Aye: Mr. John Dow, Mr. Preston Kirkendall, Ms. Patricia Laurens, Mr. William Lawrence and Ms. Joan Wilson. Mr. Sanders and Ms. Watson did not attend the April 21st meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

SP1554 (I) Shops at Sea Island

Consider approval of a site plan for the addition of 2,400 sq. ft. of retail space in an existing shopping center (Shops at Sea Island) located on the southwest corner of Frederica Road and Sea Island Road. The property is zoned General Commercial. Parcel ID: 04-12293. Sea Island Company, agent for JLV-VASI, LLC owner.

Mr. Bill Edenfield of Sea Island Company and Mr. Bill Foster of Thomas & Hutton Engineers were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Landon explained that this application is a request to add a single-story retail store to the existing shopping center. The proposed structure will be 2,400 sq. ft. of floor area. Utilities, access, and parking are to be provided by the existing development. The site is served by public water and sewer.

The proposed development will require the removal of 4 native trees on the site. The applicant is not required to replace these trees but has offered to plant 6 oaks and 5 palms to compensate for the loss of the existing trees.

The applicant is also asking for a parking variance under Section 611.7 of the Zoning Ordinance. Based on the square footage of the existing and proposed structure, the required number of parking spaces on the site is 488. The applicant is asking for a reduction to 370 parking spaces. This will require the applicant to show 51,300 sq. ft. of undeveloped land on the site to meet the reduction requirement as described in the ordinance, and according to the plan, the applicant meets this requirement.

Based on ITE estimates, this project is estimated to create an additional 106 daily trips (44 trips per 1,000 square feet x 2,400 square feet = 106).

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; the proposed addition will use existing facilities.**
- 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 site plan.**

- 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 or will be met through the building permit process. The site plan notes that the project will comply with the lighting regulations, including Section 622.**
- 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. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of the site plan *SP1554* for Shops at Sea Island 2, subject to meeting all requirements.

Chairman Kirkendall stated that the plan shows a lot of parking spaces being added between Frederica Road and the buildings. Mr. Landon stated that the parking is being shown to demonstrate that if the developers were required to do all of the parking, the additional spaces would be located in that particular area. Currently, there are 370 parking spaces and to his knowledge, the developers are not anticipating any additional parking. Chairman Kirkendall stated that apparently the site got approved with an insufficient amount of parking of 370 spaces for the previously amount of square footage. Mr. Landon pointed out that initially, the site was approved with a variance when the entire shopping center was established and although the applicant is asking for an additional variance for more square footage, the variance is within the threshold of the ordinance. Chairman Kirkendall wanted to know how many more parking spaces would be required for the amount of square footage being added. Mr. Landon stated that 12 parking spaces would be required, but if the variance is denied, the developers would have to come up with 12 more spaces.

Mr. William Lawrence wanted to know which two trees are being removed because he counted 10 trees expected to be removed. He also stated that it appears to him that the trees that are being replaced will be located behind the CVS Drug Store. Mr. Landon stated that the trees are planned to be located behind the drug store, but according to the ordinance, the applicant is not required to replace the trees at all. They are voluntarily replacing the trees. Mr. Lawrence pointed out the 10 trees including three Palm trees, but Mr. Landon stated that the Palm trees are being added; not removed.

Mr. Paul Sanders stated that if the property weren't already zoned General Commercial, could it be zoned as such under the existing ordinance. He stated that the ordinance is very clear as to what the property on Frederica Road could be zoned and it is not General Commercial, therefore it was not properly zoned at that time. He stated that when it was zoned the applicant was not required to put in a buffer against the subdivision to the south. However, if it had been properly zoned, the applicant would have had to put in the buffer. Mr. Phillips explained that what Mr. Sanders is referring to is the provision in the Comprehensive Plan indicating that certain properties along Frederica Road had to be zoned Planned Development. He stated he believes that the General Commercial came under the previous guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in 1997, but he is not sure if this property was zoned before or after 1997.

Mr. Dow wanted to know what the red dots on the map represent. He also wanted to know if there is sufficient storm drainage to accommodate the building. Mr. Landon stated that the applicant would have to address the red dots. He stated that the County Engineer will review the drainage issue during the building permit phase of the development. Mr. Dow stated that the drainage issue could have a bearing on whether the site plan is valid or not. He stated that perhaps the plan could be approved with a stipulation regarding the storm drainage. He also expressed the same concerns as Mr. Lawrence about the trees being put in the back of the building and stated that there should be a better place to put the trees. Mr. Landon explained that staff doesn't have the authority to ask the applicant to replace the trees or direct where they should go; however, the Planning Commission does have the authority. Mr. Dow stated that he doesn't want them to spend money unnecessarily but planting mature trees in the back of a building just doesn't make sense to him. He stated that the issue about the storm drainage and the future use of the other site is something that needs to be pursued.

Ms. Joan Wilson wanted to know how many parking spaces are currently required. Mr. Landon stated that with the addition and the extra 12 parking spaces there would be 488 required parking spaces, but there are 370 proposed. He pointed out that under Section 611.7 the Planning Commission has the authority to reduce it by 25% if the developer provides 450 sq. ft. of greenspace for every parking space they reduce, which is how the 51,000 was calculated. Ms. Wilson wanted to know where the parking spaces are being eliminated from. Mr. Landon explained that the original plan was approved and the applicant was given a variance for parking. In order to add a building, the applicant is asking for another variance, which is within the threshold of the Planning Commission's authority to approve.

Ms. Desiree Watson noted that the developer is planning a reduction of 118 parking spaces, which is the difference between what is required and what is being proposed. She pointed out that multiplying the reduction by the undeveloped land equals 53,100 and not 51,300. She stated that the plat shows the undeveloped space as 53,130 which means that there is an error in the report. She also wanted to know if the undeveloped land is located in the setback. Mr. Landon stated that the setback for General Commercial is zero.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Bill Edenfield clarified that the red dots as referenced by Mr. Dow, represent the native trees that are 36 inches and larger, which is what they used in the rezoning of the Old Stables Tract. He elaborated on the type of standard set for removing and replacing large native trees and pointed out that the only trees to be removed are the four trees where the building goes.

Mr. Edenfield stated that one of the big questions is whether the county's parking ratio is excessive, and it appears to him that it is. He stated that most of the shopping centers, including this proposal, are full of asphalt and are over-paved. He stated that the development is not up to standard because he received a variance several years ago, so in essence, they could add the building and still not burden the parking and still have lots of trees. He stated that "the other ugly thing" about this shopping center is that when you come into the shopping center you see all of the dumpsters, and "it's ugly." In fixing that problem, he stated that they proposed to put up an 8 ft. wall and Palm trees so that when you come into the shopping center you'll see trees and not dumpsters. Mr. Edenfield stated that none of what they're proposing is required by the ordinance, but they are offering it because it is a good idea. He pointed out other benefits imposed by the Sea Island Company over the years that were not required by the ordinance, such as buffers.

At this time, Mr. Edenfield introduced Mr. Bill Foster with Thomas & Hutton Engineers who addressed the storm drainage issue. Mr. Foster stated that the current drainage patterns in the parking lot would not be altered by the addition and the calculations will be shown when the building permit is submitted to the county.

Ms. Joan Wilson wanted to know what retail type shop is proposed for the site. Mr. Edenfield stated that a cell phone company is the potential tenant. Ms. Wilson stated that she's concerned about the prospect of attracting more parking. Mr. Edenfield pointed out that it is a retail space and not a restaurant space; so parking should not be a big problem.

Ms. Meredith Trawick, St. Simons Island resident, stated that it looks like the developers are putting a retail store in the middle of the parking lot. She stated that she shops in the area all the time and parking is already a problem especially at Harris Teeter. She stated that the proposed building looks like it will take up a lot of parking area and if the space will be utilized by a potential cell phone company, she thinks that they will need more parking. For clarification, Mr. Edenfield stated that the building is not going in a parking lot. It is actually going in an existing green space and he doesn't think that it will create a parking problem. He stated that there will be times during the holidays where parking will be an issue, but "why pave the world for that."

Mr. Dow asked Mr. Edenfield if he would be willing to restrict the building to retail only, noting that it won't be a restaurant. Mr. Edenfield replied yes.

There being no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow for approval of the site plan, *SPI554* for Shops at Sea Island 2, subject to meeting all requirements including the following; consideration that the storm drainage will not be

affected by the store; the site will be reserved in perpetuity for retail; and the trees shown on the site plan that are voluntary will be required. The motion also includes approval of the parking variance as shown on the submitted plan. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

SP1555 (I) Old Stables Tract Phase I

Consider site plan approval for development of Phase I of the Old Stables Tract commercial area located at the northwest corner of Sea Island Road and Frederica Road. The proposed improvements address access and utility improvements and removal of trees in accordance with the approved PD Master Plan and Text. Individual commercial projects will be subject to further site plan reviews. The site is 11.337 acres and is zoned Planned Development and is part of the Old Stables Tract Planned Development. Parcel ID: 04-05141, 04-01542, 04-05158, 04-05060. Sea Island Company, agent for JLV-VASL, LLC, owner.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Bill Foster were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that the proposal consists of a layout for utilities and access driveways to serve the eastern portion of the commercial area within the planned development. Four outparcel sites are shown, along with the approximate location of building pads within them. The proposal does not address specific commercial establishments. Site plan approval will be required for each of the individual building pads when a specific business is determined.

The plan identifies large trees to be removed and trees to be saved in accordance with the approved PD Master Plan and Text. The plan shows six large (over 24" or greater) Live Oak trees being removed within the driveway area and seven on the four individual building sites. In addition, thirteen trees over 34" are to be preserved. The number of trees being preserved is consistent with the requirements of the PD Text. Since the precise layout of the individual outparcel building sites has not been determined, staff suggests that tree removal on them not be approved until the site designs are available.

The site plan preserves a buffer along Frederica Road and Sea Island Road, consistent with the requirements of the Planned Development. However, there is a portion of the driveway and some parking area within the buffer on the east side. The PD Text does not provide for encroachment of these features.

Engineering has raised a number of technical design issues, particularly with respect to the configuration of traffic circulation, both onsite and on the adjacent roads. These issues will need to be addressed, although some of them may be able to be handled during the site plan review for individual commercial establishments. Another issue

raised by Engineering is the preservation of the area that might be needed for the construction of a roundabout for the Frederica Road/Sea Island Road intersection.

The impact of this development on the road system in the vicinity of Frederica Road and Sea Island Road was a major topic of discussion during the rezoning process. The layout of access and driveways is consistent with the approved PD Master Plan.

The arrangement of utilities is generally consistent with the approved PD Master Plan. Details of these facilities will be reviewed when the building permit site plans are reviewed.

Fire will need to see the more detailed plan for hydrants in conjunction with the review of individual site plans.

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. Because of the technical nature of most of the information, many of the missing items will be more appropriately addressed in the reviews of individual building site plans.**
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. **Staff comment: To the extent information is available, 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, although some additional discussion will be necessary regarding the public roads adjoining this site.**
- 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 individual site plans and building permit site plans.**
- 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 with the exception of the encroachment of the driveway and parking area into the eastern buffer.**

- 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. The site plan notes that the project will comply with the lighting regulations, including Section 622.**
- 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 that application *SPI555* for Phase I of the Old Stables Tract be approved subject to there being continued discussion with staff over the specific details of the tie-in with Frederica Road and Sea Island Road, particularly with how the new acceleration and deceleration lanes are incorporated with existing lanes. Also, the applicant needs to provide responses to the staff comments and supply the missing details on the plan during the individual site plan reviews, and meet all other ordinance and planned development requirements.

Mr. Dow stated that there is a lot of information that still needs to be discussed. Mr. Phillips stated specifically for review at this time are utilities, drainage, access, and tree removal aspects. He stated that there are some features of the plan that won't be addressed until the detail plans on the individual sites are submitted, such as parking, building appearance, bulk, etc. Those will need to comply with the ordinance and with the Planned Development.

Mr. Dow stated that he had questions and comments about the entrances and the design but in speaking with Mr. Edenfield and Mr. Foster; apparently there is a newer version of the site plan that has an update of the ingress and egress. In his opinion, given the fact that there is another version of the site plan, Mr. Dow feels that this application should be deferred until the most current site plan is submitted. He pointed out that about six trees along the road would be removed if the plan is approved now. One of the plans that he saw that may be more current would possibly eliminate that prospect. Ms. Watson noted that there are no trees shown between the two driveways on to Sea Island Road.

For clarification, Mr. Hainley explained that under the Land Disturbance Ordinance, staff has the authority to authorize removal of the trees that are shown on this plan without the Planning Commission's consent; however, given the history of removal of large Oaks that occurred on the mainland, staff and the applicant agreed to bring it forward at the Planning Commission level rather than at staff level. He stated that there are no tree plantings shown because there are no developed plans for those at this time.

Ms. Watson stated that one of the recommendations in the dialog was that tree removal shouldn't be approved until the site designs are available; however, this was not part of the recommended motion. Mr. Phillips stated that staff does suggest that the tree

removal, with the exception of the eastern most building site, be held off until the site layout is worked out. He stated that although the two western most sites and the portion between the two entrances on Sea Island Road are heavily vegetated, there aren't any existing trees of consequence in these areas.

Mr. Dow asked Mr. Edenfield if he would have a problem with a deferral until a more definitive plan is submitted showing the trees that can actually be saved. Mr. Edenfield asked if there could be a condition of approval. However, Mr. Dow stated that he would not be comfortable until he has actually seen the plan with everything included. Mr. Edenfield explained that the information was submitted, but it did not get to staff in time to disseminate to the Planning Commission. He agreed however with the deferral.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to defer application *SP1555*, Phase I of the Old Stables Tract, until the June 16th meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

TA1535

Consider an amendment adding Section 700 to the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to provide for the creation of a Village Residential District; to impose and identify certain uses and development standards for the District; and for other purposes.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Hainley explained that this is an amendment establishing a new residential zoning district to serve the Village area. This district is similar to the R-6 One-Family Residential District, with adjustments to make it compatible with the nature of the residential area in the immediate vicinity of the Village Core area. The new district implements the Village Master Plan.

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

During the course of discussion, it was pointed out that this is the same amendment previously reviewed by both Planning Commissions and there are no changes.

Mr. Dow suggested adding the word "*net*" in front of "*acre*" (page 2, line 87 and page 3, line 91) as they always have. The Planning Commission concurred.

Mr. J. Richard Lyons stated that he lives in the Village Preservation area and he would like to know if this amendment would do away with the Village Preservation Ordinance. Mr. Hainley replied no and explained that this proposal is a text amendment and not a rezoning. It would create a zoning district for the Village area. He stated that

what is unique is that the residential classifications that are under this area will now have site coverage. He also noted that there will be no new R-6 zonings in accordance with the statute enacted for the Island.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow recommending approval of the amendment to establish the new Section 700 to create the Village Residential Zoning District subject to insertion of the term “*net*” in front of “*acre*” on page 2, line 87 and page 3, line 91. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

TA1536

Consider an amendment to Section 709 of the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to establish Overlay Districts, a Design Review Committee, plan submission standards and administration and for other purposes.

Mr. Hainley reported that this is an amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance to revise the existing St. Simons Village Preservation District. Among the changes are: (1) within the existing Village Preservation area, replaces the current system of regulating new buildings and building expansions based on the footprint and height of adjacent buildings; (2) introduces a design review board and design guidelines and procedures; (3) creates the new Island Corridor District along major streets on St. Simons Island to manage appearance of buildings (other than single family dwellings). The new section establishes a design review board and includes bylaws for approval by the Board of Commissioners. These changes implement the recommendations of the Village Master Plan.

Mr. Hainley stated that the proposed membership, which would be appointed by the Board of Commissioners, would consist of a landscaped architect, someone with knowledge and experience in historic preservation, engineering, property appraisal, interior design or art, one member should be a residential property owner within the designated district and one member should be a business owner within the Village District area.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of the amendment adopting the replacement Section 709 to create the Village District and the Island Corridor District, along with regulations and procedures.

Chairman Kirkendall stated that the primary reason for the review committee is to put more expertise into the design areas than what we have on the Planning Commission. Ms. Watson stated that there are three stages of development; conceptual, preliminary, and the final stage. In the concept stage, part of the function of the design review committee would be to assist the applicant in conforming to the parameters of the area.

At this time, the floor was open for public comments beginning with Ms. Joan Cook. Ms. Cook stated that this proposal is too vague and the public has not had a chance to review it. She stressed that not enough information has been made available and she feels that there should have at least been a town hall meeting for the citizens to have a more in-depth discussion. She stated that if this amendment is approved, she would strongly recommend that the membership consist of retirees, i.e. architects or landscaped architects to avoid a conflict because vested interests often give the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Mr. R. C. Johnson, president of St. Simons Park Homeowners Association, expressed his appreciation for all of the effort that has gone into this proposal. He stated that the main concern from the homeowners is the loss of the familiar Village District. They're concern about the changes and would like some assurances that the purpose of the change is to make it better, not to open it up for wild speculative construction. Mr. Johnson feels that the layer of review and all of the cooperation put forth with this committee will actually help; however, more information and discussion is needed. He stated that although the proposal was probably available via the internet, an actual mailed packet would have helped; not all of the homeowners have computers.

Ms. Nancy Thomason stated that she has been a business owner in the Village for 32 years. She sat through all of the meetings in the mid 90's when the Village Ordinance was first adopted, which had input from virtually everybody in the Village at that time and great support on the Island. She stressed that she has found nothing confusing about the Village Ordinance with regard to determining the height and size of buildings. In her opinion, it is a developer's excuse to act like it is so difficult to understand the ordinance. Ms. Thomason stated that we have a good ordinance now and she fears that this proposal would ruin the character of the Village.

Mr. Buzzy Ramsey, former member of the Board of Appeals, stated that it has always been his belief that the requirements in the Village Preservation Ordinance are arbitrary. He stated that he constantly deals with architectural review boards and he knows that there is a problem. He pointed out that this proposal looks great and appears to be a way to help, but he feels that it will become very political and more chaotic. He suggested that the Planning Commission do a two-year or a five-year trial period in the Village District to see if this works before expanding into the boundary areas that have been included in this request, or vote this proposal down for additional review.

Ms. Meredith Trawick stated that she is very concerned about the height ordinance and asked for an explanation with regard to this proposal. Mr. Hainley explained that in the current overlay that deals with the Village area only there is a formula that tells you how to calculate the maximum allowable height. Ms. Trawick stated that in other words, "outside of the Village area anything goes because the Review Board would be the ones to decide." Mr. Hainley stated no, that is not correct. The underline zoning is still the rule which applies inside of the Village and in the Corridor Districts as well. Ms. Trawick stated that she's concerned about the five member board, which could consist of contractors and builders who may decide to allow taller

condominium buildings. She stated that this would change the look of the entire neighborhood and create a domino effect. Mr. Hainley stated that the Review Board would have no authority to change zoning and they would have no authority that deals with this Commission on submitting recommendations to the Board of Commissioners to change any zoning classification. Ms. Trawick stated that she sees this “snowballing to the point where they have absolutely no control over the height.” She then asked that if this proposal is approved, could there be another floor or level in the Village. Mr. Hainley replied no.

Dr. Mary Avram of 601 May Jo Street stated that she did not find the ordinance and regulations difficult when she built her home years ago. She agreed that this proposal is very vague and the parameters are not secure.

Mr. Hal Hart, former Planning Commission member, presented an outline of his concerns and suggested that this request be deferred in order to give the public more time to study the proposal and offer input. Some of his concerns include wording, lack of definition and scope of coverage. (The outline of concerns in its entirety is contained in the application file.)

Mr. Hart stressed that he believes in good planning and zoning, but the ordinances need to be well thought out, uniform and fair. He stated that there are good ideas in the proposed Section 709 but there are also some vague and undefined sections which are open to personal perceptions or interpretation, which can lead to bad decisions. He reiterated that this request needs to be deferred to allow for additional study and public input.

Mr. Matthew Permar of *The Islander* wanted to know who initiated this proposal, particularly the Island Corridor and expanding the Pier Village Master Plan to the entire Island. Mr. Hainley explained that there were several structures going up along the corridors that a large number of citizens raised concern about relative to the architecture and the final appearance. It was determined that the only tool that this Commission had to ensure that requirements are met for approval was the site plan. There was discussion as to whether parameters could be established regarding the corridors for this area. Research showed that there were other corridor districts in the State of Georgia with the same architecture review as the Village, and so the decision was made to look at adding the main visual corridors on the Island.

Mr. Richard Taylor stated that he spoke with Mr. Hal Hart about this proposal and he agrees with his comments. He pointed out that he is primarily interested in the representation of the five members because the way that this proposal is laid out, if he wanted to serve on the committee he would not be eligible. He stated that the subjective and vague nature of the criteria basically frightens him specifically with the amount of paperwork, time and money that would be required of him if he wanted to repaint his building inside of the corridor. Mr. Taylor stated that there is not a compelling need to change the ordinance. He feels that the Board should trust the local business owners and property owners to manager their own affairs and abide by the underlining zoning. He

also stated that he spoke with several business and property owners along the corridors within the last two days and very few of them were aware of this proposal. Mr. Taylor urged the Planning Commission to deny application **TA1536**, as well as application **ZM1532**.

There being no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to defer **TA1536** until the July 21st Islands Planning Commission meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. to consider all of the comments and allow for additional review. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Dow and unanimously adopted. (It was noted that action would be taken on application **ZM1532** at the appropriate time on the agenda.

TA1537

Consider an amendment to Section 715 of the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to revise the Section in its entirety; to replace the General Commercial Core District with the Village Mixed Use District (VMU); to impose and identify certain uses and development standards for the District; and for other purposes.

The proposed amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Hainley who explained that this district replaces the existing General Commercial Core District and makes adjustments to ensure compatibility with the Village Core area. It also implements the Village Master Plan.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of the amendment to establish the new Section 715 to create the Village Mixed Use (VMU) Zoning District.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to recommend approval of the amendment to establish the new Section 715 to create the Village Mixed Use (VMU) Zoning District. The motion was seconded by Ms. Desiree Watson and unanimously adopted.

TA1538

Consider an amendment to Section 726 of the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, to provide for renaming of the Government District, specifying uses and creating development standards for the District; and for other purposes.

Mr. Hainley explained that this amendment includes changes in the uses and standards for development. He stated that staff recommends approval of the amendment to replace the Government District with the Public District, along with changes in the regulations and procedures.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Patricia Laurens to recommend approval of the amendment to replace the Government District with the Public District, along with changes in the regulations and procedures. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. John Dow, seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted to defer **ZM1531** and **ZM1532** until the July 21st Islands Planning Commission meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m.

The next two agenda items (**SUP1522 and VP1388**) were read into the record and discussed simultaneously. The items were presented by Mr. Eric Landon and complete reports are contained in the files.

SUP1522 (I) Subway

Consider a request for a special use permit to allow outdoor dining tables at a restaurant within the General Commercial Core (GC-Core) Zoning District. The property is located at 315 Mallery Street on the west side of Mallery Street south of Ocean Boulevard and north of Lord Avenue. The property is zoned GC-Core. Parcel ID: 04-11672. Chris Brazell, agent for Shirley and Edward Ralston, owners.

VP1388 Subway

This is a request to approve outdoor signage for a restaurant located at 315 Mallery Street. The property is located on the west side of Mallery Street south of Ocean Boulevard and north of Lord Avenue. The property is zoned General Commercial Core (GC-Core). Parcel ID: 04-11672. Chris Brazell, agent for Shirley and Edward Ralston, owners.

Mr. Kevin Bartell was present for discussion.

Staff recommends approval of application **SUP1552** to allow outdoor dining tables at a restaurant within the GC-Core Zoning District. Staff also recommends approval of **VP1388** to allow signs in the form of window stickers, umbrellas with the restaurant's name at outdoor dining tables, and the addition of a green metal roof to the existing awning.

It was noted that no one was present to oppose either of these requests.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. William Lawrence to approve *SUP1522* and *VPI388*. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

In other business, Mr. Hainley advised that the May 26th Joint Planning Commission workshop meeting has been cancelled.

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