

DRAFT/MINUTES
ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 18, 2011 - 6:00 P.M.
The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

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

ABSENT: Stan Humphries

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman John Dow 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.

ZM2263 Island Medical Park

Consider a request to rezone from Planned Development (PD) zoning district to Planned Development (PD) zoning district by amendment of the existing Planned Development Text for 2.271 acres of property consisting of Lots 3, 4, 5, & 6, Island Medical Park, located east of Arthur J. Moore Drive on the south side of Hamilton Road on St. Simons Island. The purpose of the request is to allow residential with commercial medical office uses. Parcel ID's: 04-12015; 04-12016; 04-12017; 04-12018. Nick Chilton, agent for Leeward Bluff, LLC and/or South Leeward Bluff, LLC, owners.

Mr. Nick Chilton was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this request was presented to the Islands Planning Commission at their regular meeting of September 20, 2011 and action was taken to defer the request to their regular meeting of October 18, 2011.

The Commission informed staff that the proposed Planned Development Text was confusing. In the interim from last month, the text was revised per their input and has been included in the packages for review in its entirety.

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 is consistent with existing uses and adjacent residential property, and so is compatible with uses in the vicinity.

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

No, no adverse effect is expected; there are existing office and residential uses in the area.

- 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. Parking and traffic circulation will undergo site plan review at time of development. Excessive or burdensome use of streets, transportation facilities, utilizes or a school is not anticipated.

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

Yes, the Comprehensive Plan anticipated this area to continue to be developed.

- Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property, which give supporting grounds for approval or disapproval.

If approved, the existing use of the property with a residential component will conform to its zoning district. In addition, future development will occur in compliance with the revised zoning, which may serve to make development more attractive to buyers by featuring combined medical office-residential use.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of **ZM2263 (I)**, the proposed rezoning from PD, Planned Development to PD, Planned Development, to allow residential use with medical offices.

During the course of discussion, the Commission deleted the word **fenced** listed under *e) 4* located on Page 4 of the text.

There was no one present to oppose this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders recommending approval of **ZM2263 (I)**, the proposed rezoning from PD, Planned Development to PD, Planned Development, to allow residential use with medical offices with the elimination of the word **fenced** from *e) 4* located on Page 4 of the text. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

VP2289 Village Entrance Sign

Consider approval of a new sign in the right-of-way located at the south intersection of Kings Way and Mallery Street. Property zoned Village Mixed Use (VMU). The sign is to be located in the Mallery Street right-of-way. Fendig Signs, applicant.

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

The applicant proposes that a new sign be placed in the landscaped island of Mallery Street to identify the pier village. The proposed signage meets the provisions of the Sign Regulations (Article VIII) as to the type, and size of the sign. The Sign Regulations require that signs over 6 sq. ft. in area “are subject to the prior approval of the Planning Commission with regard to material, size, construction, color, face type, location and setback.” The proposed sign is 17 sq. ft. The Sign Regulations also provide that such review and approval be per the requirements of Section 709 (Island Preservation District).

The location of the sign has been approved by the Glynn County Commission due to the fact that it is located in the county right-of-way.

Section 709.4 in the Island Preservation District gives the standards for review as follows:

- (a) Construction, or remodeling or enlargement of an existing building in a manner inconsistent with the existing building massing (the three-dimensional bulk of a building: height, width, and depth), articulation (the pattern of the

building base, middle and top, created by variations in detailing, color and materials or stepping back or extending forward a portion of the facade) and fenestration (the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building) in the immediate area; or

(b) An absence of unity or coherence in composition which is in opposition to the character of the present structure in the case of repair; or

(c) Violent contrasts of materials or intense colors not representative of the existing buildings in the immediate area; or

(d) A multiplicity or incongruity of details resulting in a disturbing appearance.

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of **VP2289** to allow a new sign in the Mallery Street right-of-way.

There was no one present to oppose this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. William Lawrence, seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall and unanimously adopted to approve **VP2289** to allow a new sign in the Mallery Street right-of-way.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.