

# MINUTES

## MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION FEBRUARY 1, 2011 - 6:00 P.M. Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Brunson, Chairman  
Buddy Hutchinson, Vice Chairman  
Jim Burgess  
Aaron Carone  
Buck Crosby  
Julie Martin  
Tim Murphy

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Hainley, Community Development Director  
York Phillips, Planning Manager  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

-----

Chairman Bill Brunson 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. Afterward, Chairman Brunson introduced and welcomed the newly appointed Planning Commission members.

-----

On behalf of staff and the Mainland Planning Commission, Chairman Brunson presented a plaque to Mr. Gary Nevill recognizing his outstanding leadership as Chairman of the Glynn County Mainland Planning Commission from January 2007 to December 2010.

-----

### MINUTES

**November 9, 2010 Regular Meeting**  
**December 7, 2010 Regular Meeting**  
**January 11, 2011 Called Meeting**

A motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin to approve the Minutes of the *November 9<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and Ms. Julie Martin. Mr. Buck Crosby did not attend the November 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting. Messrs. Jim Burgess, Aaron Carone and Tim Murphy were not members at the time and also abstained from voting.

A motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin to approve the Minutes of the **December 7<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson. Voting Aye: Mr. Hutchinson and Ms. Martin. Mr. Bill Brunson and Mr. Buck Crosby did not attend the December 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting. Messrs. Jim Burgess, Aaron Carone and Tim Murphy were not members at the time and also abstained from voting.

A motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve the Minutes of the **January 11<sup>th</sup> Called Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Ms. Julie Martin. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Jim Burgess, Mr. Aaron Carone, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson Ms. Julie Martin and Mr. Tim Murphy. Mr. Crosby did not attend the January 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

-----

**ZM2153 JWSC (Southport Plant)**

Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agricultural and General Residential to General Commercial for property consisting of 14.21 acres located approximately 650 ft. east of South Port Parkway. The property is approximately 80 ft. west of the I-95 right-of-way, and is the site for the recently improved South Port Treatment Plant. Parcel ID 03-12061 and 03-16474. Property owned by Joint Water and Sewer Commission.

Mr. Keith Morgan, JWSC, was present for discussion.

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

The South Port Treatment Plant was originally designed to handle primarily the development of the South Port project and the immediate surrounding area. During the 2000's, heavy growth was being experienced in the southern and southwestern part of the County and there was a recognized need to provide services and utilities, particularly sewer. The recently completed expansion of the plant was part of this effort.

The purpose of the proposed zoning change is to classify the treatment plant in a district more characteristic of its present use. The site is buffered from the adjacent residential area to the west by a thickly wooded area. Access is by way of a driveway that does not pass through residential development. Photos of the site before and after the recent plant expansion were provided for the Planning Commission's review.

**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 represents no change from the existing use of the property. Issues relating to the development of nearby property are not affected by the proposed zoning change.*

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

*No.*

- 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.

*No.*

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

*Yes.*

- 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 **ZM2153** to rezone the subject property from Forest Agricultural and General Residential to General Commercial.

Following a brief presentation by Mr. Keith Morgan, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson recommending approval of application **ZM2153** to rezone the subject property from Forest Agricultural and General Residential to General Commercial. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **ZM2158 Towne Square**

Consider a request to amend the Planned Development Text and Master Plan to allow additional uses, including assisted living facility, nursing care, professional and general offices, medical offices and associated medical retail uses, commercial uses, hotel, etc., and similar uses. These uses would be in addition to the permitted residential uses. The property consists of 51.15 acres located generally south of Chapel Crossing Road and north of Scranton Connector. Parcel ID 03-19084 and 03-19931. Property owned by Thomas & Bryson Properties, LLC.

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

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

This property was rezoned in 2006 to provide for a neo-traditional residential development. That development did not take place due to the change in economic conditions. The proposal is to modify the provisions of the development text to allow a range of additional uses consistent with an assisted living facility and related uses.

The more specific part of the current proposal is to develop an assisted living facility with 59 units on an 8.5 acre portion of the site in the northwestern part of the property (adjacent to the Scranton Road/Chapel Crossing Road intersection).

Subdivision and site plan approval will be required for individual portions of the site. According to the proposed PD Text, some design issues will be addressed during these processes, as well as any engineering issues. The site is served by public water and sewer.

The proposed change for the assisted living facility will reduce traffic demand for the development; however, later changes from residential to commercial use may result in increases. The portion of the site designated for assisted living will produce approximately 120 trips as compared with approximately 270 trips for the same area if developed as residential.

The proposed changes will generally reduce school demand for the development, as the result of changing from a primarily residential project to a mixed residential and commercial project.

**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 uses will not detract from the existing uses on adjacent property.***

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

*No.*

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

*Yes. The proposal will expand the possible uses.*

- 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.

*No. Most impacts will likely be reduced as compared with the approved PD Text.*

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

*Yes.*

- 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 **ZM2158** to modify the approved Planned Development Text and Master Plan.

Mr. Hutchinson had questions about the location of the entrance. Mr. Phillips stated that there are several entrances. The plan indicates a couple of potential entrances on Chapel Crossing and Scranton Connector. The entire internal circulation system would have to be designed and reviewed; all of which will be subject to approval through the subdivision and site plan process.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Larry Bryson stated that due to the change in the economy, there is no longer an interest in the property as single-family residential. This proposal is an attempt to try to broaden the scope in order to capture some other interests that will hopefully create some new development in the area.

Ms. Julie Martin asked Mr. Bryson if he had done a “needs assessment” or demographic study based on what could be proposed for the site. Mr. Bryson replied no, not specifically to this particular piece of property, but there have been some general studies in the neighborhood by a few developers that he has shared information with.

Mr. Hutchinson wanted to know if this facility would be similar to the (St. Marks) “Towers.” Mr. Bryson replied yes, but the “Towers” is actually a retirement center and what he is proposing is more of an assisted living facility. Mr. Crosby asked if it is similar to “Fairhaven.” Mr. Bryson replied possibly, but he’s not sure.

Mr. Hutchinson wanted to know if the developers feel that there is a need for this type of facility in Glynn County. Mr. Phil Best, Mayor of Dublin, GA and CEO of Premier Construction Associates stated that they have been involved in several of these projects with Principal Senior Living Group of Roswell, Georgia. He stated that the unit in question is a 59 unit assisted living facility with a 12 unit memory care as part of the 59 units, which gives Dementia and Alzheimer’s care. The facilities that they’ve been involved with are classified as a little more upper scale with the rent being between \$2400.00 and \$3200.00 dollars per month. Mr. Best elaborated on the combined 50 year partnership in this type of business and stated that the total investment for this project will be around 8 million dollars. He pointed out that before they invest any money into a community for this type of facility they conduct a strenuous demographics check to ensure that there is a genuine need.

Mr. J. R. Wright, Broker involved in the real estate sale, commented that this facility will generate approximately 25 jobs for Glynn County.

For the record, Mr. Aaron Carone abstained from the discussion and voting on this item to avoid a conflict due to his firm’s involvement with the project.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Julie Martin to recommend approval of application **ZM2158** to modify the approved Planned Development Text and Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Buck Crosby. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Jim Burgess, Mr. Buck Crosby, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Ms. Julie Martin and Mr. Tim Murphy. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Aaron Carone.

-----

**SP2156 (M) Pentecostal Holiness Church**

Consider approval of a revised site plan for a church with associated parking, drive aisles, ingress and egress, drainage, public water and private sewer utilities. The 3.1 acre project is located on the south side of Old Jesup Road, at a physical address of 1861 Old Jesup Road, approximately 1,700 ft. northwest of its intersection with Cate Road, and consists of a 12,000 sq. ft. church sanctuary and social hall. The property is zoned General Commercial (GC). The original site plan was under case SP1727. Parcel ID: 03-05791. Peter Schoenauer of Tidewater Engineering, agent for Pentecostal Holiness Church Trustees, owner.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that this proposal for a church, social hall and associated parking has been designed for one of four lots proposed for a previously approved preliminary plat for the property. Previously, Lot 1 was proposed to allow the church. Subsequent to preliminary plat approval, a decision was made to move the church forward adjacent to Old Jesup Road to reduce distance, thereby reducing required driveway paving and associated development costs.

Public water is now available to the site via water lines, with a connection to be made. Sewer is by private septic sewerage system.

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: The application, site plan and other submitted information are complete.**
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. **Staff Comment: The use is allowed in GC zoning, a zoning district that allows a variety of uses.**
- 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: The site plan makes adequate provisions for ingress, egress, off street parking, loading, and traffic flow such as may be reasonably anticipated for proposed property development.**
- 4) Adequate provisions are made to control the flow of storm water from and across the site. **Staff Comment: Plans submitted for drainage were found acceptable.**
- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan. **Staff Comment: Specimen trees were depicted on the site plan as required.**
- 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 property is adjacent to GC zoned properties, and Forest Agricultural zoned properties not developed or approved as residential. GC zoning does not require buffers. Service area screening including the dumpster will occur at construction plan stage.**
- 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: Adequate provision will be made.**

- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff Comment: Open space is not required. At this time there is only one owner, so common facilities maintenance is not an issue.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff Comment: Water supply adequate for fire protection - to be provided. Sewage collection will be by septic system as sewer lines are not available.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that *SP2156 (M)* Pentecostal Holiness Church Site Plan be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve *SP2156 (M)* Pentecostal Holiness Church Site Plan subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Aaron Carone and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **SP2163 Baybridge Plaza**

Consider approval of revised site plan for a 4,400 sq. ft. commercial building on a property consisting of 0.961 acres located on the north side of Baybridge Drive, east of its intersection with Altama Avenue. The purpose of the revision is to review the specifications for the buffer fence and plantings required as a condition of the rezoning of the property. Parcel ID 03-01422. Tonnie Shadron, owner.

Attorney Kelly Lanier, representing Mr. Shadron, was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Phillips explained that this property was rezoned from Local Commercial to General Commercial on April 4, 2002. The approval of the rezoning change was accompanied by conditions, as follows:

- Installation of a wooden fence that buffers the commercial business from the residential neighborhood being frame side in.
- Any structural changes are to be brought back to the Planning Commission for site plan review.
- The planting of Greenspace buffers on both sides of the fencing.

There is a major drainage ditch along the rear (north) side of the property. When the building was constructed, there were concerns that construction of the fence would interfere with access to the ditch for maintenance. Investigation of the site with the



owner and a representative of the Public Works Department indicated that access could be provided. At a workshop meeting, the Mainland Planning Commission determined that under the zoning conditions, it would have the authority to review and approve a fence and buffer solution, and to review future changes as part of site plan review as needed.

This proposal is to provide a board fence along the north side of the property located 16 ft. from the building. This would place the fence along the flat part of the site, slightly set back from the top of the ditch. Planting would consist of vines (ivy and/or jasmine) on the fence so as to limit the footprint of the area needed for plantings. Based on the request of the neighbor to the east, the fence on the east side would be deferred unless the Planning Commission subsequently determines that it is needed.

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.
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County.
- 3) Adequate provisions are made for ingress and egress, off-street parking, loading, and the flow of traffic, which may reasonably be anticipated.
- 4) Adequate provisions are made to control the flow of storm water from and across the site.
- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan.
- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets.
- 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.
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities.
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment.

The proposed site plan is to resolve the fence issue raised by the rezoning case. Consequently, many of the specific requirements for site plan review are irrelevant to the case. The information provided is sufficient to resolve the outstanding issue. If other changes are proposed, full site plan submittal and review will be required.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends that application *SP2163* be approved.

Chairman Brunson wanted to know what would happen if in the future the adjacent neighbor were to sell the house and the new owner requests that the fence be installed. Mr. Phillips stated that he is not sure if this would trigger a site plan approval in this instance. Mr. Hainley pointed out that the house in question is currently being used as a non-traditional residential function. He stated that the Planning Commission could include a stipulation that if the function of the property changes and if written request is received, the owner would be notified and the requirement would be placed upon the owner to install that particular section of the fence. This could be added as a condition of site plan approval.

Mr. Tim Murphy wanted to know if someone other than the adjacent neighbor could come to the Planning Commission and request that the fence be installed, or even question the Planning Commission as to why it was not installed. Mr. Hainley stated that he is not sure if the non-immediate adjacent property owner could make a requirement to that affect. He noted that it is highly doubtful under a zoning case, and site plans are even more restrictive. Mr. Murphy then asked if the residents to the north would have any recourse for a fence on the eastern side. Mr. Hainley replied no.

During a brief presentation, Attorney Kelly Lanier stated that when the property was rezoned in 2002 Mr. Shadron did not realize he was under a requirement to put up a fence in the buffer zone. This particular revision of the site plan is simply to resolve the fence issue and to install plantings. Ms. Lanier stated that Mr. Shadron has done this and she doesn't know if there are any other issues relevant to this site plan. Therefore, on behalf of Mr. Shadron, she is soliciting approval from the Planning Commission at this time.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if the motion could include a stipulation that the future owner of the house could request installation of the fence. Ms. Lanier stated that the stipulation would not be a problem for Mr. Shadron. Mr. Carone asked if it would be necessary to record the area as an easement or could it just be added as a condition in the text. Mr. Hainley stated that the Planning Commission could include it as a condition in the motion.

Ms. Delores Miller of 100 Kensington Drive was present to speak against this request. She stated that when the property was being changed to commercial and the applicant proposed to put in a [beauty] college, the entire neighborhood came to the meeting to oppose the request. It was agreed at that time that the applicant would put up a fence. However, the [beauty] college never happened and the fence never happened.

Ms. Miller stated that she spoke with Mr. Shadron when the property was being staked for the building and she made him aware of the fact that there was to be a fence before establishing any type of business on the site, which is what the neighbors had agreed to. In the meantime, a beauty shop was located in the building with no problems. However, on the other end of the building an internet access business was established. This business quickly turned into a nightclub, which brought along parking problems, overcrowding, loud music, noise and other nuisances. The police were called constantly on numerous occasions.

Ms. Miller stressed that for years she and other neighbors tried to get the owners to put up a fence, to no avail. She stated that the people running the nightclub for private parties were not selling alcohol but it was brought in. All of this was happening in her back yard. She stated that when she moved into her house she intended to retire in the neighborhood because it was close to everything she needed. However, she cannot tolerate these types of activities in her backyard. At times, the music is so loud that it vibrates her house. Ms. Miller stated that there is apparently no insulation in the building because the noise should not come through so easily. She has had the police to walk through her house so that they could hear what she hears. Ms. Miller stated that she is not trying to cause trouble, but she never wanted anything like this in her backyard, and “a little wooden fence” is not going to help in any way to take care of the problem. She stated that the entire neighborhood is concerned and would like for the property to be reverted back to residential.

Mr. Carone stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve a fence and he would like to know why Ms. Miller is opposed to this. Ms. Miller stated that she is opposed to “a simple little wooden fence” because it is not going to be a sound barrier and it won’t solve the problem. Chairman Brunson explained to Ms. Miller that the problems with the loud music, noise, etc. are enforcement issues; they are not part of the Planning Commission’s purview. Ms. Miller stated that she has called the police at least 100 times. She then made reference to a particular private party that took place at the facility. Mr. Hainley explained that there are no approved uses for the property and this is the first time that he’s heard about these occurrences. He stated that staff has been prohibiting approval of occupational licenses in the facility until the issue is resolved. For clarification, he explained that the owner of the building can have a party in the building without any permits or a license, but staff would have to obtain a police report in order to understand what all transpired in relation to the private party or any other such occurrence at the facility. Ms. Miller was adamant about the rezoning being reverted back to residential because she is tired of the disturbances in her neighborhood.

Chairman Brunson reiterated that the problem described by Ms. Miller is beyond what the Planning Commission does, but he stated that they are willing to help in any way possible. Attorney Lanier stated that this is also her first time hearing about the situation. She can however, sympathize with Ms. Miller and on behalf of Mr. Shadron she is willing to meet with staff and Ms. Miller to see if they can resolve the issue amicably.

Mr. Tim Murphy asked if there are any specifications for the fence including the height. Mr. Phillips stated that the commission stipulated in the action that there be a wooden fence that buffers the commercial business from the residential neighborhood, frame side in, and planting of buffers on both sides of the fence. Because of the dimensions, the proposal calls for various kinds of vines that would be on the fence to help with its appearance. Mr. Phillips stated that the proposal is consistent with the language. Also, the specification for the height of the fence is 6 ft.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve application **SP2163** with the stipulation that in the future, if a fence is requested by the neighbor located on the eastern boundary of the property, the fence will be installed with the same specifications (height and design) as the fence on the back side of the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Aaron Carone and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Buck Crosby advised Ms. Miller to address her concerns about loud music, noise, overcrowding, etc. to the Chief of Police or to the County Commission for appropriate action. Ms. Miller stated that she has reported it to the proper authorities and their solution was to put off-duty officers in the area, but nothing changed. Mr. Hainley stated that staff would do additional research into getting police reports and discuss the incidents with Mr. Shadron. He also agreed to confer with the Chief of Police regarding the noise issue.

-----

## **CPA-2010-01**

### **Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Future Land Use Plan Amendment:**

(1) Consider an amendment to the Adopted Glynn County Comprehensive Plan (adopted October 16, 2008), “Future Development Narrative,” “St. Simons/Sea Island,” “Recommended Development Pattern,” by adding thereto the following provision: “No retail commercial, or restaurant uses shall be permitted in the area along the north side of Demere Road, between Plantation Village and the Observation Park adjacent to parcel 04-02256, currently occupied by the Waffle House.” (2) Consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Appendix A: Future Land Use Text (adopted March 19, 2009), “Corridor Mixed Use Classification” and the “Community Mixed Use Center (Village Center) Classification” by adding to each classification description the following guideline: “No retail, commercial, or restaurant uses shall be permitted in the area along the north side of Demere Road, between Plantation Village and the Observation Park adjacent to parcel 04-02256, currently occupied by the Waffle House.” (3) Consider an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (adopted March 19, 2009) referencing the amended guidelines. David Hainley, Agent for Glynn County.

Before proceeding with the staff’s report it was noted that although this amendment basically pertains to the Island, it is part of the Comprehensive Plan and therefore requires action by the Mainland Planning Commission as well.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Hainley explained that when the Waffle House was rezoned there was a commitment made by the Board at that time that "no future retail or commercial or restaurant use would occur on the north side of Demere Road." He stated that "no commission may bind the future actions of another commission." Recently, the issue came up about the documentation, and this is the proper means to document it.

Mr. Hainley stated that there is the issue that involves property rights within the area. There is concern from one of the property owner's immediately on the edge where the transaction occurs between the Village and the corridor area whose council believes that this amendment is not necessary and is worded too stringent. Mr. Hainley stated that they have tried to work out some compromised language, but it has not happened yet. However, the overall content is about the issue of "no retail, commercial or restaurant uses shall be permitted," which is believed to be too extreme.

Mr. Hainley explained that the Comp Plan is not an ordinance and does not have statute of an ordinance; it is recommendation only. During the life of a Comp Plan and based upon actions taken by the Planning Commissions and the Board of Commissioners, staff reacts and at times recommends changes that are not in strict accordance to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Hainley stated that by a unanimous vote, the Islands Planning Commission ***"recommended approval the Comprehensive Plan Amendment as written to include that no retail commercial or restaurant use shall be permitted in the area along the north side of Demere Road..."*** Mr. Hainley stated that staff has been working with the concerned property owner to essentially modify the language approved by the Islands Planning Commission to say that ***"retail commercial or restaurant uses are not recommended in the area along the north side of Demere Road."*** The suggested change will prevent the language from being so negative while making it clear that it is a recommendation. Chairman Brunson stated that this is a pretty significant change. Mr. Hainley agreed but stated that everyone needs to remember that the context of the Comp Plan is a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners on the future land use development, and as such, the Board will make the final decision as to whether they will adopt this change or not. It is not mandatory; it is deemed to be a minor amendment by DCA and the Coastal Regional Commission and therefore does not require their approval.

Ms. Julie Martin wanted to know if there is a unified voice among all of the property owners within that particular stretch of property. Mr. Hainley replied no. There are two adjacent property owners who have opposite view points. Ms. Martin noted that there are several generations who have lived in that area. Mr. Hainley concurred. He then pointed out property owned by Mrs. Berthenia Gibson and stated that a number of residents from the area in question came out to speak in favor of the proposal at the Islands Planning Commission Meeting. He stated that every time a zoning case comes up for the property, the issue of the promise also comes up.

Mr. Hutchinson wanted to know how the residents along Demere Road feel about this proposal. Mr. Hainley stated that staff notified the property owners but the only ones who have come out were Mrs. Gibson and a few property owners from the general area.

Chairman Brunson stated that we have an Islands Planning Commission who has already recommended approval of this amendment. Mr. Tim Murphy asked if the change of wording came after the approval by the Islands Planning Commission. Mr. Hainley replied yes. Chairman Brunson stated that perhaps this Commission could add to the motion that "other language will be acceptable." Mr. Hainley stated that this Commission could recommend the motion as approved by the Islands Planning Commission, recognizing the concern by the property owner in question. Mr. Carone asked if the Islands Planning Commission provided any feedback. Mr. Hainley stated that the issue did not come up at that time and they have not had another meeting on this issue. Mr. Carone suggested tabling this amendment for a future meeting after the Islands Planning Commission renders its decision. Mr. Hainley explained that this Commission could discuss and defer the item but cannot send it back to the Islands Planning Commission.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby to defer this amendment to a later date. The motion was seconded by Mr. Aaron Carone and unanimously adopted.

-----

In other business, Chairman Brunson appointed Mr. Aaron Carone as the Parliamentarian for the Mainland Planning Commission Meetings and provided him with the most recent edition of "Roberts Rules of Order."

-----

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