

CALLED MEETING

GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 23, 1996 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerome Clark, Vice-Chairman
Robert Fell
Glenda Jones
Lee Noel
Iris Touw

ABSENT: Wayne Stewart

STAFF PRESENT: Dan Reuter, Planning Official
Janet Loving, Admin.Secretary

In the absence of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman Jerome Clark called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

GC-2-96 A

**Consider amending Article VIII, Section 804.8.2A)
Interstate Highway System/I-95, of the Glynn County
Zoning Ordinance, regarding outdoor advertising signs,
located on sites which abut I-95;**

As a recap, Mr. Reuter read the following recommendations proposed by the Sign Committee (Mr. Robert Fell, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Wayne Stewart):

1. Request that Zoning Board of Appeals not grant any variances for signs for one year beginning May 1, 1996, pending actions from the State Legislature.
2. Suggest the Board of Commissioners, as well as the Planning Commission and other county agencies along I-95, write the Department of Transportation regarding pruning of trees and bushes in front of billboards along I-95.
3. Notify all property owners within 1,500 ft. of any billboard of sign requests coming before the Planning Commission. We will also request the Zoning Board of Appeals to adopt the same notice requirement.
4. Review existing signs for compliance with current sign regulations.
5. Address lighting density.
6. Review 500 ft. setback from property lines.

The following sections were then discussed. (Words underlined have been added and words with lines drawn through have been deleted.)

Page VIII-12

804.8.1 General Requirements

- e) All signs (display areas) shall be setback 25 ft. from the right-of-way line of any street or highway. Signs on the Interstate Highway System shall be setback 10 ft. from the right-of-way line or the minimum yard requirement for the zoning district, whichever is greater. The sign and shall be a minimum of 10 ft. in height above the highest point of pavement of the road or street, measuring from the lower portion of the sign face. Two signs in the same location, whether back-to-back or in a V formation, shall be the same height above the surface of the road or street.

Page VIII-13

804.8.2A

All outdoor advertising located on sites which abut the Federal Interstate Highway/I-95 right-of-way shall meet the following requirements:

Exception: The Glynn County Planning Commission may upon submittal of an application allow an exception to the height limitations for outdoor advertising signs on the Interstate Highway System. The following information shall be provided to Planning and Zoning Division staff two weeks prior to the Planning Commission meeting:

- 1) A site plan detailing the location of the proposed sign location including property dimensions, existing zoning, adjacent property zoning, heights of existing vegetation, and proximity to residential structures.
 - 2) A sign detail (elevation plan) including dimensions (height & width, overall height, lighting characteristics, (intensity and direction).
 - 3) Upon receipt of a complete application, the Planning & Zoning Division shall notify all property owners within 1,500 ft. of the proposed request.
- d) Signs shall only be permitted in areas which are zoned commercial or industrial, and are not located within located between 500 ft. and 1,700 ft. of the deceleration and acceleration ramp...

During the course of discussion, Mr. Lee Noel stated that a two week notification is a short time period. He stated information should be provided to staff at least four weeks prior, or for whatever time it takes to provide suitable notification. Mr. Noel pointed out that this was a major concern of residents. Mr. Reuter stated the time period could be changed to three weeks as follows: ...information shall be provided to Planning & Zoning Division staff three weeks prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

814.4 Nonconforming Signs

All existing Interstate Highway Outdoor Advertising Signs (billboards) not conforming with the requirements of Section 804.8.2A) may continue until January 1, 2002. All Interstate Highway Signs exceeding 25 ft. in height shall be brought into conformance or receive an exception by the Planning Commission prior to the deadline date of January 1, 2002.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to recommend approval of the proposed amendment with the following preference: "It shall be the intent of Glynn County to avoid exceptions to the height limitations for outdoor advertising on the Interstate Highway System." The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

Also, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to request that Chairman Stewart submit a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners soliciting Georgia DOT to institute a pilot program which would allow minimum pruning and landscaping of trees and shrubs in front of billboards along the Interstate Highway System. The Planning Commission welcomed the Chamber of Commerce and the Glynn County Chapter of the Garden Clubs of Georgia to participate in the pilot program.

GC-2-96B

Consider amending Article V, Section 507 Use of Substandard Lots of Record, of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, to provide for use of substandard lots of record and resubdivision prior to July 1, 1996;

Mr. Reuter stated that the County Attorney has proposed a new amendment which includes more limited goals of grandfathering in existing resubdivisions and allowing future resubdivision only to continue resubdivision that has already been partly accomplished with approval. As an example, the County Attorney referenced Rev. Julius Hammock's situation in Glynn Haven Subdivision.

The following was proposed by the County Attorney. (Words underlined have been added.)

No permit for the use of any lot which is smaller in total area than the minimum size permitted for the district within which it is located shall be issued unless said lot was legally and properly recorded prior to the passage of this Ordinance; provided; however, that in Residential Districts, substandard lots shall be used only for single-family residential purposes.

However, in all cases, construction on any such lot, after the time of passage of this ordinance, shall be required to meet all other requirements of the district within which it is located, including front yard setbacks, side yards, rear yards and others.

Any existing substandard lot or lots of record which have already been resubdivided prior to July 1, 1996 into one or more lots which are smaller in total area than the minimum size permitted for the district within which they are located

shall be deemed a substandard lot of record and usable as provided herein. This provision shall apply whether such resubdivision was accomplished by approving a plat or issuing a building permit approving the resubdivision. Where such a resubdivision has occurred prior to July 1, 1996 on any lot, an adjacent lot may be resubdivided after July 1, 1996 and used as provided herein as a substandard lot of record if the new resubdivision and the existing resubdivided lot are both part of a discernible plan dealing with those lots and both lots were, at the time of the original resubdivision owned by one person or entity and if the resubdivision results in lot(s) with more area than the original approved lot(s) from which they were formed.

A survey of Rev. Hammock's property was presented for discussion, specifically Lot 24 and a portion of Lot 23, depicted as Lot 24A. Mrs. Touw stated that a portion of the proposed amendment is intended to resolve a problem of one property owner, which she feels should be handled on an individual basis and not by way of amending the ordinance. Mr. Noel agreed with Mrs. Touw. He stated the problem with Lot 24A in this case could be resolved by the proper authorities approving a permit which would allow Rev. Hammock to build on his property.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to recommend approval of the amendment with the exception of the following: "Where such a resubdivision has occurred prior to July 1, 1996 on any lot, an adjacent lot may be resubdivided after July 1, 1996 and used as provided herein as a substandard lot of record if the new resubdivision and the existing resubdivided lot are both part of a discernible plan dealing with those lots and both lots were, at the time of the original resubdivision, owned by one person or entity and if the resubdivision results in lot(s) with more area than the original approved lot(s) from which they were formed." The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

A separate motion was made by Mr. Noel in which he stated "the Planning Commission supports an exception to allow the use of Lot 24A in Glynn Haven Subdivision." The motion was seconded by Mrs. Jones. Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mr. Robert Fell, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Lee Noel. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw.

Consider amending Article VIII, Section 802 Resubdivision of Land, of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, to provide for a procedure for resubdividing lots previously subdivided in recorded plats, and for other purposes;

Mr. Reuter stated that in this amendment, the word "**reached**" has been changed to "**recorded**" as follows:

For any change in an approved and recorded subdivision plat or any map or plat legally **reached recorded** prior to the adoption (August 5, 1976) of these Subdivision Regulations, if such change affects any street layout, right-of-way, easement, improvement, area reserved for public use or any lot line shown on such plat, such change shall be approved by the Planning Commission...

Following review, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:25 a.m.

**Consider amendment to Article VI. Section 617
Exception to Height Limits, of the Glynn County
Zoning Ordinance to provide additional require-
ments for the location of a new cellular and
other transmission towers;**

Mr. Reuter presented the following requirements recommended by staff for revising Section 617:

1. Require approval for any tower which exceeds building height limitations of zoning district;
2. Require setback from property line equal to height of tower to protect from falling on adjacent property or a roadway;
3. Five mile radius from any existing towers;
4. Six foot chain link fence around base possibly with barbed wire;
5. Require certification from existing tower operators that collocation is not possible;
6. Provide for basic lighting needs only;
7. Aesthetics requirements.

A sample copy of a tower ordinance was presented for the Planning Commission's review; however, Mrs. Jones stated additional ordinances from other urban areas would be helpful in making comparisons. Mr. Reuter stated he would confer with the County Attorney for additional copies from the ACCG, and he will also provide maps for the next meeting.

STAFF ITEMS

**A) El Potro Restaurant
Site Plan Requirements**

Mr. Reuter read portions of Section 723.3 and Section 723.6 of the Zoning Ordinance as they relate to site plan requirements; however, due to questions regarding the entrance, street access and alignment, it was the consensus of the members that a site plan for this restaurant needs to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to have the applicant

for El Potro present a site plan for the Planning Commission's review, and further, that the County Engineer appear at the next meeting to provide input on consistency with street alignment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Robert Fell stated that at a previous meeting, Mr. Ray Richard was requested to examine a possible egress lane from Tabby Plaza through Redfern Village as a means of controlling traffic. He stated that the Planning Commission is still waiting to hear from Mr. Richard. Mr. Reuter stated he would contact the property owner, confer with Mr. Richard and report back to the Planning Commission.

B) Advertising Balloons

Mr. Reuter stated that according to the ordinance, balloons are considered portable signs and are therefore illegal. He then asked if the Planning Commission concurs that advertising balloons may be permitted in certain areas; or should they be removed everywhere. Mrs. Jones stated that if the balloons are illegal, they should be removed. Mr. Noel stated that they are garish and should be removed. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that if advertising balloons are in violation of the ordinance, a citation should be issued to the owner and the balloons should be removed.

Banners and ribbons were then discussed. Mrs. Jones commented that banners located at the Spur and Altama Avenue (Kroger's) are in violation of the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Reuter stated he would advise Mr. Conley to investigate this and others that may be located in the county.

C) Unified Development Ordinance

A draft report explaining why the Subdivision Regulations, Zoning, Flood and Sedimentation & Erosion Control Ordinances should be combined into a Unified Ordinance was included in the packages as information for the Planning Commission's review.

According to the report, a Unified Ordinance would - 1) conform to the way developments occur today; 2) enable the Planning & Zoning office to administer the land-use control system more efficiently; 3) avoid overlapping and conflicting ordinance provisions; 4) enable the Planning & Zoning office to administer the relationship between the Land Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan.

COMMISSION ITEMS

Mr. Fell asked if the final meeting had been rescheduled at the St. Simons Casino to discuss the Planning Commission changes. Mr. Reuter stated he had no information on the meeting schedule at this time.

Mrs. Touw had comments regarding "lighted tube signs." She suggested changing the word exposed to visible. Mr. Reuter advised that this could be advertised for the September meeting.

Also under Commission Items, Mr. Lee Noel announced that he had submitted his letter of resignation to the Chairman of the Glynn County Board of Commissioners, effective immediately. He stated that he has enjoyed serving on the Planning Commission and will miss everyone in Glynn County. Mr. Noel and his wife are moving back to North Carolina. The Planning members and staff expressed their admiration for Mr. Noel and wished him success in his future endeavors.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.