

MINUTES

**GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 7, 1996 9:00 A.M.**

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

ABSENT: Richard Parker

STAFF PRESENT: Dan Reuter, Planning Official
Mark Schroeder, Planner
Deborah Taylor, Zoning Administrator
Andy Gryzmski, Transportation Planner
Anne Kilponen, Transportation Planner
Janet Loving, Administrative Secretary

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

Due to a lengthy agenda, Mr. Stewart advised that some items on the agenda would be shifted around in the essence of time. He stated that Item #33 (Approve Proposed Budget...) is being presented for informational purposes only. A worksession will be scheduled at a later date for further discussion.

Mr. Stewart stated that a letter was submitted by Attorney Jameson Gregg on May 6th requesting a deferral of Item #14 on the agenda, application #GC-8-96, property owned by Northend Partners. Therefore, Item #14 will not be discussed today.

Referring to Item #25 on the agenda (GC-2-96 A), Mr. Stewart reported that the sign committee held three meetings to discuss the proposed amendment to Article VIII, Section 804.8.2 A) Interstate Highway Systems/I-95. He then presented recommendations to the Planning Commission for informational purposes only. Mr. Stewart stated the committee members concurred that no action would be taken on the amendment today in order to allow the Planning Commission more time to review the recommendations submitted by the sign committee.

Mr. Stewart stated that Chairman Parker asked him to announce that the county is discussing the possibility of establishing a building review committee to address commercial lighting, landscaping guidelines, etc., and make recommendations to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Commissioners. The following people have been contacted to serve on the committee: Mr. Ben Slade, Mr. Howard Lynn, Mr. Ron Sawyer, Mr. Bill Edenfield, and a GA Power representative. Mr. Lee Noel has been asked to serve as chairman; however, Mr. Noel stated that due to other obligations, he has declined the offer to serve as chairman of this committee. Mr. Stewart advised that this goal is in the early stages of discussion and no decisions have been made.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that items on the agenda pertaining to the Village Preservation District will be addressed at 1:00 p.m. today. Following a brief discussion regarding the "consent process," a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to consent approval of Item #17 (request to construct an addition to existing residence), and Item #24 (request for approval of signage for Poppingo Video). The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

**Preliminary Plat
Ocean Road (road approval only)
4.856 acres, zoned Resort Residential,
located on Sea Island.**

Sea Island Company, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

Mr. Mark Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the proposed development in Ocean Forest is for the platting of Ocean only. Ocean Road will be extended from its current limits in front of Ocean Cottages, Phase I at Ocean Forest to the proposed cul-de-sac flanked by the 18th fairway and marsh. Mr. Schroeder stated that the property is zoned Resort Residential which permits the development of Row Houses. He pointed out that the developer intends to continue the development of Row Houses down the length of Ocean Road. He also noted that Row Houses require formal site plan approval by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Schroeder explained that an exception to the road length for Ocean Road from 1,200 ft. to 2,600 ft. is recommended due to the physical constraints surrounding the property. The road extends out of a peninsula surrounded by marsh and wetlands. In addition, the County Engineer has recommended approval of the road length exception.

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff received approval of the Ocean Road Preliminary Plat from the following agencies: Corps of Engineers, Georgia DNR, the County Engineer, Fire Planning and Zoning, Building Inspections, Public Works, Sanitation, and Water and Sewer. He stated staff recommends approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell. Further discussion ensued.

Mrs. Touw had questions concerning the right-of-way width. Mr. Bobby Shupe, County Surveyor, stated that the right-of-way is 50 ft. wide. Mrs. Touw suggested that the developer confer with staff regarding the possibility of establishing an overlay plan for Sea Island, similar to the St. Simons Village plan.

Mr. Noel wanted to know the reason for having the 1,200 ft. limitation. Mr. Shupe replied that one reason is for fire protection. Mr. Ray Richard agreed and added that another reason is due to emergency vehicles.

After discussion, the motion for approval was unanimously adopted.

**Preliminary Plat
Valerie Subdivision, Phase IV, Minor Revision
Touchstone Ridge area, 65.9 acres, zoned M-12
One-Family Residential Manufactured Home**

Driggers Construction Co., Owner/Developer

Mr. Harry Driggers and Mr. Ralph Lackey were present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the proposed entrance into Valerie, Phase IV crossed Glynn County property to connect to Abbott Avenue. The county property was dedicated as part of the approval of Touchstone Heights. He pointed out that as a solution, the developer has realigned the proposed entrance to connect through a 60 ft. opening in the dedicated area to Abbott Avenue. Options to connect across from Laura Lane were halted due to a dispute over the ownership of the property. The realignment avoids this issue of property ownership which allows the developer to move forward with this project.

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends approval of the realignment to connect to Abbott Avenue through the right-of-way opening noted as "Road to Touchstone Ridge Estates" on the Touchstone Heights Final Plat. Staff also recommends that the developer considers paving the portions of Abbott Avenue and Touchstone Drive to the entrance of Valerie, Phase IV. The pavement ends near Laura Lane on Touchstone Drive.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jerome Clark to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Tabby Plaza
Private Access Easements, 7.239 acres,
zoned Highway Commercial, located on
the northwest corner of Demere Road
and Frederica Road.**

Stewart Commercial Investments, Inc.

Mr. Tommy Stewart was present for discussion. (It was noted that Tommy Stewart and Wayne Stewart are not related.)

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is proposing to resubdivide the Tabby Plaza property into four large tracts. Access to the tracts will be provided by the two access points as shown on the minor plat and on the engineering plans. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that one access to Demere Road will line up across from the entrance to Retreat Village, and the entrance along Frederica Road is located as far north as possible. When future traffic patterns in Frederica Road dictate, the entrance to Frederica Road may be limited to a right turn in and right turn out only.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the smallest lot is 18,208 sq. ft. which exceeds the minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. in a Highway commercial zoning district. The developer has agreed to the following improvements/restrictions:

1. Only one curb cut along Demere Road and one curb cut along Frederica Road shall be permitted as shown on the engineering plans.

2. No trees shall be removed from the Demere Road or Frederica Road rights-of-way.
3. The sidewalk shall be extended north along Frederica Road to the northeast corner of the outparcel.
4. All lots depicted shall be served by public water and sewer.
5. Provide a 50% contribution towards the signalization cost at the Demere Road connection.
6. Curbing is provided at the two entrances (one at Demere and one at Frederica).

Mr. Schroeder stated that all applicable departments will review each site plan for the development to ensure that all requirements are met in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance. He pointed out that the parking areas for the various properties will more than likely be interconnected to provide circulation across the entire tract.

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends approval of the minor plat subject to the conditions outlined above. Also, staff recommends that site coverage, landscaping, lighting, size of structures and architecture be appropriate for the location and St. Simons Island. He stated that these items will be considered during the Building Permit review process.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Robert Fell had questions regarding traffic movement. Mr. Schroeder pointed out the access points and out-parcels and stated that interconnected parking lots would be helpful to traffic movement at the two points. Mr. Fell stated that a connecting road at Redfern would also help relieve traffic. Mr. Tommy Stewart stated that the only way to add a connecting road would be through wetlands or across private property. He stated he had no "fundamental objection" to trying to work something out with the Redfern Village property owners.

Mr. Lee Noel stated that the parcel is located at a very busy intersection and zoned Highway Commercial, and as such, the developer is not required to submit a site plan for the Planning Commission's review. Mr. Noel asked if Mr. Stewart (Tommy) could give them an idea of what is proposed for the area. Mr. Stewart (Tommy) stated he had no specific plans at this time; however, he is considering a motel and some retail. Mr. Noel asked Mr. Stewart (Tommy) if he would consider having a public meeting at a future date in order to inform the public of his plans. Mr. Stewart replied that he would be willing to do whatever he can; however, he stated he will not obligate himself but he will comply with the staff's recommendations. Mr. Noel asked if he had a time table for the development. Mr. Stewart replied not at this time.

Mrs. Iris Touw also expressed concerns about traffic. She stated "we do not know how much traffic will be generated until we know what is proposed." Mr. Richard stated that is correct. He stated that a particular type of traffic signal will be installed and possibly an egress lane through Redfern.

Mr. Roger Peters, St. Simons resident, stated he is concerned about the traffic and the dangerous position of one-way signs in the area. Mr. Richard stated he would look into these concerns.

Mr. Lee Noel asked that the motion be amended as follows: "Whereas the intersection of Demere and Frederica Roads is the busiest and potentially most dangerous intersection on St. Simons Island, and it serves as a gateway to the Island, the Tabby Plaza Development must be carefully monitored by appropriate county staff departments, i.e., Public Works, Traffic Safety and Planning & Zoning, to ensure that it is compatible with this scenic area and meets all safety

considerations. Furthermore, we ask that the Planning & Zoning Division report to the Planning Commission on a regular basis regarding the progress of the development.”

The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Glynn Haven Estates, Portion of
Block 56 - Lots 1 thru 8 and a
portion of Lot 9 (6 lots, replat
at 4 lots), zoned R-6 One-Family
Residential**

Property owned by Julius Hammock

Mr. Schroeder stated that the applicant proposes to take 8 and a half existing lots of record (Block 56, lots 1 thru 9) and create 6 lots meeting the residential standards. Each lot will be served by public water and sewer. He stated the applicant is willing to comply and would like clearance to proceed in obtaining a building permit.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Fell to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Glynn Haven Estates, Block 22
Lots 21 thru 24 (4 lots, replat
at 3 lots), zoned R-6 One-Family
Residential**

Property owned by Julius Hammock

Mr. Schroeder stated that the applicant proposes to take 3 existing lots of record (Block 22, Lots 21 thru 24) and create 3 lots (40'x 80'). The resultant lots would each have an area of 3,200 sq.ft. These lots do not meet the zoning district requirement for lot area (minimum 6,000 sq.ft.) or lot width (minimum 60 ft.) However, the proposed lots are larger and have more road frontage than the original lots (30'x 80' = 2,400 sq.ft.) Under the current regulations, this division cannot be approved. Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends a deferral until the Subdivision Regulations are amended.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to defer this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Pine Knoll Subdivision, Redivision
of Lots 1 & 8, located on Blythe
Island and zoned R-20 One-Family
Residential**

Property owned by Richard McKinna

Mr. Schroeder stated that the applicant is proposing to relocate the original lot line separating lots 1 and 8. The new lot configuration adheres to the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance. Lot 1 would be provided access via Fernwood Court instead of the current flag lot with frontage on Blythe Island Drive.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Community Commercial and Industrial
Park, create a lot off an existing
road, zoned Highway Commercial**

Property owned by Sound Investments

Mr. Schroeder stated that the applicant is proposing a 1.2208 acre commercial tract within the recorded subdivision. The new lot configuration adheres to the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance. Access points will be reviewed and approved during the building permit review process.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

**802 Subdivision Plat
Harrison Pointe, Phase V, Revision
to Lot 135 due to edge of pavement
encroaching on lot, additional ROW
to be dedicated.**

Mr. Schroeder explained that dedication of additional rights-of-way must also be accepted by the Board of Commissioners.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this revision. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

**Site Plan Approval
Buckingham Terrace, Phase II
1.707 acres located off Buckingham
Place, zoned Medium Residential**

Property owned by Buckingham Terrace, Inc.

Mr. Don Hutchinson was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that Buckingham Terrace, Phase II is an extension of Buckingham Terrace, Phase I which is a senior citizen apartment complex. This phase will consist of 20 one bedroom apartments. The units will be clustered into five quadruplexes (4 units to each complex). The density is 11.71 units per acre.

Mr. Schroeder explained that 30 parking spaces are proposed with 2 handicapped spaces. This computes out to 1.5 spaces per unit. He stated that according to the zoning code, a multi-family complex shall supply a minimum of 2 spaces per unit; however, due to the proposed clientele (elderly) and due to all of the units being one bedroom, 1.5 spaces per unit should be more than sufficient. Also note that approximately two years ago, a similar site plan was approved for this location which allocated 1.5 spaces per unit.

Mr. Schroeder stated that all reviewing departments have approved this request with the exception of the Sanitation Department. He stated staff recommends approval subject to the elimination of the proposed dumpster in the northwest corner of the site. The current dumpster in Phase I is more than sufficient for both phases (60 units total). Mr. Schroeder stated that if Phase III is constructed, a location for an addition dumpster will be considered.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jerome Clark to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

**Site Plan Approval
Village at Glynn Place, Phase II
Extension of Publix Shopping Center
34,751 sq. ft., located off Altama
Connector, zoned Planned Development-
Shopping**

**Property owned by Village at Glynn
Place, L.L.C.**

Attorney Tom Lee was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that at the April 2nd Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Tom Wheeler presented a proposal to expand the existing Publix Shopping Center to include a "Goody's" and additional shops. During this presentation, it was brought to staff's attention that the current owners/managers of the Publix property will also manage and own The Village at Glynn Place, Phase II. The merging of the property under one control creates a development which exceeds 10 acres in area. Mr. Schroeder stated that all development in excess of 10 acres must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. A building permit has been issued for "Goody's" as decided at the April meeting. In order to meet the requirements of the Planned Development, the shops that connect the entire shopping center must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the Planned Development text specifically outlines 6 major review areas including the following:

- a. Height of Improvement
- b. Calculations of Proposed Parking
- c. Setbacks
- d. Frontage on a Dedicated Street or Perpetual Easement
- e. Lighting and Loading/Unloading Areas
- f. Location of Curb Cut Spacing

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends approval of the proposed shops connecting "Goody's" to the existing Publix Shopping Center subject to the following conditions:

1. Engineering: Drainage easements throughout the site, especially the one running under the proposed shops, shall not be dedicated, accepted, or maintained by the county. Furthermore, the drainage easements shall not convey water from any county maintained drainage system. (The 80 ft. drainage easement on the south side of the property is excluded from this requirement)
2. Community Development/Planning & Zoning: The applicant shall contribute 25% (approx. \$10,750) toward the improvements for the Altama Connector and Scranton Connector intersection. A Certificate of Occupancy shall not be issued until the 25% contribution is made to Glynn County.
3. Future development within the vicinity of the Altama/Scranton Connector intersection will require re-addressing the extension of the Scranton Connector back to Altama Avenue.

Mr. Stewart had questions regarding drainage under the shop. Mr. Richard stated the pipe is an existing pipe that was installed due to anticipation of space between buildings. He stated that the system will serve to drain the parking lot. Mr. Richard stated that he checked to make sure that no water coming off of county roads was in that system. He stated that from an engineering stand point, the proposed drainage can be done safely, but he feels that it is not a good idea. However, if a problem is created, the developers would be liable.

Mr. Noel wanted to know how the storm water is kept separate. Mr. Richard explained that the storm water on Altama Connector goes into the county drainage system, and all of the parking lot water for the shopping center goes into their system. He stated the county does not maintain the shopping center's drainage system.

Attorney Tom Lee stated that the office at the location will be owned by the shopping center and will be the tenants' responsibility to maintain. Mr. Stewart stated he is concerned that when the tenants move in and when their stores begin to flood, they will probably call Glynn County. Attorney Tom Lee stated that staff has made it perfectly clear that the system is a private drainage system, and the tenants are aware of their liability. He stated they will take all necessary precautions to ensure that this does not happen.

Following a brief discussion regarding construction of the access road, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to approve this request subject to conditions stated by staff and subject to an additional condition that a letter be sent to the developer restating the Planning Commission's understanding that a road will be constructed with the next phase of development. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark. Mr. Robert Fell asked that the motion be amended to include the following in the letter: "Before any additional development occurs to Phase III on Tracts 2, 3, and 4, the road will be completed all the way through." The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess at this time. The meeting resumed at 10:45 a.m.

Mr. Stewart advised that Item #28, "Consider Amending Article VI, Section 602 Streets, Subsection 602.2 g) Permanent Dead-End Streets; and Item #31, "Access cuts on Demere Road" have been deferred. He stated that a Called Meeting will be scheduled to further discuss these items. Item #25, "Consider Amending Article VIII..." and Item #33, "Proposed Budget..." will also be discussed at the Called Meeting.

Site Plan Approval
Holiday Inn Express
1.286 acres, Plantation Village,
located off Demere Road, St. Simons,
zoned Planned Development-General

Island Group Inc., Property Owner

Mr. Bill Kirby was present for discussion

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is proposing a 60 unit motel on a 1.286 acre site. A hotel/motel is a permitted use within the Planned Development. He stated that 66 parking spaces have been provided per the parking requirements.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the proposed development adheres to the requirements outlined in the Planned Development Zoning Text with the exception of improvements within the 7 ft. perimeter setback. The Zoning Text states 7 ft. building and parking setback along other perimeter property lines. However, in addition to the 7 ft. setback along this property line, there is a 7.5 ft. drainage easement. Mr. Schroeder stated that at a recent Board of Commissioners meeting, it was stated that no improvements shall be located within a county easement. With this direction, the improvements should be removed entirely from the 7.5 ft. drainage easement. The last additional requirement for this side of the property is the establishment of a landscaped buffer strip, as outlined in Section 613 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Schroeder further stated that the development covers greater than 90% of the site which staff feels is out of character with the Plantation Village development. Also, most trees on the site will be removed. Photographs of the area were presented for the Planning Commission's review.

Mr. Bill Kirby gave a brief presentation. He pointed out that the pine trees in the area are very large and dangerous. He stated he would like to remove the pine trees and replace them with live oak and palm trees for a better visual affect. Mr. Kirby stated he will save as many trees as possible and will stay within the character of the Island. He further stated that the biggest issue in this case is maintenance of the ditch. He stated he would like to leave the trees in the 7 ft. easement; however, Mrs. Taylor stated that the Ordinance does not allow any obstruction in a drainage easement.

Mr. Lee Noel stated he is concerned that there is no zoning text with this proposal, no building material for review, elevation is not addressed, and there is no statement from other property owners indicating their approval. Mr. Noel stated that "this is an inadequate proposal." Mr. Kirby stated that he has complied with what he was told by staff. He stated it would not be fair to make him wait another 30 days. Mr. Noel stated he requested staff to provide him a copy of

the Planned Development Zoning Text; however, one was not provided. Mr. Stewart asked that a member of staff retrieve this information for the Planning Commission's review. In the meantime, he advised that they would proceed with the next agenda item until the information is presented.

GC-6-96

Request to rezone from General Commercial and R-6 One-Family Residential to Highway Commercial, 2 parcels of land consisting of 3 acres as follows: Parcel 1) GC to HC, 1.78 acres fronting 387.60 feet on the north side of Perry Lane Road beginning 200 ft. east of Cate Road; and Parcel 2) R-6 to HC, 1.22 acres lying immediately north of Parcel 1.

Property owned by Driggers Construction Company

Mr. Harry Driggers and Mr. Ralph Lackey were present for discussion.

Mrs. Taylor presented the staff's report. She stated that this request is to rezone 3 acres fronting on Perry Lane Road, beginning 200 ft. east of Cate Road and approximately 1,800 ft. west of Spur 25. The property was previously part of a larger tract of land zoned Mobile Home Park.

Mrs. Taylor stated that in 1992, the owner requested zoning changes, 30 acres rezoned to R-6 One-Family Residential (to be developed an additional phase of a residential subdivision) and 6.87 acres rezoned to General Commercial. She stated the request at this time is to rezone portions of these to Highway Commercial.

Mrs. Taylor stated that subject property is located on a section of Perry Lane Road that was developed in 1990, connecting Cate Road with Spur 25, creating a thru road between Spur 25 and Highway 341. The property is located 200 ft. east of Cate Road and 1,800 ft. west of Spur 25. This section of road contains mixed zoning classifications and land uses, i.e., Forest Agricultural, Local Commercial, General Commercial, Highway Commercial and Freeway Commercial.

Mrs. Taylor pointed out that the majority of the property is already zoned commercial, but designated as General Commercial. The intent of General Commercial is to be developed for general business purposes; however, it does not require setbacks from the road right-of-way. Highway Commercial is intended to be developed and reserved for commercial uses which primarily render a service or cater to tourists, vacationers, truckers and the traveling public in general, but does require a front yard setback of 25 ft. from the road right-of-way.

Mrs. Taylor stated that in order to further evaluate this request, the following matters were considered in developing staff's recommendation:

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Yes.

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

No.

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

Yes.

4. 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.

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

Yes.

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

Current and proposed commercial development along this section of Perry Lane Road between Cate Road and Spur 25.

Mrs. Taylor stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jerome Clark to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

Discussion Continued On Item #11

Mr. Reuter distributed copies of the Planned Development Zoning Text and proceeded to read the Text. Mr. Stewart asked that the Zoning Text be included in the request. He also asked that the staff's recommendations be presented at this time.

Mr. Schroeder stated staff recommends approval subject to the following:

1. Remove all improvements, i.e., pavement, from the 7.5 ft. drainage easement along the west property line. Do not remove any trees from the easement area.
2. Install a landscaped buffer strip along the west property boundary to comply with Section 613 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. Preserve all trees within the Main Street right-of-way. Install additional landscaping and trees within the 5 ft. buffer strip along Main Street.
4. Install additional landscaping along the sides of the building and around the pool area.
5. Height of the proposed structure shall not exceed 30 ft.
6. Provide a minor plat adjusting the north property line.

Mr. Noel had questions regarding the Average Daily Travel for peak hours. Mr. Schroeder stated according to the Trip Generation Manual, the estimate for week day peak hours is 791 trips per day for a 60 unit motel. Mr. Reuter stated that the current daily average trips for Demere Road is 14,500. Mr. Noel stated he is concerned that this proposal will increase the volume of trips to over 15,000 per day.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request subject to the conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark. Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Robert Fell and Mr. Lee Noel.

GC-7-96

Request to rezone from R-6 One-Family Residential to Planned Commercial to permit a mini warehouse storage unit. Property known as Lots A,B,C,D,E,F and additional Area C-2 of Glynn Haven Estates, consisting of 32,670 sq.ft., having frontage of 179 ft. on the west side of Sylvan Drive and 123 ft. on the south side of Oak Street (an existing unopen right-of-way), St. Simons Island.

Property owned by Michael L. and Catherine L. Fitzgerald

Attorney Bob Cunningham was present for discussion. Mrs. Catherine Fitzgerald and Mr. Tony Thaw were also present.

Mrs. Taylor presented the staff's report. She stated that this request is to rezone 32,670 sq.ft., consisting of several lots within Glynn Haven Estates (currently one single-family residence), from residential to Planned Commercial. The property has frontage on Sylvan Drive and Oak Street (unopen right-of-way).

Mrs. Taylor stated that located to the south of the subject property is a tract of land zoned commercial, which has frontage and access on Frederica Road; however, it also has a 25 ft. access easement from the property to Sylvan Drive. Located to the east, across Sylvan Drive, are properties zoned General Commercial consisting of various businesses. The property located immediately to the east, previously owned by the Fitzgeralds, was rezoned from residential to commercial in 1991. At that time, it was stated in the staff's report that the remaining portion of the owner's property located to the west (subject property involved in the rezoning request at this time), should remain single-family and should serve as a buffer between the commercial and residential property. Glynn Haven was originally platted in 1929, but within recent years has become a fast growing residential area.

Mrs. Taylor explained that according to the County Engineer, if the property were rezoned to commercial, on site detention may be required due to the additional run-off that would be generated by a commercial development as opposed to the existing residential classification.

Mrs. Taylor further explained that in 1995, the applicant requested the rezoning of the subject property to General Commercial. Following review by the Planning Commission, the request was recommended for denial for the following reason: "Rezoning property on the west side of Sylvan Drive to commercial would be an encroachment into a pre-existing single-family residential area. Sylvan Drive should continue to serve as the boundary between the commercial and residential zoning districts." Thereupon, the application was withdrawn. She stated that the request submitted at this time is for Planned Commercial. The PC Zoning Text and Plan outlines the proposed use for 99 mini-warehouses. This type use is very limited as to which zoning districts are permitted in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. Mini-warehouses are only allowed in a Highway Commercial Zoning District as a conditional use if there is direct access to a major street or controlled access highway, or within Industrial Zoning Districts.

Mrs. Taylor stated staff does not feel that the intent of Planned Commercial is met with the proposed use of mini-warehouses. Section 717 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance states the following for Planned Commercial:

Be reserved for areas located within Glynn County in which commercial uses would normally not be allowed and that this classification be allowed only for small scale businesses delivering a variety of goods and services... In establishing this zoning classification, it is the legislative intent of the Commission that this classification be used only in those circumstances where the conditions attached to the use of property reduces, if not eliminates, objection to the commercial nature of the proposed use.

Mrs. Taylor pointed out that Planned Commercial also states: "**The site must have a minimum width between any two opposite boundary lines of one 100 lin. ft. and must adjoin or have direct access to at least one major public road as shown on the Official Zoning Map.**" This requirement cannot be met, and therefore the property would not be eligible for a Planned Commercial zoning. Staff feels the request at this time does not meet the intent or requirements for a Planned Commercial zoning.

Mrs. Taylor stated that in order to further evaluate this request, the following matters were considered in developing staff's recommendation:

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

No, Sylvan Drive is currently the boundary between the commercial and residential areas, and allowing commercial/industrial type use on the west side of Sylvan Drive would remove the district boundary and create an intrusion into the residential area. Further, the proposed use would not be compatible with the surrounding area or have the required road system to provide access.

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

Yes.

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

Yes, the property could be developed for single-family residential, the same as other lots that abut commercial. Access to the residential lots could be provided from Oak Street and could be buffered from Sylvan Drive by fencing, landscaping, etc.

4. 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;

Yes, additional traffic onto Sylvan Drive which is a minor street is already congested and is not a major street which is required for mini-warehouse use.

The ITE Trip Generation Manuel estimates the following number of daily trips: Weekday 28; Saturday 25; Sunday 18.

5. Whether the zoning proposal is in conformance with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan;

No, shown as low-density single-family.

6. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal;

The residential development of Glynn Haven should be protected from incompatible land use encroachments.

Mrs. Taylor stated staff feels that this request for a zoning change to Planned Commercial to allow mini-warehouses, does not meet the intent or requirements as outlined in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. Staff feels this tract can be developed as zoned for single-family residential, utilizing Oak Street. A buffer or privacy fence could be constructed adjacent to Sylvan Drive. In this manner, the residential development would not be impacted by the commercial area any greater than many other areas of Glynn Haven and St. Simons Island. Mrs. Taylor stated staff recommends denial of this request.

Attorney Bob Cunningham gave a brief presentation. He explained that no one has offered to use this property as residential, and therefore the owner is requesting a Planned Commercial zoning. He stated that the development would be low impact. There will be one electric gate, one sign and no office will be located on site. Mr. Cunningham stated that Sylvan Drive serves many commercial properties but it is not an affective buffer for this property. He stated this particular project is a very convenient way to facilitate the residential nature of St. Simons Island. Mr. Cunningham presented a map showing the surrounding commercial and residential property for the Planning Commission's review. He stated the owner is trying to get the best possible use of her property.

Mr. Lee Noel stated there are other places better suited for mini warehouses. Mr. Stewart stated he thinks this is a good transition. He stated he is not absolutely comfortable, but he thinks this is the best use of the property.

Mr. Robert Fell had questions concerning the exterior of the site. He asked if security lights are proposed for the area. Mr. Cunningham replied yes; however, there will not be any electricity between the units.

Mr. Noel stated he feels this is inappropriate activity for the area, and therefore he made a motion to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye for Denial: Mr. Robert Fell, Mr. Lee Noel and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Wayne Stewart. The motion did not carry due to a tie vote. The request will be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for further action.

At this time (12:15 p.m.) the Planning Commission took a one hour lunch break. The meeting resumed at 1:15 p.m.

GC-9-96

Request to rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential and R-12 One-Family Residential to Planned Development-General for mining and hauling activities and future use as residential, 41.43 acres lying immediately east of Cypress Mill Road (having frontage of 992 ft.), west of F-009/Spur 25, north of Old Benedict Road (right-of-way unopened) and south of properties now or formerly owned by Wiggins and Souter, known as a portion of Lots 191, 192, 193, 203 and 204 Brunswick Peninsula Tract "H"

Property owned by H.S. Wilson Construction Co., Inc.

Attorney Jim Gilbert was present for discussion. Also present were Mr. Charles Wilson, and Mr. Dave Smith, representing Hercules, Inc.

Mrs. Taylor presented the staff's report. She stated that This request is to rezone a 41 acre tract located between Old Cypress Mill Road and Spur 25. Staff reviewed the information and determined that the property has been utilized for a fill material/excavation operation since December, 1986 which is when the property was purchased by the applicant. The existing zoning does not allow this operation and it is unclear as to how the operation began or how it was permitted.

Mrs. Taylor stated that currently, the mining dirt is hauled off the property by trucks to various construction sites. Hercules Incorporation is in the process of trying to purchase the property at this time. However, after the purchase, the Wilson Company will continue to operate. When Wilson is complete, Hercules will bring stump dirt to the property to begin re-filling the pit created by Wilson. The Zoning Text states that Hercules intends to haul no more than an average 25 truckloads of dirt per day to the property and the operation could last a maximum of 15 years. Wilson would not be permitted to mine and haul from the property once the filling begins.

Mrs. Taylor pointed out that the applicant has excavated the tract to such an extent that no other use could be developed without all or some of the excavated area being re-filled. The Zoning Text states that when the mining operation is completed the property would be utilized for residential. Staff feels that due to the current zoning classification and future proposed use being residential, the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners may determine that a rezoning request will not be required. Any future use of the property would require some filling of the property. As the property cannot be used for residential in its existing state, the fill operation may possibly be permitted under the existing zoning designation. Staff feels issues related to the composition of the Hercules fill material can be more easily reviewed when considered separate from the zoning of the property. The need to fill any tract of land for future development is similar to numerous fill requirements on property in the county.

Mrs. Taylor stated that the Planning Commission may wish to require additional documentation to support that the particular fill material on this location is appropriate considering the existing and future residential character of the area, high pollution susceptibility of soils and possibility of contaminants occurring in groundwater. She stated although staff understands the proposed fill dirt from Hercules is pre-process dirt from stumps, the fact the stump dirt can arrive at Hercules from numerous possible sites in the southeast United States, and the fact that Glynn County will not monitor the dirt or fill operation raises some questions and concerns.

Mrs. Taylor stated staff feels the most essential question is whether the site will be appropriate for residential development after the fill operation is completed. If the site will not be appropriate for development after the Hercules fill has been deposited at the site, then staff would recommend denial of the request due to a large tract of property within the urban area having no future use or value. In staff's opinion, this possibility would be a detriment to the area and would possibly affect adjacent property values.

Mrs. Taylor stated that following documentation and presentation by Hercules, the Planning Commission may feel that the fill material from Hercules is not appropriate for the area. The property owner could obtain another source of fill material to utilize the property as a residential subdivision, possibly incorporating a large lake. She stated that another concern is whether the

current illegal excavation operation should terminate immediately if the application is denied, or should it be allowed to continue as a non-conforming use. Any further removal of fill from this site will render the tract without a future use or diminished value. Considering the close proximity to the urban area, services and infrastructure, a future use of this tract is desirable.

Mrs. Taylor stated that in order to further evaluate this request, the following matters were considered in developing staff's recommendation:

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Surrounding existing and future residential developments.

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

Possibly.

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

Yes.

4. 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 states there would be 25 truckloads a day. This could damage the minor roads in this area due to the weight of the trucks, etc.

5. Whether the zoning proposal is in conformance with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan;

No, shown as residential.

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

Need to retain a future use for the property.

Mrs. Taylor stated that with the information provided, staff recommends approval of the request to rezone to Planned Development. This recommendation is subject to the applicant providing current and future documentation from legal and objective sources to adequately give Glynn County confidence that the property will have a future use as residential as outlined in the Planned Development Zoning Text.

Mr. Smith, Hercules, Inc., gave a brief history of the Hercules site and the current use of dirt at the Habersham site. He also elaborated on the difference between usable dirt and fill dirt. He stated usable dirt is sandy soil and is excellent for construction.

Mr. Smith pointed out that they are willing to do whatever the Planning Commission deems necessary regarding the "hole in the ground" (as presented in photographs by staff). They also want to satisfy surrounding neighbors. He stressed that they do not wish to change the zoning.

Mr. Noel asked where does the mining dirt go. Mr. Smith replied that it goes to any location that needs filter, i.e., Sidney Lanier, etc.

There was a brief discussion regarding collecting soil samples. Mr. Smith stated that the county could come out at random and take soil samples, specify where they want the samples sent for testing, and Hercules would be responsible for sampling expenses.

Mrs. Touw asked if a state permit is needed to fill or put the soil back. Mr. Smith replied not to his knowledge.

Mr. Noel asked Mr. Wilson how long he intends to extract the dirt. Mr. Wilson stated possibly for 5 years.

Mr. Fell asked if Hercules would be willing to continue testing the soil. Mr. Smith stated they would continue to have the soil tested and they would self monitor the testing on a regular basis; however, he stated they would prefer to have someone else test the soil.

Mr. Ron Saball, 219 Souters Dairy Lane, stated the "hole in the ground" is too deep. He stated he is concerned about it causing drainage problems. He is also concerned about the quality of water because most residents in the area are served by wells and septic tanks. Mr. Saball further expressed concerns about the increased traffic from dump trucks coming in and out of the area. Mr. Smith stated he would appeal to Georgia DOT to allow Hercules to put in a temporary access in an effort to decrease traffic.

Ms. Ruby Souter wanted to know if the Habersham site had been monitored. Mr. Smith replied no.

Mr. Noel stated the following concerns need to be addressed before a decision is made.

1. Establish a credible protocol for testing soil;
2. The owner (Mr. Wilson) should establish a timetable for mining operation;
3. Significant tax consequences should considered;
4. An estimated time should be set to let residents know when land will be returned to usable state;
5. Utilize a road map as a guide;
6. Request Georgia DOT to allow a temporary access from F-009 Spur, or work with county staff to develop an access plan to minimize traffic within the residential area;

Mr. Stewart advised staff to address these concerns and report back to the Planning Commission for further discussion. Thereupon a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to defer this request pending development of these concerns. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

**Request for approval of additional
signage for "Just 4 Funn Toys"
206 Mallory Street, zoned General
Commercial-Core**

Mr. Tim Matthews, business owner, was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is requesting approval of an existing wall sign installed during the month of March. The wall sign reads, "Just 4 Funn Toys with the logo centered over the lettering. Mr. Schroeder stated that the sign measures 4'7" high and

7'4" wide for a total area of 33.5 sq. ft. The same color scheme (Blue, Yellow, Green and Red) is incorporated into the sign as the projecting sign located above the overhang.

Mr. Schroeder explained that the color scheme, location and layout is in conformance with the Village Preservation District; however, the sign exceeds 24 sq.ft. in area. Section 813.2 Wall Signs of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance limits all wall signs on St. Simons Island to a maximum of 24 sq. ft. He stated that the sign should be reduced by 9.5 sq. ft. in order to be in conformance with the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Matthews presented photographs and explained the sign calculations. He stated that he used the computer measurements from the sign company where the sign was made and calculated its total size at 20.9 sq.ft. He pointed out that the sign is in two unconnected pieces. The top part is a picture of a "jester" with the store name underneath in a semicircular form.

Mrs. Touw criticized Mr. Matthews for erecting the sign before bringing it to the Planning Commission, especially since he is a long time pier business owner and "knew better." She also stated that Mr. Matthews should have used the same methods as staff to calculate the size of the sign. Mrs. Jones also stated that Mr. Matthews "knew better" than to put up a large sign before coming to the Planning Commission. She stated on different occasions she has supported Mr. Matthews in his efforts; however, she is disappointed in this case because he knew that the sign was not in compliance. Mrs. Jones stated rules and regulations apply to everyone.

Following discussion, Mrs. Glenda Jones made a motion to have Mr. Matthews replace the sign with one that conforms to the 24 sq. ft. requirement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

**Request for signage for a proposed
bar to be known as "Rafters", located
at 315 Mallory Street, zoned General
Commercial-Core**

**Michael Gowen, Property Owner;
Jeff Irwin, Business Owner**

Mr. Steve Bristol was present to represent Mr. Jeff Irwin.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the proposed signage is in conformance with subsection 813.2 and 816.5 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance which limits maximum sign area to 24 sq.ft. and limits the cumulative sign area to no more than 10% of the building face for business on St. Simons Island. The proposed sign area of 23.5 sq. ft. and 1 sq. ft. adheres to both requirements. Lighting shall be limited to two low wattage shielded lights casting either up or down on the sign.

Mr. Schroeder explained that in addition to the proposal, staff is recommending that the windows be reopened. The windows should be in character with the existing windows located to the right of the establishment. Also, prior to erection of the wall sign, an alcohol/occupation tax permit must be issued for Rafters.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mr. Lee Noel, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Robert Fell.

Request for approval of additions to "Dairy Queen", front patio, entrance and storage area, located at 501 Mallory Street, zoned General Commercial

Property owned by Watson Holding Company

Mr. Jim Watson was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is requesting to add a 200 sq. ft. storage area to the rear (north side) of the building. The sole purpose of the additional storage is to store paper and dry goods for the restaurant. The addition represents an 8% increase in building area. The siding material and color will match the existing structure.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that the applicant also desires to install a 434 sq.ft. patio on the front of the building. The existing arched window will be converted into the main entrance, and the side entrance/exit on the drive-thru side of the building will be closed.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the additional storage will require the removal of a mature Crepe Myrtle and several shrubs. The front patio will result in the removal of three parking spaces which are currently located partially within the Magnolia Avenue right-of-way. He stated that the remaining parking spaces (26) and the provision for a bike rack provides sufficient parking for the establishment.

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends approval of the proposed Dairy Queen modifications subject to the following:

1. Preserve the Crepe Myrtle tree by shifting its location slightly to the east. Install additional ground cover in front of the drive-thru ordering sign.
2. Remove all pavement on the property around the proposed patio and install additional landscaping around the patio/seating area.
3. Install a bike rack in the vicinity of the wooden deck (picnic table area) to encourage the deck area to be used by patrons arriving by bike and to off-set the loss of three parking spaces.

Mr. Watson gave a brief presentation and pointed out the area where the proposed bike racks will be installed.

Mr. Stewart advised staff to confer with Mr. Richard about painting in the white lines in the parking area.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request subject to the following conditions:

1. Preserve existing Crepe Myrtle tree by shifting its location slightly to the east near the proposed storage expansion.
2. Install bike racks near the proposed front patio. The front three parking spaces shall be removed.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

**Request to modify existing freestanding sign
at "Parker Express", 501 Ocean Blvd.(northeast
corner of Mallory Street at Ocean Blvd.),
zoned General Commercial**

Mr. Patrick Parker, property owner, was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is proposing to remove the existing pole sign and replace it with a tabby ground sign. The existing Amoco sign with the torch would be removed and installed along with a price sign in a tabby ground sign. The total area for the new sign would be 39.3 sq.ft.(not including the supporting tabby area). The overall height of the sign is 5 ft. and the proposed setback is 3 ft. from each right-of-way.

Mr. Schroeder stated that although the proposed sign would be an aesthetic improvement over the existing sign, the proposal does not comply with the Village Preservation District, which restricts ground signs to the following dimension: maximum height 10 ft., minimum setback from right-of-way 10 ft., and maximum area 12 sq.ft. The only condition the proposed sign complies with is the height limitation of 10 ft.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that Section 816.1 of the ordinance states, "The Planning Commission is to encourage signs which are harmonious with existing signs and overall character of the Village area signage and architecture." He stated this proposal, although more in keeping with the Village area, still greatly exceeds the requirements outlined. Mr. Schroeder stated staff recommends that the pole sign be permitted to be converted to a ground sign with the following recommendations:

1. The total sign area shall not exceed the current sign area (approximately 22 sq.ft.);
2. The ground sign placed 3 ft. from the right-of-way shall incorporate a landscaped planting bed a minimum of 3 ft. out around the base of the sign; and
3. The sign shall be made of wood with tabby supports and shall be externally lit.

Mrs. Touw stated that previously, there had been a request similar to this and the Planning Commission did not approve the request because the sign did not conform to the ordinance. She stated until the ordinance changes, everyone should be treated equally. Mrs. Touw stated that an exception should not be granted in this case.

Mr. Lee Noel stated he feels that the proposed sign is too big to be 3 ft. off the road. He stated he would prefer to see a pole sign rather than a ground sign; however, Mr. Stewart disagreed. He stated in his opinion, a ground sign is fairly attractive and he would support the variance request. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Parker if he intends to advertise gas prices on the ground sign. Mr. Parker replied yes. He also explained that the oval shaped "Amoco" section of the sign is the smallest size made by the company. He stated he needs the additional square section for the prices in order for drivers to see the gas prices without pulling up to the pumps.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to deny this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lee Noel. Voting Aye for Denial: Mr. Robert Fell, Mr. Lee Noel and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Due to a tie vote, the motion did not carry. It was noted that the applicant may appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Request for approval of signage for
"St. Simons INFO", located at 206 Mallory
Street, zoned General Commercial - Core**

Mr. Abbas Vakili, property owner, was present for discussion.

Following a brief discussion and clarification regarding sign calculation, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the proposed sign subject to the stucco bandings above the store front being modified so that the sign (2'x 12') fits within the raised stucco bandings. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

**Request for approval of freestanding neon
sign reading OPEN GOLF for "The Links", located
at 1228 Ocean Blvd.(Neptune Park), zoned General
Commercial**

Business owned by Donnie Coffey & Jeff Jenkins

Mr. Donnie Coffey was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder explained that this is a two part report.

Part 1 - request for approval of a neon sign. Mr. Schroeder stated that the applicant is requesting the continuance of a freestanding neon sign reading, "OPEN GOLF". This sign is in addition to the previously erected sign which reads "The Links". Section 816.3 Freestanding Signs allows only one (1) freestanding sign per parcel of land. Also, Section 816.2 Signs-General Provisions, prohibits signs utilizing exposed lighting tubes or exposed neon lighting tubes. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that as a solution, staff recommends that the existing sign (The Links) be modified by painting the outlined letters so that the sign can be read from a greater distance. In addition, he stated that a small sign could be mounted above The Links sign reading, "OPEN". The total sign area of the freestanding sign shall not exceed 24 sq.ft. Mr. Schroeder stated staff recommends denial of the request for a neon sign.

Mr. Coffey stated he did not know that only one (1) sign is allowed in the ground. He stated he would remove the painted sign to comply with the ordinance; however, he stated he needs the neon sign for his business. Mr. Coffey stated that most of his business is during the summer months. He stated the neon sign is easier to see which lets people know that the business is open. He stated it is attractive and it works.

Mrs. Touw stressed that Mr. Coffey should not have erected the sign before coming to the Planning Commission, and the neon sign should be removed.

Mr. Stewart commented that perhaps we need to take another look at the Village Preservation District. Mr. Reuter explained that neon signs are restricted in other parts of the county and not just the village. He stated they are allowed in the face or storefront of a business but not as a freestanding sign. It was noted that the golf course is owned by the county.

Mr. Coffey stated he does not see any difference between his neon sign and one that is in a store window. He rhetorically asked, "Does an airplane look better on the ground or up in the air?" Mr. Coffey stressed that the miniature golf course is a family oriented activity. He stated to the Planning Commission that "you should be lucky to have me in the area." He further stated that he has cleaned up the neighborhood and has done everything good that he knows how to do.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request as is. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Noel stated "we should remember that we have an ordinance," and if something is not clear, staff can clarify and answer questions. He stated there are a lot of people who followed the ordinance and did not request something because it was not permitted.

Mr. Fell stated he has a hard time believing that people do not know about the sign ordinance. He agreed that Mr. Coffey has done a good job improving the golf course; however, the neon sign is in violation of the ordinance.

After discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for approval: Voting Aye: Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mr. Robert Fell, Mr. Lee Noel and Mrs. Iris Touw.

Part 2

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that at the March 5th Planning Commission meeting, the applicant, Mr. Coffey, requested an expansion to the existing caddy shack specifically to provide additional storage and maneuvering area. The Planning Commission's approval was for additional storage. Since that time, Mr. Schroeder stated he has received complaints that Mr. Coffey is utilizing the space for food sales, and therefore, the Planning Commission may wish to re-address concerns related to the validity of the previous application.

Mr. Coffey acknowledged that he is selling ice cream and "shaved Hawaiian ice" out of the window in the new structure. He stated that the county had approved the sale of the shaved ice product last year. He also stated that the building is being used for additional storage.

Mr. Stewart advised Mr. Reuter to confer with the County Attorney to determine if Mr. Coffey is in violation of the ordinance. Mr. Reuter concurred and stated he would also consult the County Administrator.

Request for approval to construct a Guest/Pool House, located at 330 Oak Street, zoned R-6 One-Family Residential

Mrs. Catherine Henderson, property owner, was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is proposing to construct an 800 sq.ft. guest/pool house (including an 8'x 20' covered deck) in the southeast corner of the property. The guest house will be elevated 8 ft. above grade to allow adequate space for two cars to park below the structure. Mr. Schroeder stated that the structure will have a maximum height of 22 ft. at the ridge height and 16 ft. at the eaves. The existing residence is approximately 20 ft. in height at the roof ridge and 10 ft. at the eaves. In order to be considered a guest house, no kitchen facilities are permitted.

Mr. Schroeder explained that the exterior of the structure will be made of hardi plank siding which will resemble as close as possible the existing lap siding on the existing home, and will be painted to match the color scheme (yellow with white trim) of the existing residence. All existing and proposed structure footprints (not including the pool) on the 10,500 sq.ft. covers approximately 29.37% of the lot. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that in comparison, the average lot coverage of adjoining lots is 26.8%. He stated that the height of the structure is in compliance with Section 709.5 General Provisions of the Village Preservation District; however, the deck off of the back porch will be overlooking their neighbor's yard.

Mr. Schroeder stated that in order to preserve privacy, ensure the use as only a guest cottage, and to comply fully with Section 709.5 regarding footprint coverage, staff recommends the following modifications to the proposal:

1. Reduce the overall square footage of the guest/pool house to 500 sq.ft. to bring the total footprint coverage into conformance with the average of the adjoining lots.
2. The deck should be oriented to the west side of the guest house towards the pool.

Photographs were presented for the Planning Commission's review.

Mr. Albert Henderson stated that the deck came with the Jim Walter Homes package; however, he would be willing to eliminate it.

Mrs. Touw asked Mr. Henderson if he intends to rent out the structure at any time. Mr. Henderson replied no. She then asked that "no renting allowed" be included in the motion. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to approve this request subject to the deck on the west side of the guest house being removed, and subject to no renting being allowed at any time. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

Request from Palmer Wireless, Inc. for an Exception to Height for a Tower Site, 160 ft. monopole tower to be located on Young Lane, zoned Limited Industrial.

The following was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

Palmer Wireless, Inc. ("Palmer") is currently authorized to provide domestic public common carrier cellular radio telecommunications services as licensed by the Federal Communications Commission for Market No. 382 GA12 Liberty RSA.

Market No. 382 GA12 Liberty RSA incorporates the City of Brunswick and Glynn County...Palmer would like to increase and improve its service to Brunswick by placing a cellular communications facility on property owned by Gerald Edwards located on Young Lane. Palmer has leased a portion of the parcel on Young Lane, approximately .0470 acres in size. The property would be used for the purpose of installing, constructing, maintaining, repairing, operating and inspecting a cellular communications facility. The facility will include a 160 ft. monopole tower...Palmer Wireless, Inc. appreciates the Planning Commission's consideration of the request for approval to exceed the 150 ft. tower height restriction to enable Palmer to construct the cellular facility in Brunswick.

Mr. Wayne Stewart stepped down as Vice Chairman at this time and offered a motion to approve this request as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jerome Clark and unanimously adopted.

GC-2-96 B

Consider amending Article V, Section 507. Use of Substandard Lots of Record, to provide for use of substandard lots of record, resubdivision and subsequent use of substandard lots of record and for other purposes.

A motion was made by Mr. Lee Noel to recommend approval of this amendment with the provision that previous resubdivided lots signed and recorded by the Planning & Zoning Office are grandfathered in as buildable lots. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted. This amendment will be reviewed by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners at their regular meeting on June 6, 1996.

SR-1-96

Consider amending Article VIII, Section 802. Resubdivision of Land, to provide for a procedure for resubdividing lots previously subdivided in recorded plats, and for other purposes.

A motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted. This amendment will be reviewed by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners at their regular meeting on June 6, 1996.

Review Planned Commercial Master Plan/Site Plan for The Whitefield School, property consists of 31,955 sq. ft. and is located at 2015 Frederica Road, St. Simons Island.

The following information was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review:

An amendment was recently approved by the Board of Commissioners to incorporate an additional area into the site for the Whitefield School. Staff has reviewed the proposed parking and feel that the two additional spaces can be accommodated as designed (2 spaces at 8.5 ft. x 18 ft.), parked parallel adjacent to the southern lot line.

The Zoning Ordinance requirements for submission of a request to Planned Commercial includes a site plan for review with the zoning text. The Zoning Ordinance does not specify a separate Site Plan Review requirement as for multi-family or Planned Development. Site plan review would be required separately if additional conditions are placed on the zoning request by the Board of Commissioners which are not depicted, or unless a change to the site is proposed by the applicant. These additions or changes would be resubmitted to the Planning Commission. Therefore, in the future when a Planned Commercial rezoning request is reviewed, it should also be considered approval of the site plan which is incorporated. Staff will perform an additional review of the site during the Building Permit review process.

Following discussion, Mr. Reuter explained that this information is being presented for review only. No action is required at this time.

MINUTES

Upon a motion made by Mr. Lee Noel and seconded by Mr. Robert Fell, the Minutes of the April 2, 1996 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

COMMISSION ITEMS

Mr. Lee Noel asked that staff provide an inventory of variances permitted for commercial zoning, and also provide a list of AADT's of major thoroughfares in Glynn County.

Mr. Schroeder presented for the Planning Commission's review, an overview of developments approved by Glynn County through a public hearing process over the past two years.

Also under Commission Items, Mr. Fell stated he is still concerned that citizens are coming to the Planning Commission and requesting approvals after the fact, i.e. painting and erecting signs, etc. He asked staff to send a letter to current owners in the Village advising them of the ordinance. Mr. Schroeder stated that in 4 weeks, he and others are planning to take a walking tour through the Village area to re-evaluate the Village Preservation District Ordinance. Mr. Fell stressed that we should abide by the ordinance. Mr. Stewart stated that he is in support of re-evaluating the ordinance; however, he urged the members and staff to use caution in the process. He stated "if we cause too much restrictions, we will lose the entire ordinance."

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.