

**M I N U T E S**

GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 10, 1996 1:00 P.M.

-----

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerome Clark, Vice-Chairman  
Lamar Cole  
Robert Fell  
Glenda Jones  
Iris Touw

ABSENT: Wayne Stewart

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

-----

Mr. Clark explained that due to a mandatory principal's meeting today at 9:00 a.m., the Planning Commission meeting was changed to 1:00 p.m. He apologized for the inconvenience and thanked everyone for attending.

-----

**Preliminary Plat  
Murray Field Subdivision  
15.32 acres, Zoned R-6 One-Family  
Residential, 71 residential lots**

**Murray Seckinger, Inc., Owner/Developer**

Mr. Ralph Lackey was present for discussion.

Mr. Mark Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the developer is proposing to construct a 71 lot subdivision, accessed by Hornet Drive and Culligan Drive. All lots comply with the minimum area and width standards for an R-6 zoning district.

Mr. Schroeder explained that the creation of a connector street between Hornet Drive and Culligan Drive is a requirement of Section 602.2a) and Section 602.2g) of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Section 602.2 a) reads, "Continuance of existing street pattern. The arrangement of streets in a subdivision should provide for the alignment with, or the continuance of, or the appropriate projection of existing major streets in surrounding areas as shown on the Glynn County road classification map." Mr. Schroeder stated that the proposed layout has been modified to connect Hornet and Culligan Drive through the subdivision.

Section 602.2 g) reads, "Major Thoroughfare Plan. Whenever a major thoroughfare plan of the community shows proposed arterial streets and collector streets within a proposed subdivision, the subdividers shall design the street system within such subdivision to conform with the location and arrangement of such arterial and collector streets". Mr. Schroeder pointed out that continuance of the Altama Connector through to US 17 is in the Tier 1 Transportation Improvement Plan. The proposal, as designed, will run through the southern portion of the development. In lieu of the county purchasing the necessary rights-of-way and the developer constructing a section of the connector road, the developer has agreed to "Reserve" lots 56 through 71 pending construction of the connector road. Construction of the connector road is dependent upon the availability of funding.

Mr. Schroeder stated that in order to limit the impact of a connector road to the residential area, additional measures referenced in Section 602.2 e) should be considered. Section 602.2 e) reads, "Subdivisions on Arterial Streets. Where a subdivision abuts or contains an existing or proposed arterial street, the Planning Commission may require marginal access streets, reverse frontage with screen planting contained in a non-access reservation along the rear property lines, deep lots with rear service lanes, or such other treatment as may be necessary for adequate protection of residential properties and to afford separation of through and local traffic." If the connector road is constructed, the connector road shown on the preliminary plat would be a frontage road.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the developer has received a Nationwide Permit to fill approximately 4.3 acres of wetlands on the tract. Many of these wetlands have already been modified due to the existence of a large drainage system to the west and north of the site. He further explained that the subdivision at buildout will generate approximately 550 trips per day. The trip generation per dwelling unit was adjusted for development density and household size to create an average rate of 7.75 trips per dwelling unit (Average Rate of 9.55 adjusted by -1.8 for average household size of 2-3 persons). (Reference Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 5th Edition p. 255-257)

Mr. Schroeder stated that the extension of Brunswick Water and Sewer into this development is being considered by the Board of Commissioners at their September 5, 1996 meeting. He stated staff recommends approval of this preliminary plat subject to the following:

**Building Inspections:**

1. Obtain a Sedimentation and Erosion Control Permit.

**Planning & Zoning:**

1. Revise signature block on the Preliminary Plat as per Section 703.1 n).
2. Place the following statement on the final plat, "Lots 56-71 depicted hereon are "Reserved" through September 1, 2002 pending acquisition of necessary rights-of-way by Glynn County to construct an arterial (connector) road from Altama Avenue to U.S. 17." The final plat shall clearly reference the above statement graphically where the future road may be located.

**Engineering:**

1. Subject to review and approval of drainage plan and calculations
2. Provide location of proposed benchmarks.

Mr. Robert Fell wanted to know if the streets within the subdivision would be paved. Mr. Reuter replied yes, and dedicated to the county. Mr. Fell also asked if the city approved the water and sewer for the development. Mr. Reuter replied yes.

Mrs. Iris Touw stated her main concern is the road. She stated staff noted that the road going through the subdivision is a Tier 1 Project, but to her knowledge this has not been discussed by the Citizens Advisory Committee. She stated she is not against the subdivision; however, she will abstain from voting because she doesn't want to vote for the road going through the subdivision. Mr. Reuter pointed out that the road is a future proposal and would have to be approved by the Policy Committee and the Board of Commissioners. He explained that today's action would involve the subdivision only, and would not include the road.

Mrs. Glenda Jones wanted to know that if this subdivision is approved, would the approval exclude Lots 56 thru 71. Mr. Reuter explained that the developers will ask that they be given a reduction on the taxes and keep Lots 56 thru 71 reserved until the year 2002 in case there is ever a road planned through the subdivision. He stated that when the developers come in for final plat review at that time, there may be some discussion to leave those lots as a next phase and not proceed with a final plat.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Robert Fell to approve this request subject to staff's recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones. Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Robert Fell and Mrs. Glenda Jones. Abstained From Voting: Mrs. Iris Touw.

-----

**Preliminary Plat  
Jillwood Subdivision  
5.598 acres, zoned Forest Agricultural  
9 residential lots with individual  
wells, septic tanks and unpaved road.**

**Lanett Johns, Owner/Developer**

Ms. Lanett Johns was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the proposed development includes 9 residential lots and is currently zoned Forest Agricultural which requires a minimum lot area of 20,000 sq.ft. All lots exceed the minimum requirements.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the property fronts on Old Post Road which is a county maintained paved road. Access to the proposed lots will be provided by Jillwood Court. Jillwood Court is proposed as an unpaved road to be dedicated to Glynn County.

The following departments have approved Jillwood Subdivision: Community Development (Building Inspection and Planning/Zoning Division, minor comments), Fire Department, Health Department, and Public Works (Traffic Safety Eng.)

Mr. Schroeder stated that staff recommends approval of this preliminary plat subject to the following:

**Planning & Zoning:**

1. Recommend the unpaved road (Jillwood Court) remains private.
2. Access to lots 1 and 9 shall be limited to Jillwood Court.

**Engineering:**

1. Proposed ditch elevations every 100 ft. shall be shown on the plans.

**Water and Sewer Department:**

1. No public water or sewer is available to the area.

Mr. Fell stated he agrees that the county should not accept a dedicated dirt road. He stated if a developer wants the county to take over the road, it should be paved first.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this preliminary plat subject to the conditions stated by staff and subject to the road remaining unpaved and private. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Site Plan  
Cottages at Brockinton  
Request for a 6 month  
extension on approved  
site plan**

**Thomas L. Williams, Owner**

Mr. Bill Lorenz-Hooker, agent, was present for discussion.

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is requesting a 6 month extension for a multi-family site plan which was approved by the Planning Commission on September 12, 1995. The extension will make the site plan valid through March 12, 1997.

According to Section 619.6 of the ordinance, "no site plan approval by the Planning Commission shall be valid for a period longer than 12 months unless within such period a building permit is obtained and construction commenced. The Planning Commission may grant extensions not exceeding 12 months each upon written request of the original applicant if the application is substantially the same as the initial application. However, the Planning Commission has the power in such cases to attach conditions to its re-approval. Where the application for re-approval contains changes which the Planning Commission concludes materially alter the initial application, a new site plan review procedure shall be initiated."

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that there has been no substantial changes from the approved site plan for Cottages at Brockinton, and therefore, staff recommends approval of the request for a 6 month extension.

Mrs. Touw stated there is a lot of talk about the sidewalk encroachment. She wanted to know what the setback is in relation to the sidewalk presently located on the property. Mr. Lorenz-Hooker explained that the sidewalk encroaches approximately 6 inches and overlaps slightly in some places. The northern side of the sidewalk is the property line within 2 ft. The setback is 30 ft. from the property line (or sidewalk). Mrs. Touw had further questions regarding the type screening proposed. Mr. Lorenz-Hooker stated that an assortment of shrubberies will be installed. He stated there are no plans for a fence. The shrubberies will serve as a barrier. He pointed out that any plantings disturbed during construction will be replaced. Mrs. Touw suggested that staff and the landscape architect work together to develop as much screening as possible.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve the 6 month extension subject to the landscaping plans being reviewed by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Site Plan  
Barnes Plantation  
Request for a 6 month  
extension on approved  
site plan**

**Dial Properties, Owner  
Rick North, Agent**

Mr. Schroeder presented the staff's report. He stated that the applicant is requesting a 6 month extension for the multi-family site plan which was approved by the Planning Commission on September 12, 1995 and then by the Board of Commissioners on September 18, 1995. The extension will make the site plan valid through March 12, 1997.

According to Section 619.6 of the ordinance, "no site plan approval by the Planning Commission shall be valid for a period longer than 12 months, unless within such period a building permit is obtained and construction commenced. The Planning Commission may grant extensions not exceeding 12 months each upon written request of the original applicant if the application is substantially the same as the initial application. However, the Planning Commission has the power in such cases to attach conditions to its re-approval. Where the application for re-approval contains changes which the Planning Commission concludes materially alter the initial application, a new site plan review procedure shall be initiated."

Mr. Schroeder stated that the changes to the site plan has been limited to the proximity of the apartment units to adjacent residential property. He stated staff recommends approval of the 6 month extension for Barnes Plantation subject to all conditions placed on the development by the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners. Mr. Schroeder further stated that staff recommends that prior to any construction, including clearing, a

final report shall be presented to the Planning Commission addressing all conditions of approval, drainage, water and sewer, and site layout.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the 6 month extension with further recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Discussion continued. Mrs. Touw pointed out that there was a dotted line on the original plan that showed a 30 ft. buffer plus the 10 ft. setback. Mr. Reuter stated he thinks what Mrs. Touw is referring to is the line that shows the width of the buildings.

After discussion, the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Robert Fell and Mrs. Glenda Jones. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw.

Mrs. Touw commented that she is still concerned about the final decision being made on the pump station.

-----

**GC-24-96**

**Request to amend the GC-24-88 Planned Development Zoning Text (South Port) to allow signs at a height of 50 ft. instead of 35 ft. 1.25 acres known as Block 1, Lot 27 and a portion of Lot 26 of South Port Subdivision, said lot (proposed sign of Super 8 Hotel) is located on the southeast corner of Palisade Drive and South Port Parkway.**

**Property owned by Natu and Niru Patel.**

Mr. Duane Larson was present for discussion.

Mr. Reuter presented the staff's report. He stated that this request is to amend the Planned Development Zoning Text for South Port Subdivision, involving Lot 27 and a portion of Lot 26 in Block 1. The property owner is currently constructing a Super 8 Hotel and has already received site plan approval. However, during site plan approval, the proposed location was addressed but the height of sign was not addressed.

Mr. Reuter explained that this Planned Development states that the requirements to be met are those outlined in Highway Commercial of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. This would only allow a sign to be at a maximum height of 35 ft. The property owner wishes to have the sign at a maximum height of 50 ft. Based on the plan submitted, the sign would not obstruct visibility in either direction and at a maximum height of 50 ft. would still be lower than other signage in the area.

Mr. Reuter stated that the subject property is located within close proximity to property zoned Freeway Commercial, which allows signage at a maximum height of 140 ft. He stated staff recommends approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend approval of this request. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Robert Fell pointed out that a letter was written to the Variance Board asking that there be a moratorium on sign height variances until the new sign ordinance is received. Mr. Reuter stated that applied particularly to billboards. He stated the

change in this Planned Development Text will only affect the Super 8 Hotel. The motion was then seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Jerome Clark, Mr. Lamar Cole and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Robert Fell and Mrs. Glenda Jones.

-----

**GC-25-96**

**Request to rezone two parcels of land, beginning 801.60 ft. south of the intersection of Jetport Road and US Highway 17 in the Needwood Community ,as follows: Parcel 1)Rezone from Local Commercial to Forest Agricultural, 23,854 sq.ft.fronting 171.54 ft. on the east side of US Highway 17; Parcel 2)Rezone from Local Commercial and Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial, 1.4 acres (LC 53,116 sq.ft. & FA 7,887 sq.ft.) fronting approximately 153 ft. on the east side of US Highway 17 and lying immediately south of Parcel 1.**

Arthur and Kimberly Marsh, property owners, were present for discussion.

Mr. Reuter presented the staff's report. He stated that this request is to rezone two parcels of land located on the east side of U.S. Highway 17 North, zoned Local Commercial. The owners are operating a personal care home on the property known as Marsh Plantation. Currently, there is a one story single-family residence with 5 occupants. The owner would like to expand the personal care home to accommodate 11 occupants which would require the property to be rezoned and renovations/additions to be made to the existing structure.

Mr. Reuter stated that this request is to rezone Parcel 2, consisting of 1.4 acres, to Highway Commercial to permit the expansion of the personal care home. Highway Commercial zoning would permit the facility, provided the following are met: 1) conformance with the requirements of the Georgia State Board of Health; 2)plans for such facility should receive written approval from the Glynn County Board of Health and the County Fire Chief prior to the issuance of any permits for construction and operation; and 3) must have a minimum lot area of 1 acre (the area consists of 1.4 acres). Mr. Reuter stated that Parcel 1 is being requested for a rezoning in order to allow the location of a mobile home for the property owners of the facility to live. The back portion of the owner's property will remain zoned Forest Agricultural consisting of a pond and recreation/open area. The section of Highway 17 between Jetport Road and Marshes of Mackay Subdivision is zoned Forest Agricultural with the exception of four parcels of land. The four parcels were rezoned to commercial in 1979 and 1980, including the subject property.

Mr. Reuter 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;

Allowing the expansion of an existing use (Personal Care Home) which is a needed facility within the community.

Mr. Reuter stated staff recommends approval of this request.

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

-----

**GC-26-96**

**Request to amend the Planned Commercial GC-7-96, proposed development of mini-warehouses, to eliminate required setbacks on the south and west property lines; subject property consists of .69 acres located on the west side of Sylvan Drive and south side of Oak Street (an existing unopen right-of-way), known as Lots A,B,C,D,E,F, Block 11 Glynn Haven Estates.**

**Property owned by Catherine S. Fitzgerald**

Attorney Robert M. Cunningham, agent, was present for discussion.

Mr. Reuter presented the staff's report. He stated that this request is to amend a Planned Commercial zoning that was approved on June 20, 1996. At that time, it was noted that the subject property consisted of .75 acres. However, since then a new survey has been obtained by the owner and it has been determined that the subject property only consists of .69 acres.

Section 717. Planned Commercial, states the following:  
Front, side and rear yard requirements -

1. All buildings and structures shall be setback a minimum of 25 ft. from front property lines and all side property lines abutting street or road right-of-way;



2. Side yard setback may be reduced to 10 ft. unless side of lot abuts a residential district, in which case all structures shall be setback a minimum of 50 ft. of which 10 ft. abutting the residential property line shall be maintained as a landscaped buffer area as shown on the site plan;
3. Rear yard setback shall be a minimum of 10 ft. except where rear lot line abuts a residential district, in which case all structures shall be setback a minimum of 50 ft. of which 10 ft. abutting the residential property line shall be maintained as a landscaped buffer area as shown on the site plan;

Buffer Area Abutting Residential Properties: Where a Planned Commercial parcel abuts a lot zoned for residential, then at the time of development of the parcel, a landscaped buffer shall be provided along rear or side to lines, said buffer to be at least 10 ft. wide and established along the entire length of and contiguous to lot lines.

Mr. Reuter pointed out that the application and site plan submitted at this time is a request to amend the Planned Commercial to delete the required setbacks along the south and west property lines. He stated that the west property line lies adjacent to Lot 65 in Glynn Haven Estates, which is zoned R-6 One-Family Residential and currently consists of a lake. This lot is owned by the current property owner and is not proposed to be purchased by the new property owner/developer. The property line to the south lies adjacent to residentially zoned property with a 38 ft. drainage ditch.

Mr. Reuter stated that allowing the proposed amendment to the Planned Commercial would create a zoning classification that would not meet the district requirements. Staff feels the proposed owner/developer should either reduce the number of units or redesign the mini-ware house development to meet the setback requirements as stated in Section 717 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Reuter stated staff recommends that this request be denied.

Attorney Robert Cunningham presented the survey with corrections. He also presented a map of the area already approved for Planned Commercial. Mr. Cunningham stated that the 38 ft. drainage ditch is not being used for drainage. He also stated that the owner would like for Lot 65 to be included in the Planned Commercial zoning as part of the setback.

Mr. Reuter pointed out that Lot 65 was not legally advertised as part of this request. He then suggested a deferral. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to defer this item in order to allow Lot 65 to be legally advertised as part of the application. Attorney Cunningham concurred.

-----

**GC-2-96C**

**Consider amending Article VI, General Provisions, Section 617 Exceptions to Height Limits, of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, to place additional requirements on location of cellular and other transmission towers.**

A motion was made by Mr. Robert Fell to defer this item until Chairman Stewart is present for discussion. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-96D**

**Consider amending Article X, Appeals - How Taken, Section 1009 Appeals from Decisions of Board of Appeals, of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, to allow appeals from the Board of Zoning Appeals to the Board of Commissioners.**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. The following was then addressed: (words underlined have been added and words with lines drawn through have been deleted)

**Section 1009. Appeals from Decisions of Board of Appeals**

Any person or persons severally or jointly aggrieved by any decision of the Board of Appeals, may take an appeal to the Glynn County Board of Commissioners, Superior Court. Following the decision of the Glynn County Board of Commissioners a decision may be appealed to the Superior Court...

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to defer this amendment for the County Attorney's review and written explanation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-96E**

**Consider amending Article VI, General Provisions, Section 608 Home Occupations, of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, to allow members of the immediate family not residing on the premises to participate with a member of the family living on the premises in operating a home occupation business.**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. The following was then addressed: (words underlined have been added and words with lines drawn through have been deleted)

**608.1 Operational Conditions:** A home occupation, as defined in Article III, Section 302, shall be permitted in any residential district provided that such occupation:

- a) Is conducted by ~~no other person than~~ only by members of the family residing on the premises and their children not residing on the premises;

Mr. Reuter stated that the County Attorney has submitted an additional amendment as follows:

- i) As used in this section, the term family and member of the family residing on the premises includes any living person who is a brother, sister, mother, father, husband, wife or child of any family member residing on the premises; and
- j) Any home occupation operated in conformity with this ordinance for a period of 10 years or more may be continued so long as the operator owns the residence and operates the business continuously without regard to the actual residence of the operator.

Mrs. Iris Touw stated "it looks like this amendment was written for the specific need of someone in the community." She stated it seems that every time someone gets a citation, we change the ordinance. Mrs. Touw stated that the ordinance needs to be enforced; not changed.

Mr. Robert Fell stated he is totally against any commercial activity in a residential area.

Mrs. Virginia Sunderhaus of 114 Northwood Drive stated that approximately 6 months ago, her neighbor, Sara Brown closed in her garage and opened up a business, more specifically, a beauty salon. She stated that traffic is intolerable and she has lost her privacy. Mrs. Sunderhaus stated that Mrs. Brown has turned their neighborhood into a commercial business and has made the area unsafe for elderly and retired people. She stated that they can't walk their dogs, or ride their bicycles because the street has become a commercial parking lot.

It was pointed out that Mrs. Brown's daughter works at the salon but does not live on the premises (which is in violation of the ordinance). Mrs. Sunderhaus stated that Mrs. Brown is also selling cosmetic products and vending items which are brought in by big delivery trucks. She stated the trucks are a part of the traffic problem. She further stated that in her opinion, a home occupation should be available for those who are disabled or homebound, and should not be for people who are able to go out and rent a place to put their business. Mrs. Sunderhaus presented photos showing the salon, a gravel driveway installed by the owner, and parked cars.

According to the ordinance, the home occupation - d) produces no alteration or change in the character or exterior appearance of the principal building from that of a dwelling; e) involves no sale or offering for sale of any article not produced or assembled by members of the family, or any service not entirely performed by members of the family residing on the premises; f) creates no disturbing or offensive noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odor, heat, glare, traffic hazard, unhealthy or unsightly condition.

Mr. Reuter stated that the Enforcement Constable has been monitoring the area and it is likely that citations will be issued soon. He explained that home occupations were intended more for an office type business or something that does not disturb the neighborhood.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones recommending that the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance for Home Occupations be left as is and that the present ordinance be enforced. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

-----

## **MINUTES**

Mrs. Touw pointed out that at the August 6th meeting during discussion of the Golden Isles Marina, her statement "if the Planning Commission has a dispute or a disagreement with staff, it should be noted as technical and not emotional," was not just directed at Mrs. Jones as appears in the Minutes. She stated the

Minutes should reflect more of the comments made by Chairman Stewart. Mrs. Loving will review the tapes and make the necessary corrections, and any other corrections noted.

Following review, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the Minutes of the August 6, 1996 Planning Commission meeting with corrections/additions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Fell and unanimously adopted.

-----

#### **STAFF ITEMS**

**a) Discuss construction plans for Bluewater Grill located in General Commercial-Core St. Simons Village Preservation District**

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that several months ago, the owner, Mr. Charles (Ace) Harris, received approval to enclose the existing deck area on the back side of the Bluewater Grill. However, since that time Mr. Harris has changed the design of the roof line, received a building permit and began construction. According to the Village Preservation District, building changes must be approved by the Planning Commission.

Following discussion, Vice Chairman Clark advised staff to draft a letter (with suggestions) for the Planning Commission members to sign, notifying Mr. Harris that the changes are not what the Planning Commission approved. An in-house discussion with Mr. Harris will be scheduled.

-----

**b) Accessory Apartments in Single-Family Residential Areas**

Mr. Reuter distributed copies of "Performance Based Standards (PBS) Uses" for the Planning Commission's review and consideration. He explained that accessory apartments can be built onto existing structures with the original intent being a caretaker's residence.

Mr. Bill Lorenz-Hooker commented that accessory apartments represent a good use of land because aged or infirm parents can be cared for at home. He stated perhaps this could be allowed through a special use permit so that neighbors are aware of it and can voice their opinion.

The main concern expressed by the Planning Commission was that such structures could end up being rental property for commercial usage.

Mrs. Touw was concerned that this proposal may be a result of someone violating the ordinance. She reiterated that it seems when a citation is issued, we propose changes to the ordinance to make the complaint legal. She stressed that the ordinance should be enforced and not changed. Mr. Reuter explained that this is being proposed for discussion only, and not because of any particular issue.

-----

**c) Review Report on Restructuring  
The Planning Commission**

A summary of the public hearings was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review; however, discussion was deferred due to the Chairman's absence. A list of comments and suggestions from Ms. Nancy Thomason was also issued for their review.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.