

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION SEPTEMBER 6, 2011 - 6:00 P.M. Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Brunson, Chairman
Buddy Hutchinson, Vice-Chairman
Larissa Harris
Julie H. Martin
Tim Murphy
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Aaron Carone
Buck Crosby
- STAFF PRESENT:** David Hainley, Director
Eric Landon, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Brunson called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes

August 2, 2011 - Regular Meeting

Upon a motion made by Ms. Julie Martin and seconded by Mr. Tim Murphy, the Minutes of the *August 2nd Regular Meeting* were approved and unanimously adopted.

Agenda - deferrals, withdrawals, postponements, additions, change order of presentation

Upon the applicant's request, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Julie Martin and unanimously adopted to withdraw application *SP2275*.

In order to accommodate an applicant due to medical concerns, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Julie Martin and unanimously adopted to move application *SUP2243* to the top of the agenda.

In addition to the above changes, Mr. Hainley suggested that agenda item *SP2270-SPNR* be discussed simultaneously with *ZM2274-SPNR*. (Each item requires separate action.) The Planning Commission concurred.

At this time, Chairman Brunson gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

SUP2243 (M) 126 Williams Road

Consider a request for a special use permit to allow a mobile home as an additional dwelling unit in the case of a medical hardship on property located on the north side of Williams Road, approximately 600 ft. west of its intersection with Highway 341, and addressed as 126 Williams Road. The property consists of 6.29 acres and is zoned Forest Agricultural. Parcel ID: 03-16487. Norma and Tyona McDaniel, owners.

Ms. Norma McDaniel was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this property was platted into two lots beginning the process in the spring of 2008, to allow a mobile home to be on the property in which Norma McDaniel's son was residing. A Final Plat for the two lots was approved by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners on February 19, 2009. The final step after approval of the Final Plat was for the applicants to convey right-of-way for the widening of Williams Road to Glynn County. After Final Plat approval by the Board, the applicant was unable to complete the items required to enable the plat to be recorded.

This is an initial request for a medical hardship permit. Under this procedure, if approved by the Board of Commissioners, the special use permit will be valid for two years or until the medical hardship ceases to exist (in accordance with Section 704.2 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance). If the medical hardship does not cease within the two years, the special use may then be renewed administratively for two additional years. After that time, a new application will be required. For the record, evidence of the medical hardship has been provided to staff.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of application **SUP2243 (M)** to allow a mobile home as an additional dwelling unit in the case of a medical hardship at 126 Williams Road.

There was no one present to oppose this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson recommending approval of application **SUP2243 (M)** to allow a mobile home as an additional dwelling unit in the case of a medical hardship at 126 Williams Road. The motion was seconded by Ms. Julie Martin and unanimously adopted.

ZM2259 Brampton Commercial Park, Lot 6

Consider a request to amend the Planned Development Text for property located at 230 Frontage Road on the south side of Highway 17 South. The request is to amend the signage requirements for this property. Parcel ID 03-16377. Iron Horse Development LLC, owner.

Mr. Doug Walker was present for discussion.

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

This property was rezoned as a planned development in 1997. The adopted PD text states that the sign regulations will meet the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance states that PD signage will be identified in the PD text. As a result, there are no requirements for signage on this site. This application is a request to adopt the Highway Commercial sign standards in the existing Zoning Ordinance.

The property has existing frontage on the right-of-way and the project will use municipal water and sewer from the Joint Water and 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 use clarifies signage for this property. Without this request no signage can be approved on this site. The original PD text does not provide regulatory standards.

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

The proposed signage will provide visibility to the proposed business, and will be visible to adjacent properties.

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

Yes, although the current zoning does not allow for signage on the site.

- 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.

None.

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

Yes, this property is located in an Existing Activity Center which allows a mix of commercial uses.

- 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. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2259** to amend the Planned Development Text to provide signage regulations.

There was no one present to oppose this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin recommending approval of application **ZM2259** to amend the Planned Development Text to provide signage regulations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

ZM2266 McGarvey Efficiencies

Consider a request to amend the Planned Development Text and Master Plan for property on the east side of Altama Avenue, south of its intersection with Baybridge Road. The purpose of the request is to allow the efficiency apartments to be operated as an extended stay hotel. Parcel ID 03-01889 and 03-01500. Property owned by Cormac McGarvey.

Mr. Chris Amos was present for discussion.

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

The property was rezoned as a planned development in 1999 to be used as efficiency apartments. Since that time, the property has been developed and managed in that manner. The applicant is now asking to amend the permitted uses in the Planned

Development text to allow an “extended stay hotel” as a permitted use. It does not appear that the change in the defined use will affect the manner in which the property will be utilized.

The property is an existing development and has frontage on Altama Avenue. The project uses municipal water and sewer from 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 request is a technical change in the type of rental agreement to be used with the owner and tenants.

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

The proposed change should not affect the manner in which the property is used.

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

Yes, the current zoning can be reasonably used.

- 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.

None.

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

Yes, this property is located in a Medium Density Residential area which allows a mix of residential uses.

- 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. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2266** to amend the Planned Development Text.

Ms. Julie Martin asked if this is a proposal to change one building or is it for the entire complex. Mr. Landon replied that it would be for the entire complex located on Altama Avenue. Ms. Martin asked if there were any controversial responses to this request. Mr. Landon stated that this item was properly advertised and letters were mailed to the neighbors, but staff did not receive any responses.

Chairman Brunson wanted to know when the hotel tax would go into effect. Mr. Hainley explained that on any property that is rented for residential purposes, whether it's a single-family house, a motel unit or an apartment, if occupied for less than 31 days the first 30 days would be subject to the hotel/motel tax. Chairman Brunson then asked if every apartment owner in Glynn County is supposed to be collecting a motel tax for the first 30 days of occupancy. Mr. Hainley stated that if it is only for that period of time, yes, but if you're signing a one-year lease, no. However, if you're signing a 30 day lease, the 30 days should be subject to the hotel/motel bed tax. Mr. Hainley pointed out that this act is enforced by the Finance Department and not by Community Development.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Chris Amos explained that the reason that Mr. McGarvey submitted this request is because of the limitations in a Planned Development, which is restricted to efficiencies and apartments. Adding this use to the allowed uses will give the applicant more flexibility in how he manages the property as an extended stay hotel rather than its current use.

There was no one present to oppose this request, and at the end of discussion a motion was made by Mr. Tim Murphy to recommend approval of application **ZM2266** to amend the Planned Development Text. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted.

ZM2274 SPNR

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural (FA) to Highway Commercial (HC) for a portion of property located on the southeast side of Blythe Island Highway approximately 1,000 feet east of its intersection with Fancy Bluff Road. The purpose of the request is to allow an automotive school, shop, and display building. Parcel ID 02-00735. Tidewater Engineering, agent for EHLE Trust, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer and Mr. Randall Ehle were present for discussion.

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

The majority of this property was rezoned in 2005 from FA to HC. The request did not include the rear portion of this property. It appeared at that time that it was part of a separate parcel of land. Therefore, the rear section remains FA. This request is to unify the zoning of this property to HC so that it can be developed as an automotive school, shop, and display building.

Engineering had concerns which would be resolved during the building permit process, including verification of the issuance of a GDOT right-of-way permit.

The property has direct access on Blythe Island Highway and the project will utilize a private well and septic system.

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 request is consistent with the surrounding zoning and with the zoning of the majority of this property.

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

The proposed change is consistent with adjacent zoning.

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

The majority of this property can be used as HC, but the particular portion in this application would have to remain vacant.

- 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.

None.

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

Yes, this property is located in an Existing Activity Center which is an area that allows a mix of commercial uses.

- 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. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2274** to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer gave a brief presentation and a general discussion followed. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson recommending approval of application **ZM2274** to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Murphy and unanimously adopted.

SP2270 SPNR

Consider approval of a site plan for a project consisting of an automotive restoration school, shop, and display building. The proposed buildings total 16,000 sq. ft. of floor area. The property is located on the southeast side of Blythe Island Highway approximately 1,000 ft. east of its intersection with Fancy Bluff Road. The property is zoned Highway Commercial. Parcel ID 02-00735. Tidewater Engineering, agent for EHLE Trust, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer and Mr. Randall Ehle were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Landon stated that this site plan, in conjunction with the rezoning (**ZM2274**), contains the same issues. The report does point out however that there are no comparable traffic generation calculations according to the ITE traffic generation manual for such a specific use as an automotive school. Given the fact that this property has frontage on a state highway it is anticipated that the traffic impact will be minimal.

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends that **SP2270** be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin, seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted to approve **SP2270** subject to meeting all requirements.

SP2254 Cypress Lake

Consider approval of a site plan for a project consisting of a 165 multi-family residential units on 12.09 acres. The property is located on the southeast corner of Altama Connector and Old Cypress Mill Road. The property is zoned Medium Residential (MR). Parcel ID 03-16488. Atlantic Housing Partners, applicant for Montgomery Bank and Trust, owner.

Mr. Robert White was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this is a request to develop a multi-family development on a vacant parcel, which is currently zoned for such a development. Zoning regulations allow up to 16 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is requesting a density of 13.65 dwelling units per acre. The development will include one-story and three-story construction. Required buffers will be provided adjacent to residential property and the right-of-way.

Engineering comments will be addressed during the building permit stage of this project. Issues to be resolved include acceleration/deceleration lanes and access location and compatibility with existing road network. The applicant has agreed to conduct a traffic study as part of the construction plan process. Also, extensive engineering work will be required for the site with regards to storm-water. Additionally, the site will be served by JWSC utilities.

According to the ITE traffic generation manual, this site is anticipated to generate 1,109 daily trips (6.72 trips per dwelling unit x 165 units proposed). Apartment trips are calculated at a lower rate than traditional single family (land use 220 apartment).

It is anticipated that approximately 83 school aged children will live in this development.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission's 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. County Engineering is also requesting a traffic study to be completed by the applicant prior to construction.**

- 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. Extensive engineering will be required for this development. The applicant will be required to cooperate with County Engineering staff in this effort.**
- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan. **Staff comment: Specimen trees have been located on this site, but the applicant has not shown the preservation of these trees.**
- 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: The applicant is required to provide adjacent buffers as required in Section 613 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has shown a buffer plan that complies with this requirement.**
- 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. The applicant has noted on the site plan that the lighting plan will conform.**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: The applicant is showing common facilities for the residents on the plan.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: This requirement will be met during the building permit process. Fire and JWSC will be required to approve permit.**

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends that *SP2254* be approved subject to meeting all requirements including the following conditions:

1. A traffic study is required to be submitted to County Engineering prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. The applicant is required to work with County Engineering staff to resolve all engineering comments prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Several questions were raised about the existing pond near the property. Ms. Julie Martin wanted to know if the development would impact the size or shape of the pond. Mr. Landon stated that the pond may have to be modified in order to make the storm-water work but it wouldn't be done prior to County Engineering agreeing to it.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he would like for the motion to include that the storm-water runoff will be settled before any permits are issued. Mr. Landon stated that the issue of the storm-water is included as part of the general engineering comments but perhaps a resolution to this problem should be more specific. Mr. Hutchinson suggested the following language: "...resolve all engineering comments plus storm-water..." Chairman Brunson stated that he believes that the storm-water issue will be settled.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Robert White stated that he met with the development review team and discussed this project in detail with staff members. He stated that Mr. Paul Andrews was very specific about what needed to be done with the storm-water issue. Mr. White stated that they have actually completed the traffic study but have not submitted it to staff yet. He pointed out that he has read the staff's report and he understands and agrees with the conditions. He stressed that the storm-water runoff issue will be dealt with during the permitting process and he understands that he cannot start construction until all of the issues are reviewed and resolved. Mr. White stated that he would appreciate the Planning Commission's approval of this site plan submittal.

Ms. Julie Martin asked if this development will provide housing at different income levels. Mr. Mark Goutier, Atlantic Housing Partners, stated that they don't have any income levels identified for the site yet but he would expect a mix of incomes. He stated that the community will also be a mix of age levels. They are proposing 165 units with 47 being restricted to older persons in accordance with the Housing for Older Persons Act. He stated that they have not applied for any funding so he doesn't know what the income levels will be. He does anticipate however that there will be some income restrictions on at least a portion of the property.

Regarding the specimen trees located on the site, Ms. Martin asked if they intend to save some of the trees and have them be included as part of the buffers or the center courtyard area. Mr. Goutier stated that he doesn't know exactly where the trees are located and at this point he's not sure how many would be salvageable. He stated that as they go through final engineering they will meet the requirements for either preservation or mitigation. Mr. White added that they are in the process of getting the topo surveys to see exactly where everything is located, and once they are able to get to the specific site grading they will work with staff to save as many of the trees as possible.

Mr. David Hobbs, adjacent property owner, stated that it is "worthy of note" that the property adjacent to this proposal on the east side is all single-family. The property across the street on Old Cypress Mill is also single-family, as well as the property on the west side across Altama Connector. Mr. Hobbs stated that over 1000 additional trips per day concerns him and is also "worthy of note." He pointed out that the site plan shows that the triangle of water that extends to the intersection of Altama Connector and Old Cypress Mill Road is going to become a parking lot. He stated that he is sure that it will be addressed at some point if the site plan is approved but it is "worthy of note." Mr. Hobbs stated that he is curious as to what the definition of the buffer is for those three single-family residential boundaries, which he feels is "worthy of note."

Chairman Brunson stated that there is a road on two sides and a lake in the back; therefore, the only buffer in question is the east buffer. Mr. Hainley pointed out that the amount of parking triggers the buffers adjacent to all of the roads. Chairman Brunson agreed but stated that the only buffer adjacent to housing is the east buffer.

Ms. Martin stated that the point is well taken about the changing of the storm-water runoff and the pond. If it is already at the maximum capacity and it looks as if it will be reduced, she is concerned about how it would affect the property and still have the Home Depot in compliance with its own storm-water runoff. Mr. Landon stated that if they don't conform staff cannot issue any permits for the work to be done. The applicants will have to confer with our engineering staff to prove that it would work.

For clarification, Ms. Larissa Harris asked staff to define the buffer. Mr. Landon stated that the buffer is very specific as far as the type and height of trees, shrubs and bushes along with the separation, but it can be wide with less planting or it can be narrow with more planting. Some of the options are detailed on the landscape plan. He stated that if they reduce the width of the buffer then they have to increase the density and maybe even include a fence or a wall for total blockage.

Mr. Jimmy Souter stated that he is actually the only resident that abuts the property in question and he's concerned about the buffer and the dumpster location, which backs up to his property. He is also concerned about the lake, specifically the runoff from the lake if it fills like it has done so many times in the past. Mr. Souter stressed that he is especially concerned about how the applicants intend to treat him with respect to the location of the dumpster being so close to his house.

Mr. Goutier stated that they would be willing to extend the buffer closer to Old Cypress Mill Road to the extent that it works with engineering to ensure that it doesn't create any different problems. He stated that the compactor is fully enclosed on three sides by a tall concrete wall. Having them close to the property line is not unusual but he would also be very open to working with staff and Mr. Souter for an alternate location. Ms. Julie Martin suggested that the dumpster be relocated to the corner of the property near the maintenance building and the car care area. Mr. Goutier stated that there is plenty of room and that corner of the parking lot would need to be modified, but it is a viable option for the compactor.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Julie Martin and unanimously adopted to approve **SP2254** subject to meeting all requirements along with the following conditions:

- 1) A traffic study is required to be submitted to County Engineering prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 2) The applicant is required to work with County Engineering staff to resolve all engineering concerns including the storm-water runoff;

- 3) The compactor to be relocated to the corner of the property closer to the maintenance building and the car care area; and
- 4) The fence line to be extended as far as possible without obstructing site view and traffic along the side of the project.

SP2272 Scojet Facility

Consider approval of a site plan for a project consisting of a 15,569 sq. ft. building with parking, detention, and all associated utilities on a 3.87 acre site. The property consists of Lots 2 and 3 of North Glynn Commerce Park, located generally southwest of the intersection of Harry Driggers Boulevard with Jetport Road, physical addresses of 140 and 180 Innovation Drive. The property is zoned Planned Development. Parcel IDs: 03-26452 & 03-26453. Charles Ezelle of Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co., agent for Gary and Dawna Trzcianka, owners.

Mr. Charles Ezelle was present for discussion.

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

This request is to develop a technological facility at 140-180 Innovation Drive consisting of a 15,569 sq. ft. building, parking for 18 vehicles, a rear loading dock, detention lagoon, and all associated utilities.

Access roads for the site in order of highest capacity to lowest capacity are Harry Driggers Boulevard, Jetport Road, and Innovation Drive. Other Industrial Uses included as examples in the ITE traffic generation manual were not comparative to the facility proposed for this site because they were considerably larger, whether measured by square footage or number of employees. They could not be used to provide a reliable estimate of average daily traffic trip generation for this facility.

The site is will be served by JWSC utilities. Life and Public Safety issues for fire and police protection have been addressed.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission's 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 site that are required to be protected or replaced by the ordinance.**
- 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: Adequate provisions have been made.**
- 7) Adequate provisions are made to control the location, intensity, and direction of all outdoor lighting so that it will not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: This requirement will be met during the building permit process.**

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends that *SP2272 (M)*, Scojet Facility, be approved subject to meeting all requirements

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Mr. Tim Murphy and unanimously adopted to approve *SP2272 (M)*, Scojet Facility, subject to meeting all requirements.

SP2273 The Reserve at Altama Phase II

Consider approval of a site plan for a project consisting of 104 multi-family residential units on 8.62 acres. The property is located on the west side of Altama Boulevard behind the existing Reserve at Altama Development. The property is zoned Medium Residential (MR). Parcel ID 03-00913. South Shore II, LLC, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer was present for discussion.

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

This request is to develop a multi-family development on a vacant parcel. The property is currently zoned for such a development (MR) and would be a continuation of the already developed portion fronting on Altama Boulevard. Zoning regulations allow up to 16 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is requesting a density of 12.06 dwelling units per acre. The development will include a two-story construction.

According to the ITE traffic generation manual, this site is anticipated to generate 699 daily trips (6.72 trips per dwelling unit x 104 units proposed). Apartment trips are calculated as a lower rate than traditional single family (land use 220 apartment).

The site is will be served by JWSC utilities. Also, it is anticipated that approximately 52 school aged children will live in this development.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission's 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: One specimen tree has been located. The applicant has stated their desire to preserve this tree.**

- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 7) Adequate provisions are made to control the location, intensity, and direction of all outdoor lighting so that it will not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties. **Staff comment: This requirement has been met.**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: Not applicable.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: This requirement will be met during the building permit process. Fire and JWSC will be required to approve permit.**

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends that *SP2273* be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

During a brief discussion, Ms. Julie Martin asked if some of the Greenspace would be used for playground area. Mr. Peter Schoenauer stated that he doesn't have any specific details on any playgrounds but there will be Greenspace or some sort of recreational space. He stressed that the owner is environmentally conscious and has instructed them to try to preserve as many trees as possible, which they will keep in mind throughout the design process.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin, seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted to approve *SP2273* subject to meeting all requirements.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.