

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 21, 2010 - 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
Paul Andrews, Assistant County Engineer
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman 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

August 17, 2010 Regular Meeting

Before offering a motion on the Minutes, Mr. Dow reminded staff of the issues of application *ZM1953 (I)* regarding the Waffle House, the park and the line of demarcation to ensure that staff follows through with these concerns, including staff's commitment to get an opinion from the County Attorney; all of which are included in the August 17th Minutes. Mr. Hainley explained that the applicant has withdrawn this case and therefore it is no longer before the Board. He pointed out however that staff has started to implement these issues by contacting GIS for the parcel that was not depicted on the map for the park property, which was deeded to the county as part of the Waffle House rezoning case. There will be a zoning case to correct the map in that particular area.

Also, this Planning Commission can initiate a change to the map and the text of the future land use map to clarify and to immortalize this issue. He would however urge caution on the procedure to ensure that a number of public hearings are conducted to receive input on implementing this process. Mr. Hainley advised that there will be continued discussion on this issue at an upcoming workshop.

A motion was then made by Mr. John Dow to approve the Minutes of the *August 17th* IPC Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

ZM1968 (I) Red Barn Development

Consider a request to amend a Planned Development (PD) for property consisting of 14.62 acres located on the southeast corner of Frederica Road and South Harrington Road. The property has 656 ft. of frontage on Frederica and 632 ft. of frontage on South Harrington. The purpose of the request is to allow a restaurant and combination of Local Commercial (LC) and mixed-residential uses. Parcel ID 04-05348, 04-09952, 04-05347, 04-05399, 04-05411. Ussery/Rule Architects, agent for Don Gentile, owner.

Messrs. Jim Bishop, Don Gentile, Robert Ussery, Bobby Shupe, Bob Peck, John Callaway and Ed Ellis were present for discussion

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

This site is located in the Islands Future Development Area. The designation is considered appropriate for small commercial activities, particularly where clustered in villages and in commercial nodes. The adopted Future Land Use Map shows this site as Medium Density Residential.

The property is divided into two areas, a commercial development area and a residential development area.

The commercial development is for the property fronting Frederica Road and at the intersection of Frederica Road and South Harrington. This area is a minimum of 5.3 to a maximum of 7.3 acres. The commercial development currently allows the uses permitted in the LC section of the Zoning Ordinance. There is no specific maximum square footage provided for this portion of the development, only maximum site coverage of 70%. This would yield approximately 40,000-55,000 sq. ft. of retail floor area. It is estimated that the commercial development would generate between 4,100 and 5,600 average daily trips (102 ADT x 1,000 square feet of floor area).

The second section is identified for residential development. This property is generally the eastern portion of the property for a minimum of 7.3 and a maximum of 9.3 acres. The residential development allows for one-family, two-family, one-family attached, row houses and multi-family dwellings. The maximum lot coverage for the residential portion of this property is 50%. The maximum density is 8 dwelling units per acre with a maximum of 64 dwelling units. It is estimated that this residential development would generate a maximum of 640 average daily trips (10 ADT x # of dwelling units).

The proposed PD Text divides the property into three areas “A,” “B,” and “C” which are identified in the Master Plan.

Area “A” is the 1.29 acre parcel at the intersection of South Harrington and Frederica Road. Area “A” is the location of the existing Red Barn Restaurant. The requested uses at this location are uses allowed in LC in the Zoning Ordinance.

Area “B” is the central 9.18 acres which is identified as a future shopping center. The requested uses for this portion of the PD are those allowed in the LC district of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant is requesting a maximum of 70,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and maximum site coverage of 70%. It is estimated that this portion of the development would generate 7,140 average daily trips (102 ADT x 1,000 square feet of floor area).

Area “C” is 4.15 acres of this on the southeast portion of this zoning request. The requested permitted uses in this area are a mixture of commercial and/or residential uses. The commercial uses include those permitted in the LC district of the Zoning Ordinance, a landscape/nursery, outdoor sales and display. The total requested commercial square footage for Area “C” is 40,000 sq. ft. It is estimated that this portion of the development would generate a maximum 4,080 average daily trips (102 ADT x 1,000 square feet of floor area). This number would be reduced if this portion were to be developed as residential.

The residential uses for Area “C” include loft apartments, row houses, and multifamily dwellings. The requested density is 8 units per acre for a total of 32 dwelling units. It is estimated that this residential development would generate a maximum of 320 average daily trips (10 ADT x # of dwelling units).

This site is served by Frederica Road and South Harrington. Based on GDOT traffic counts for 2007, there are approximately 13,000 average daily trips on Frederica Road at this location. GDOT also classifies this road as currently operating at a daily Level of Service C or better. Additionally, GDOT has provided a projected Level of Service for 2035. Based on existing data, Frederica Road is projected to operate at a Level of Service F in 2035. This is primarily due to the projected and currently approved development on the north end of the Island.

The applicant had a traffic study prepared to analyze the traffic issues associated with the development. The study maintains that the existing Level of Service can be maintained at this intersection based on existing traffic counts if the following improvements are made:

1. A traffic signal at South Harrington and Frederica Road installed prior to occupation of the proposed development.
2. One ingress lane and two egress lanes (a shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive left-turn lane) at General Oglethorpe Road and the adjacent driveway at Frederica Road.

The analysis submitted by the applicant provides data on existing conditions and the proposed development at this location. It is unclear if approved/future developments elsewhere on Frederica and Lawrence Road are considered as part of this study. It should be noted that in addition to generating new trips this development would capture existing trips traveling north, and especially south on Frederica Road. This is particularly true for residents traveling from north of this project wishing to find shopping.

Buffers to adjacent property owners are shown on the Master Plan, and are described in Section K of the PD Text. Generally, the applicant is proposing versions of buffer "Type A" as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The buffers defined in the Zoning Ordinance are listed as minimum distance and plantings and need to be carefully considered when creating the transition zone between the commercial and residential areas.

In addition, lighting, loading zones, and hours of operation will need to be considered where this development is adjacent to existing residential uses. Lighting will need to be oriented away from residential uses and toward the commercial site. Shields should be used to direct the light away from residences. The concept plan shows a loading zone directly adjacent to an existing residential use. Consideration for hours of operation and delivery should be considered.

Finally, signage will need to be taken into consideration for this location. Typically, a maximum of 24 sq. ft. is permitted for St. Simons. The applicant is asking for 10% of the wall area to be permitted. Based on this calculation, staff is unable to determine the proposed signage. The applicant should be required to specify the maximum sign size.

Prior to any development on this property a Planning Commission Site Plan will be required. At that time County Engineering staff will review this plan for drainage and access. The applicant is currently showing a proposed traffic signal at South Harrington and Frederica Road. The concept plan also shows controlled access at the Red Barn location with curbing. There are a total of three proposed access points for this project.

The PD Text states that utilities are to be provided by the Joint Water and Sewer Commission (JWSC).

If area “C” is developed as residential it could have a maximum of 32 dwelling units and could create approximately 17 school aged children.

Fire issues will be addressed through the Planning Commission Site Plan and building permit review.

Red Barn Rezoning Summary Table

	Current Approved Zoning	Proposed Amendment to Zoning
Commercial Acres (max)	7.3	14.6 (staff recommends 10.5)
Residential Acres (max)	9.3	4.15
Commercial Uses	Uses in Local Commercial (LC) of Zoning Ord.	Uses in Local Commercial (LC) of Zoning Ord.
Residential Uses	Mix of single/multi-family	Mix of single/multi-family
Residential Density (max)	8 dwelling units per acre	8 dwelling units per acre
Residential Dwellings (max)	64	32
Commercial Sq/Ft (max)	approx 40,000-55,000	110,000 (staff recommends 70,000)
Commercial Trip Generation	approx 4,000-5,500 average daily trips (ADT)	approx 11,000 ADT (staff recommends 7,000)
Residential Trip Generation	640 ADT	320 ADT
Total ADT	approx 4,600-6,100 ADT	approx 11,300 ADT (staff recommends 7,300)

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 the existing permitted uses on the property. The proposed development is a more intense use and may therefore have an impact on adjacent property if measures are not taken to properly buffer or otherwise accommodate the adjacent residential properties.

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

If impacts on nearby residential property are not properly mitigated as mentioned above, adjacent property could be adversely affected.

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

Yes, there is an existing approved Planned Development at this location which allows a combination of commercial and residential 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.

The proposal could have a detrimental affect on the existing road network. The current LOS is a “C” or better; however, based on projections, the future LOS for this roadway is an “F.”

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

The Future Land Use Map identifies this location as Medium Density Residential.

The Future Development Map identifies this area in the Islands. The Glynn County Comprehensive plan provides for commercial development patterns in the Islands to be as follows: “Clustering commercial and mixed use development at nodes along major corridors, separated by areas of open space or attractive residential development.” This map is a generalized land use map and is not parcel specific.

It should be noted that the existing Planned Development at this location was approved prior to the development and adoption of the Future Land Use Map and the Comprehensive Plan.

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

The permitted uses in this amendment are similar in nature to the adopted uses; however, the amount of potential commercial development is increased. This proposed change could bring commercial uses closer to the residents of north St. Simons, but also provides additional stress on the existing infrastructure.

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM1968** to amend a Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

1. Traffic signal/ingress egress lanes as identified in the traffic study or on the concept plan shall be installed and functional prior to Certificate of Occupancy.
2. Signage for proposed uses shall be specified before going to the Board of Commissioners.
3. Landscape/Buffers adjacent to South Harrington and residentially zoned property shall incorporate a berm (preserving existing trees) with a height of 4 ft. with 6 ft. of fencing on top of the berm, or a 10 ft. tall solid masonry wall with stucco or

textured surface. The plantings shall be intensified to provide a full evergreen screen to a height in excess of the building height. Minimum size at installation shall be 10 ft. tall. Canopy trees shall be incorporated into the design.

4. Lighting shall be located at the perimeter of the paving and pointed at the rear of the building. No building mounted spot lights shall be permitted. All perimeter lights shall have shields to ensure compliance with Section 622 of the Zoning Ordinance.
5. Loading/Unloading times shall not be before 7 am and not after 10 pm.
6. Area "C" shall be restricted to residential uses.
7. No dumpster shall be emptied before 8 am.
8. Based on the parking reduction, restaurants shall be restricted to 15% of the major tenant space in Area "B."

For clarification, Ms. Patricia Laurens asked staff to reiterate what can actually go on the property with the current usage, and what is being proposed for the property. Mr. Landon explained that the proposed uses and the existing uses are essentially the same, but the question is how much of it can you have. The commercial portion in the existing PD and the commercial portion in the proposed PD both allow local commercial uses. A grocery store would be permitted today, as well as with the proposed change. The amount of acreage is actually what's changing. The same goes for the residential uses.

Mr. Dow wanted to know if the applicant is in agreement with the stipulations. Mr. Hainley stated that the applicant is aware of the stipulations but would like to modify a couple of them. Mr. Dow stated that with the current PD for the commercial property the applicant could go up to approximately 55,000 sq. ft. He pointed out a discrepancy in the staff's report that shows the building area as 70,000 sq. ft. but the map indicates 65,000 sq. ft. Mr. Landon explained that staff used the maximum allowed in the PD Text where as the applicant may not have shown the full build-out on the concept plan, and as such, the PD Text prevails. For the record, Mr. Dow wanted to know if Publix is in fact committed to the site. Mr. Hainley stated that the applicant would have to address that question, as well as traffic concerns that Mr. Dow has, i.e., average daily trips (ADT's), location of the traffic light, etc.

Mr. William Lawrence also expressed concerns about the traffic and stated that the current average daily trips on Frederica Road appear to be 13,000. He then asked staff to point out what the increased amount of ADT's would be if this proposal is approved. Mr. Hainley gave several examples of what the increase could be; however, he stated that in the worst case scenario if area C is developed as 40,000 sq. ft. of commercial area there would be an increase of 11,000 additional trips. Using the shopping center scenario, the current zoning would allow approximately 5000 ADT's and

the proposed zoning would allow approximately 5500 ADT's. Mr. Lawrence asked if any of the roads would be widened. Mr. Hainley explained that currently, there is no master plan for Frederica Road, which is expected to go to a category F in accordance with the current long-range transportation plan, primarily attributed to the zoning that is already in place for Frederica Township. Mr. Lawrence stated that for the benefit of the general public, category F is "stop and go traffic," which could very well lead to category G, "gridlock." Looking at some of the other properties, Ms. Joan Wilson noted that it appears that we have already exceeded the previously predicted traffic count. Mr. Hainley stated that the primary count that we have exceeded is in the Sea Island area near Frederica. He stated that staff does not have the new 2010 counts for this particular area.

At this time, Chairman Kirkendall opened the floor for the applicant's presentation.

Mr. Jim Bishop, representing the developers, stated that his main purpose for being here is to introduce all of the associates involved with this proposed development as follows: Mr. & Mrs. Don Gentile, Property Owners; Bob Peck & John Callaway of Watkins Retail Group, Developers; Robert Ussery, Architect; Bobby Shupe, Surveyor; Bill Edenfield, Landscape Architect (absent); and Ed Ellis, Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Bishop then turned the presentation over to Mr. Robert Ussery of whom he referred to as the lead associate in this case.

Mr. Ussery commended staff for being so thorough in its presentation of this request. During his presentation, he compared the proposed development with other developments in the area such as: Retreat Village, which is 132,000 sq. ft. on 12 acres of land at approximately 11,000 sq. ft. per acre; Shops at Sea Island with 94,000 sq. ft. of commercial tenant space on 11.62 acres at 8,162 sq. ft. per acre. He stated that the proposed grocery store shopping center component alone is 70,000 sq. ft. on 9.18 acres at 7,225 sq. ft. per acre. The entire tract is 112,000 sq. ft. on 14.6 acres at 7,671 sq. ft. per acre. Mr. Ussery's point being that in terms of intensity of development, the proposed commercial node is less than what is currently on St. Simons so far. He stated that the reason for this is largely due to the amount of buffers included around all of the site lines. He stated that they have planned for drainage by way of a large detention area, which will take care of on-site storm water for the entire site including the Red Barn Restaurant, the shopping center with the grocery store, and the development in the corner area.

Additionally, Mr. Ussery explained that Mr. Bill Edenfield has worked closely with them to locate the trees. Mr. Edenfield actually selected the trees that he felt were most likely to survive and with that in mind, he incorporated an area around the trees that would preserve the root systems. He stressed that there is quite a bit of land that is set aside for things other than just parking lots and buildings. They have trees, buffers and ponds all of which means that they would have a shopping center that is greener than any other on St. Simons Island.

Mr. Ussery addressed the stipulations recommended by staff with the following comments:

1. Traffic Signal

Yes, they will abide by the traffic study and agree with staff's recommendation.

2. Signage

Yes, they agree to define the size of the signage.

3. Landscape Buffers

They agree with the 10 ft. tall fence, masonry and textured, and will finish it on both sides. They will also move the wall 5 ft. off of the property line in order to allow some planting, which they will provide, on the adjacent neighbor's side of the fence.

4. Lighting

Yes, they will abide by the lighting recommendations and will comply with the requirements of Section 622.

5. Loading/Unloading Times

Yes, they will agree to the 7 am and 10 pm but would like consideration for loading area in the back of the store.

6. Area "C" restricted to residential uses only

They would like an opportunity to look at the size of the shopping center and come up with a commercial use for the back corner. The grocery store developer is mainly looking at Area B. The remaining portion, Area C, will continue to belong to the Gentile family. Currently on the property is a small landscape center for plant sales, as well as utilization of two tree surgeons. The family would like to continue these services in Area C.

7. No dumpster emptied before 8 a.m.

Yes, they agree with staff.

8. Parking restrictions for restaurant in Area "B"

Yes, they agree with staff.

At this time, Mr. Ussery introduced Mr. Ed Ellis, Traffic Engineer with Kimley-Horn Associates of Atlanta. Mr. Ellis stated that he and his wife have been part-time residents of St. Simons Island for over 10 years and are hoping to spend more time here. He stated that he prepared a detailed traffic study focusing on the impact that the proposed development would have in the specific area that would be drawing traffic to the site. He elaborated on the type of traffic generated by a retail center versus residential traffic. A retail center will cause you to rearrange trips, which means that they have to make sure that the driveways work and that the routes to and from the development site work. The area where they will be rearranging trips the most will be the area between Sea Island Road and the proposed site on Frederica.

Mr. Ellis stated that in the future, there will be significant development north of the site. Currently, 4% of the people coming to Publix will actually come from the north, which works out nicely from the standpoint of traffic operation at the driveways. As the growth to the north occurs, he stated that they may have to put in a left turn lane, but for the time being, it currently works well.

Mr. Ellis stated that in doing the traffic study, he projected traffic volumes in a very conservative way. He didn't take a lot of credit for by-pass trips. He put the cars on the road and analyzed them. The Levels of Service (LOS) is what is used in Traffic Engineering. He then described the type of traffic at each intersection near the site and expounded on the recommendation for a traffic signal at South Harrington. He also explained that they analyze the peak hours at intersections, but not the daily traffic. He stated that during the peak hour there will be about four cars per minute in each direction, which averages out to be 250 cars an hour in each direction. This is not enough to cause a congestion problem; it is not about congestion at this time, it is however about making sure that things work well with the quality of life, which will not be impacted. He stressed that the residential development will cause more problems than the commercial development.

At the end of Mr. Ellis's presentation, Mr. Ussery introduced Mr. Bob Peck who addressed the operation of the grocery store along with the shopping center. Mr. Peck first clarified a question from Mr. Dow, confirming that Publix is not committed to this site as of today. He stated that they are just one of a number of grocers that they have spoken to about the site location. Secondly, he addressed hours of operation. He explained that if they move forward with the Planned Development the store will operate 7 days a week, 7 a.m. until 10 p.m. He stated that there's been some discussion about deliveries, traffic and rear store operations. Mr. Peck pointed out that the number of trips from tractor trailers and smaller trucks would vary depending on the volume and size of the store. However, a store of this particular size typically would see 1 to 3 tractor trailer trucks per day. On additional days that number may increase with the delivery of beer and wine. He stated that they would probably see an additional 4 to 5 smaller size trucks, i.e., UPS, which delivers to the rear of the store. Also, they have a bay dock that can handle two trucks at one time.

Mr. Peck pointed out that the space off to the side is for the self contained trash compactor for the store, which is a sanitized unit. All refuse will be placed in the container from inside of the store, compacted, sanitized and deodorized. The rear of the store has no mechanical equipment.

Mr. Peck stated that all of the compressors and AC units are located on the roof of the store and are screened; not in all cases of their previous developments, but they are self contained. One of the items for recommendation was the delivery hours. He stated that they can live well within the parameters of 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. with the one exception of "bread trucks" that deliver earlier in the morning between the hours of 4:30 and 6:00 a.m. and they typically deliver to the front of the store.

Chairman Kirkendall opened the floor at this time for questions and comments from the Planning Commission members.

Ms. Desiree Watson had questions about the radial turning of the trucks and the impact on the roadway from the tractor trailers in terms of width. Mr. Peck pointed out the area on the map that he stated is designed for truck traffic including the backup lane and exit route. He also demonstrated the flow and direction of the trucks and reiterated that there would only be 1 to 3 tractor trailers per day. Occasionally, there would be beer and wine trucks approximately twice a week.

Ms. Watson wanted to know what the radius is for the trucks to turn on to South Harrington. Mr. Peck stated that the trucks do not need extra space. The curbing is already designed with proper radius for the trucks to make the turn. Ms. Watson asked if the trucks need extra space to come out onto Frederica Road. Mr. Peck replied no; however, there will be some improvements, i.e. widening. Mr. Ellis explained that one lane would be added for vehicles to turn right to avoid being restrained. Ms. Watson asked if the property has been acquired for the extra width. Mr. Ussery stated that the right-of-way on Harrington Road is 60 ft. wide, which is the requirement for a commercial road. He stated that they will be re-working the road basically from the driveway all the way to the intersection, and because of the 60 ft. width of the right-of-way there is enough room to broaden the radius.

Ms. Joan Wilson stated that previously when Mr. Gentile came before the Planning Commission, it was brought out that coming out of the intersection down Frederica Road is not very visible as far as seeing other traffic. The members asked the applicant at that time to take a portion of his parking lot and put up white posts, which he did, to enable people to see where the traffic is coming from. Mr. Ussery stated that the current plan includes a commitment for the parking lot to be fixed to avoid the issue of people parking around the outside of the property, as they currently do.

Continuing her questions about the trucks, Ms. Watson stated that if a truck should miss the entrance and goes down South Harrington, is there enough room for trucks to turn around and come back. Mr. Ussery pointed out another route if by chance they miss one entrance. He stated that they would also consider signage to this affect.

Mr. Paul Sanders asked if the 10 ft. buffer wall would extend along the south side of the property. Mr. Ussery stated that they have not discussed the extension of the buffer. Mr. Sanders asked Mr. Ussery if they met with all of the adjoining property owners. Mr. Ussery replied yes, with the exception of owners of the undeveloped subdivision. Mr. Sanders stated that he spoke with those owners and they had no objections to this project.

Ms. Wilson had questions about the location of buffers around the Red Barn. Mr. Ussery explained that there is nothing in the development text that shows buffers around the Red Barn from the shopping center.

Ms. Wilson stated that there is a traffic light at Harrington and there are 19 parking spaces approved to go out on Frederica Road, with two entrances, which in her opinion “looks like a disaster waiting to happen.” Mr. Ussery stated that the parking lot will be paved and there will be a curb at that particular area. He explained that part of their commitment with the new plan is to shut the parking down that is currently on South Harrington and Frederica Road. Also, there will be three entrances to the shopping center. Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Ussery if he had an estimate of the number of residences that would be in Area C if approved. Mr. Ussery stated that according to the development text, there could be a maximum of 32 units, and if they develop the 32 units there would not be any commercial on that particular site.

Mr. Dow had additional questions about the traffic. He stated that it appears that the heaviest traffic will be on South Harrington and because there will be a traffic light, this would provide an opportunity for vehicles coming out of Oglethorpe. He then posed an alternative location for the traffic light at the four-way intersection instead. Mr. Ellis explained that when they looked at the Oglethorpe signal location they noticed that the problem was with the left turn coming out of South Harrington. The traffic signal will be less disruptive to the corridor if it is located in a “T” intersection, rather than a four-way intersection. Mr. Ellis feels that what they are proposing is a better solution. Mr. Dow then asked for an estimated number of new trips generated from Sea Island Road to the site, excluding the current trips. Mr. Ellis stated that the diverted trips in the peak hour would be approximately 250 cars in each direction, which equates to 4 cars per minute.

Mr. Dow reiterated his suggested location for the traffic light. Mr. Peck advised that the intersection does not line up. Alignment issues are out of their control; however, Mr. Sanders pointed out that the right-of-way is not out of alignment. He feels that it would be safer to put the traffic light at Oglethorpe rather than at South Harrington, which is what he proposed in 2005. Mr. Lawrence noted that it took him 7 minutes this morning to get out of South Harrington. Mr. Sanders then asked who would pay for the traffic signal. Mr. Ellis replied that the developer would be responsible for this fee, as well as for the road improvements to the intersection and on Frederica Road.

Mr. Dow asked the developers if they could put Publix on the site under the existing PD Text if the Planning Commission were to do nothing with this request. Mr. Ussery stated that they could put a grocery store on the site, but whether or not it would be a Publix is the question. He stated that Publix, as any other quality grocer, has certain requirements in order to be the best that they can be, and to be competitive. Mr. Dow wanted to know what would happen with the 70,000 sq. ft. Area B (if approved) if Publix doesn’t come. Mr. Ussery explained that Publix would have to know that we have the proper location in order for them to make a commitment.

Ms. Patricia Laurens wanted to know if having a couple of different businesses, i.e. the nursery and the tree surgeon, is the reason behind the request for having Area C as a mixed use. Mr. Ussery stated that it was part of the reason, but they don’t have a big picture for Area C. The owner would like some flexibility in order to market the property

and currently residential is not the hottest market in the world. If there is a Publix on the site, it would perhaps attract certain people who are looking for real estate behind the grocery store. Ms. Laurens asked if the two businesses could be located in Area B. Mr. Ussery replied no, not with the current parking requirements.

Chairman Kirkendall wanted to know the ratio of trips for residential versus commercial with the same square footage. Mr. Ellis stated that approximately 4 residential uses would equal 1,000 sq. ft. of retail in terms of Trip Generation. However, that would vary based on daily and peak hours. In other words, Chairman Kirkendall stated that the 32 units would equal 8,000 sq. ft. of commercial. Mr. Ellis replied yes, roughly. Chairman Kirkendall then asked how much square footage could be built with what is currently there and what would the necessary parking be for that square footage if nothing is changed. Mr. Ussery stated that they never develop a precise plan, but they would agree with staff's assessment of 45 to 55,000 sq. ft. Mr. Peck stated that the ultimate size of the grocery store that they would like to attract is 45,600 sq. ft.

Ms. Watson asked if Publix need a shopping center, or are they willing to stand alone. Mr. Ellis stated that the Publix Grocery Store chain does have some stand alone stores, but shops make the project economically viable. They also create more shopping experience and encourage more people to come to the shopping center.

Mr. Dow reiterated his concerns about the signal and asked the developers to consider an alternative location. He also discussed other issues with the PD Text, i.e. temporary uses, and stated that some of them should be omitted. Additionally, he expressed concerns about existing uses in Area B, stipulations under Section 611, development standards, off street parking and density.

Mr. Sanders asked if any of the developers did a study or estimate as to whether there would be a gain or loss of value to any of the surrounding properties. Mr. Ussery stated that he met with one of the local churches who have several members living in Harrington. Their question was if this request is approved would it raise their property values because over the years they've enjoyed a certain level of property value. Mr. Ussery admitted that he'd never been asked that particular question, but agreed to try and get them an answer. He stated that Mr. Robert Gerhardt, Glynn County Chief Appraiser, reported that "based on the very similar results of the target and control neighborhoods, it is his opinion that the shopping center development did not detrimentally affect home values in the adjoining neighborhood. On the other hand, by comparing the target and control neighborhood results with subject neighborhood results, it is obvious that a shopping center development did not inordinately increase home values in the adjoining neighborhood."

Ms. Patricia Laurens asked Mr. Ussery to list the neighborhoods that were used in the comparison. Mr. Ussery stated that the target neighborhood used was Harrison Pointe, similar to the subject neighborhood adjoining a shopping center; with the control neighborhood being Hamilton Landing, away from a shopping center.

At the end of the Planning Commission comments, Chairman Kirkendall opened the floor for public comments. There were a number of citizens present (at least 100) to discuss this request; however, not everyone was opposed. Additionally, several letters of opposition, as well as letters in favor of this request are contained in their entirety in file application **ZM1968**.

Ms. Meredith Trawick of 305 John Shaw Road spoke in opposition. She stated that her main reason for opposing this request is because of the increase in traffic at the end of South Harrington, which is a residential area. The property is described as mixed use but if this request is approved, every square inch is commercial and she doesn't want that to happen. She stated that in the past, Glynn County indicated that they did not want any new cuts in Frederica Road, but if this is approved there would be many new cuts of large entrances and exits.

Ms. Trawick stressed that she is totally against having the traffic light in the proposed location and pointed out that she "would like for St. Simons to remain as a nice sleepy comfortable Island." She stated that there are two grocery stores on the Island that have recently been revamped and enlarged. They are more than adequate for the area and we need to support them.

Ms. Trawick also referenced Gould Cemetery as a historical site located on the southern border of the property. She stated that "a lot of old timers say that the cemetery use to be bigger." She believes that there are graves in back of the property that the applicant is trying to develop. She stated that when a request was previously proposed by Mr. Gentile she enlisted a gentleman to radar the area for graves at no cost, but Mr. Gentile refused to have anything to do with the process simply because if a grave is found he could not develop the property. She pointed out that if this request is approved, the ground in the area needs to be checked with radar to determine if there are graves there. However, she is asking that it be denied and that the area remain residential.

Mr. Don Young of 215 Five Pound Road agreed with Ms. Trawick and asked that this request be denied. "We should keep what we have."

Ms. Elaine Townsend of 104 Village Creek Way expressed concerns about drainage and feels that this request should be denied. She doesn't want any of this to end up in her yard.

Mr. Jim Drake of Village Creek Subdivision stated that he visited approximately 75 homes on South Harrington Way and adjacent roads; not everyone was home, but of the 38 people that he spoke with only one was in favor of this request, with the others being opposed. He stated that he is against this request largely due to traffic and parking and he is asking that it be denied.

Ms. Peg Shorey of 142 St. Clair Drive expressed concerns about the school buses and large trucks in relation to traffic. She stated that the people who live on the Island deserve all consideration above anyone who comes to the Island for financial gain.

Mr. Julius Williams of 135 South Harrington Road stated that the area in question is just a small portion of what use to be, and he would like to see it preserved as such so that they can live in peace and harmony.

Also present to speak in opposition were Mr. Jim Graham, Ms. Donna Livingston, Mr. John Teramo, Mr. Frank Holland, Ms. Tory Braden, Mr. Mark Goleonder, and Ms. J. Lowsten. They were all opposed due to traffic congestion, drainage problems, increased property taxes and potential damage to the infrastructure.

Mr. Ben Williams of 1608 Demere Road was somewhat undecided. He stated that he's not sure if what the applicant is proposing is the right plan, but it might be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Bill Hooker gave an extensive presentation in opposition to this request. He stated that since a rezoning approval is not conditional on a specific tenant like Publix, but rather the permitted uses, the proposed zoning text would permit a 110,000 sq. ft. Wal-Mart Supercenter as well as a Wal-Mart Murphy Gas Station. He urged the Planning Commission to deny this request.

Mr. Joe Fendig of 100 Cart Drive was present to speak in favor of this request. He stated that most of the opposition came to the Island, cut down trees and built their homes, but now they want development to stop. He stated that when he was child he would ride his bicycle past the Sea Island Road and would almost never see another car. Mr. Fendig stated that the Gentiles have been here for a long time and have paid a lot of property taxes. He feels that their request is not unreasonable and if the Planning Commission approves this he is confident that it would be done right, with minimal impact on the area.

Ms. Dawn Forbes spoke in favor of this request, agreeing with Mr. Fendig that the Gentile family has paid a lot of taxes and they have a right to develop their property. She also asked if anyone considered how much this proposal would decrease the traffic.

Mr. Jeff Jones, President of the Sea Palms West Home Association, stated that the Board of Directors is not opposed to this request but would like for the Planning Commission to deal with what is currently in place, plan and control the growth on the Island, and also consider an alternative location for the traffic light.

Mr. Charlie Crumbless stated that currently, there are no curb cuts at the Red Barn. He feels that this development would be an improvement.

Mr. Henry Wilson stated that he is in favor of this request because of the potential jobs that would be created. He feels that it would be good for the economy.

Also present to speak in favor of this request were Mr. Chad Kidwell and Mr. Orange Moore; both citing property rights and economic reasons as grounds for approval.

Mr. Robert Ussery gave a brief rebuttal followed by additional discussion from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sanders stated that there would be no gain or loss in property values, and he feels that people should be allowed to do what they want with their property as long as it does not harm surrounding property values. Mr. Dow stated that if he had to give a definite vote at this time, he would have to vote against this request due to the issues raised. He stated that this request should be deferred to allow the developers to consider the comments and address the issues brought up during discussion. Several members agreed. They also feel that the PD Text needs greater detailed information. Mr. Ussery stated that they are willing to consent to a deferral rather than risk being denied at this time.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to defer application **ZM1968 (I)** until the October 19th IPC meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 5 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 9:15 p.m.

SP1969 (I) CVS Pharmacy

Consider approval of a site plan for a 13,225 sq. ft. retail pharmacy on property consisting of a 1.97 acre portion of a parcel located on the north side of Sea Island Road, approximately 1,000 ft. west of its intersection with Frederica Road. The property is zoned Planned Development (PD) and is part of the Old Stables Tract PD. Parcel ID: 04-05141 (part). Adams and Wilson, agent for Varner & Varner, owners.

Mr. Ricardo Peleto was present for discussion.

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

This proposal is part of the development of what was formerly used for various support functions for the Sea Island resort properties. In addition to consolidated employee parking, the site included a day care center for employees, maintenance support facilities, vehicle maintenance, and the computer center. The site received zoning approval (March 5, 2009 - ZM1373, Old Stables Tract Planned Development) to be developed as a mixed-use project including residential, hotel, and retail uses, along with a smaller support facility for the resort. The day care center is currently used by a private

school. An area near the intersection of Frederica Road and Sea Island Road is being acquired by the Sea Island Land Trust for preservation.

Earlier this year a modification was made to the approved Planned Development (May 20, 2010 - ZM1754) to permit an additional access on Sea Island Road at this location. The approval included a restriction that the additional access be “right-out only” for the CVS site, and further included a requirement that the existing “right-in/right-out” access at the Shops at Sea Island (located on the south side of Sea Island Road) be modified so that in-bound left-hand turns off of Sea Island Road are prohibited.

The proposed pharmacy is consistent with the overall plan for the development of the Old Stables Tract project. A plan has also been approved for some of the infrastructure that serves this site, specifically including the driveways and water and sewer facilities lying to the east.

The site plan has been reviewed and a corrected plan has been submitted and reviewed. The corrected plan meets all technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance with the following exceptions: (1) the FEMA flood zone is not identified; (2) outdoor lighting is not shown; (3) the site coverage tabulation is not shown (note: the coverage limitation is for the entire development, and is not calculated on a lot-by-lot basis); and (4) the plan lacks a statement of the intent of the development. The applicant has been asked to supply this information prior to the planning commission action.

A tree plan has also been submitted and reviewed. The tree plan complies with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

In addition, staff suggests that final approval of the Building Permit and the Building Permit Site Plan should include a pre-construction meeting to ensure coordination of construction on this site with nearby infrastructure serving the project.

Engineering concerns are primarily technical comments that will be resolved before approval of permits.

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: As noted, the remaining information will be available prior to Planning Commission action.**
- 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: This requirement has been met in the tree plan.**
- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets. **Staff Comment: 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 will be met through the building permit.**
- 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 has been met, subject to coordination of on-site and off-site improvements.**

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application *SP1969*, subject to meeting all requirements.

Ms. Desiree Watson had questions about the type of building material proposed for the structure. Mr. Peleto stated that the core of the building is structural concrete block and is entirely covered with (island white) hard coated stucco. The base of the wall will consist of a type of stone and the roof will be clay tile to ensure compatibility with the architecture of the surrounding buildings.

Ms. Joan Wilson questioned the ability of trucks to maneuver in the loading zone. Mr. Brad Taylor pointed out the turnaround area on the plan and expounded on this issue of concern. Ms. Wilson also asked Mr. Varner if he agrees to fix the entrance and exit at the Shops at Sea Island to prevent vehicles from cutting across. Mr. Peleto replied yes. Mr. Phillips added that this issue was included as a condition on the rezoning and will have to be complied with as part of the final permitting package.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve application *SP1969*, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

VP1970 529 Beachview Drive (Glynn Art Assoc.)

Consider approval of two signs for the Glynn Art Association located on the north side of Beachview Drive east of its intersection with Fifteenth Street. The requested signs meet the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, but require approval by the Planning Commission because each exceeds six square feet in area. The property is zoned Village Mixed Use (VMU). Parcel ID: 04-04664. Sign-A-Rama, agent for Lucas Properties Holdings, LLC, owner.

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

The applicant proposes that three signs be added to the building to identify the gallery, along with a banner to identify specific exhibits. This is not a change in use. The proposal will allow signs for the building.

The proposed signage meets the provisions of the Sign Regulations (Article VIII) as to the number, types, and sizes of signs. The Sign Regulations provide 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 Sign Regulations also provide that such review and approval per the requirements of Section 709 (Island Preservation District), which 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. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of **VP1970** to allow the signs as requested.

Following review, a motion as made by Ms. Desiree Watson, seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted to approve application **VP1970** to allow the signs as requested.

VP1972 507 Ocean Boulevard (Mitchell Building)

Consider approval of modifications to an existing building located on the north side of Ocean Boulevard approximately 200 feet east of its intersection with Mallery Street. The modifications are primarily to the interior of the building, but include the addition of dormers, an exterior staircase, and changes to the porch railings. The property is zoned VMU (Village Mixed Use). Parcel ID: 04-04468. Larry Bryson, agent for Lucas Properties Holdings II, LLC, owner. (Y. Phillips)

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:

The new building owner is making a number of interior renovations to the building, including an elevator and changes to bathrooms. In addition, the owner proposes to add dormers, an exterior rear staircase, and to make changes to porches.

Section 709.4 of the Zoning Ordinance provides for review of building alterations and establishes 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. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of application *VP1972* to allow the building alterations as requested.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. John Dow to approve application *VP1972* to allow the building alterations as requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Joan Wilson and unanimously adopted.

VP1974 Lighthouse Garden Improvements

Consider approval of a landscaped garden with improvements located west of the Lighthouse and the Light Keeper’s House at 101 Twelfth Street. In addition to the plantings, the improvements include the addition of an arbor and an access ramp. The property is zoned (P) Public. Parcel ID: 04-12924. Property owned by Coastal Georgia Historical Society.

The staff’s report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Phillips as follows:

The proposal will allow development of improvements in a small landscaped area immediately west of the Lighthouse (requiring review under Section 709.6 of the Zoning Ordinance) an arbor and a ramp. The ramp will make the Light Keeper’s House (used as a museum) accessible as required under the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Section 709.4 of the Zoning Ordinance provides for review of new structures, and establishes 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.

In addition, a landscape plan is required.

Staff has reviewed all submitted materials and has determined that they adequately demonstrate compliance with the applicable standards. Therefore, staff recommends approval of **VP1974** for landscaping adjacent to the Lighthouse, including the arbor and access ramp, subject to meeting all requirements (including ADA standards).

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Joan Wilson, seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted to approve application **VP1974** for landscaping adjacent to the Lighthouse, including the arbor and access ramp, subject to meeting all requirements (including ADA standards).

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.