

MINUTES

GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 5, 1998 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Altman, Vice Chairman
Lamar Cole
Hal Hart
Jeff Shell
Iris Touw
Jonathan Williams

ABSENT: Glenda Jones

STAFF PRESENT: Lee Gilmour, County Administrator
Charles Taylor, Community Dev. Director
Keith Taylor, Assistant County Attorney
Ron Milburn, Planning Official
Dick Newbern, Planner
Deborah Taylor, Zoning Administrator
Jim Bruner, County Engineer
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Janet Loving, Administrative Secretary

Vice Chairman Richard Altman called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

At this time, Mr. Lee Gilmour introduced the new Community Development Director, Mr. Charles "Chuck" Taylor from the Metro-Atlanta area. Mr. Taylor thanked the Planning Commission and staff for the opportunity to serve in the Golden Isles and pledged to work hard at keeping the area as beautiful as it is. On behalf of the Planning Commission, Vice Chairman Richard Altman acknowledged and welcomed Mr. Taylor as part of the planning staff.

Site Plan
Pittman Apartments
Three Triplexes, Zoned General
Residential, located off Walker
Road on Pittman Circle

Tharion Pittman, Owner

Mr. Pittman was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to develop an extension to his duplex developments along Pittman Circle. Specifically, he

is proposing to develop three triplexes, or nine apartments, to be located on the western end of Pittman Circle near the Altamaha Canal. The triplexes would be located on a 1.17 acre site that was recently rezoned by the Board of Commissioners to General Residential. There is a 30 ft. utility easement on site where a portion of the 18 ft. asphalt road has already been installed. Though the road is an encroachment on the easement, it has been determined that the road will not interfere with the function of the easement.

This project was deferred from the March 3, 1998 Planning Commission meeting because the project had not receive Board of Health septic system approval or County Engineering approval for the paved road and the proposed drainage. These approvals have since been secured. Also, a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit application had not been prepared or filed at that time; however, it is now on file and a permit has been approved by the local NRCS office.

The three proposed triplexes are to be served by septic tanks, or two for each triplex. The private water system now serving the existing duplexes along Pittman Circle will be extended to serve the three triplexes.

This Site Plan meets or exceeds the General Residential Zoning District requirements (Section 706) for the following items: parking, setbacks, height, access and buffers.

The Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Engineering, Fire Department and the Board of Health recommend approval of this project.

Mr. Newbern stated that previous conditions have been met, and staff recommends approval of this site plan with no conditions.

Mr. Bob Gilleski of 132 Bel Air Circle expressed concerns about drainage and sedimentation. He stated that two septic tanks for two families might be putting a strain on the area. He further stated that there is no sedimentation control. Mr. Gilleski asked if triplexes are allowed in the General Residential District. Mr. Newbern replied yes, multi-family is allowed.

Mr. Jim Bruner pointed out that the area is swaled so that no water goes into the canal. He stated that there is no discharge or sedimentation into the Altamaha Canal.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request subject to Mr. Pittman recognizing that the road is built on a county easement. It was noted that Mr. Pittman acknowledges that fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Messrs. Richard Altman, Lamar Cole, Hal Hart, Jeff Shell and Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw.

Site Plan

St. Simons Condos

**32 Condominiums on a 3.39 acre tract
known as Tract D per Planned Development
Zoning Text and Master Plan, located north
of Frederica Road, west of Longview Road
in Dunbar Center, Zoned Planned Development
General (General Residential Standards)**

John Jones, Owner/Developer

Mr. Jones was present for discussion.

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

This request is for a 32 unit condominium complex proposed on a 3.4 acre tract in the Dunbar Center PD. According to the PD document, this tract is to be developed in accordance with the General Residential (GR) standards.

This condo development will be accessed by a 230 ft. long, 40 ft. wide private access easement that runs northerly from Longview Road. The easement is authorized as an access in the Planned Development document. The 230 ft. long access road will be paved in accordance with Section 602.4 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, Design Standards for Paved Streets. The road will be curbed, guttered and paved to meet the requirements of a minor street (per Section 602.4b).

If the site plan is approved, the condominiums will be developed as 16 individual units, with 2 condos per unit, for a total of 32 units. They will be located in four clusters: One four-unit cluster will be located near the entrance on the western side of the site; one four-unit cluster will be located on the south side of the property nearest to Longview Road; one ten-unit cluster will be located on the north side of the property overlooking the marsh; and one twelve-unit cluster will be located next to the ten-unit cluster on the north side of the property, also overlooking the marsh.

The proposed site plan meets the GR zoning district density requirement [per Sec.706.4 (1)] of no more than 10 units per acre. This development proposes 32 units on 3.39 acres, or 9.4 units per acre. A total of 65 parking spaces are shown on the plan, which meets the requirements of Section 611.6a of the Ordinance (2 spaces per condo unit). The Site Coverage requirement of 50% has also been met. The total site coverage, including condos, pavement and parking is 41%.

A 10 ft. setback around the property, as set forth in the PD text, is shown on the site plan. Wetlands documentation authorizing the fill of wetlands on site has been submitted.

The site plan has been favorably reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Engineering, Water & Sewer and the Fire Department.

Traffic will impact Riverview Drive and Frederica Road. According to the Trip Generation publication, the average daily traffic generated by the 32-unit development is 134 additional vehicle trips per day (50% ingress and 50% egress).

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this site plan with no conditions.

Mrs. Touw had questions concerning Item VII of the original zoning text, Public Parks and Open Space, in relation to this development. Mr. Newbern explained that there are commercial tracts being developed; however, this particular tract (Tract B) is for residential. This area of land does not influence Tract B, which is the only tract that he can address at this time.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Discussion continued.

Mrs. Touw expressed concerns about drainage. She wanted to know if the permit required any type of filtering from the drainage before it runs through the ditch and into the marsh. Mr. Bruner replied no, not to his knowledge.

After discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion for approval: Voting Aye: Messrs. Richard Altman, Lamar Cole, Hal Hart, Jeff Shell and Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting (due to her concerns about drainage): Mrs. Iris Touw.

**Site Plan
Morningside of Brunswick
Request for a 12-month extension
on Site Plan approved by the
Planning Commission on May 6, 1997
Located at 823 Scranton Road**

Life Trust American, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mrs. Deborah Taylor explained that a representative was not required to attend.

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

On May 6, 1997 the Planning Commission approved the site plan for Morningside of Brunswick with conditions. There are no changes to the site plan.

This request is being processed in accordance with Section 619.6 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, which states:

Period of Validity. 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 application 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. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Shell to approve this request for a 12-month extension. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

**Minor Plat
Revision/Royal Oaks Subdivision, Phase I
Lot 1, Request to revise rear setback
requirements, Zoned R-20 One-Family
Residential**

Dr. Ralph Ellis, Property Owner

Dr. Ellis was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to reduce the required rear setback from 100 ft., which was originally platted for Royal Oaks Phase I, to a 50 ft. rear setback. The purpose of this reduction is to provide enough space to install a swimming pool and pool deck in the back yard.

The 100 ft. setback was stated on the final plat for the riverside lots in Royal Oaks, Phase I when the plat was approved in March, 1994. Therefore, any change in the rear setback constitutes a technical change in the subdivision, thus warranting an 802.3 application. All other lots in the subdivision not abutting the river have a rear setback of 15 ft.

Approval of this request would allow the applicant to reduce the setback to 50 ft. and proceed with the next step of his pool installation project.

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this setback change.

Mr. Altman wanted to know the reason for the 100 ft. setback. Mrs. Deborah Taylor stated that during review of this request, staff found no documentation concerning the River Corridors Act. Therefore, staff concluded that the purpose was for a visual of the river. Mr. Altman stated that there are other homes in that row that have adhered to the setback requirements.

Dr. Ellis stated that he just wanted a permit to build a pool. He pointed out that he did not understand why there was a 100 ft. setback on the property, and the other lots only had a 15 ft. setback. Mr. Hart asked if this would impact the marsh. Mrs. Taylor replied no.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Shell. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Jeff Shell, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman.

**Preliminary Plat
Palm Lake Subdivision
65 Single-Family Lots, located on
the west side of U.S. Highway 17/
Darien Highway, approximately 400 ft.
north of Cypress Mill Road, Zoned R-6
One-Family Residential**

Dru Doyal, Property Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Titus of EMC Engineering Services and Mr. Doyal were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

This request is for a proposed 65 lot subdivision to be developed in an R-6 zoning district. The sole access is an 80 ft. right-of-way off of Highway 17. The lots are presented in a sequential fashion along a circular drive. Lots 1 thru 38 are presented on the outer rim of the subdivision road, and Lots 39 thru 65 are presented on the interior of the road. On the interior of the development is a five-acre lake that will be maintained by the homeowner's association of the subdivision.

Each lot conforms to the R-6 zoning district requirement of minimum lot sizes and lot widths. Lot 29 is the smallest lot with 6,122 sq. ft.; Lot 13 is the largest proposed lot with 16,328 sq. ft. Each lot meets the lot width requirement of 60 ft. at the 20 ft. setback line.

The Engineering Department has approved this subdivision road as a Minor Street with a 50 ft. right-of-way, as required by Section 602.4 of the Subdivision Regulations. However, because the estimated traffic counts generated by a 65 lot subdivision, the Engineering Department has required that the pavement width adhere to the 20 ft. pavement width for a sub-collector street (in accordance with Section 602.4b of Subdivision Regulations). Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 contain marshland, which is visible from the front of the project on Highway 17. The marshland is not being calculated into the lot area. On the proposed plat, these lots include upland lot area calculations that meet the R-6 lot area requirements.

The proposed subdivision name "Palm Lake" must be changed to meet 911 requirements. There are already too many subdivisions with the name "Palm" as a prefix.

The Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspection, Engineering, Fire Department, and Brunswick Water & Sewer requirements have been met. The Glynn County Board of Commissioner would have to authorize the extension of city water & sewer lines into the county (as they do on a case-by-case basis).

According to the publication Trip Generation, a total of 22 vehicle trips per day will be generated by this development (9.55 per dwelling unit X 65 lots). This represents an increase of 3.2% above the average (19,549 vehicles per day) of the two traffic counts at U.S.17/ south of Redwood and U.S.17/Cardinal Street.

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this request with the following condition:

1. The name "Palm Lake" and "Palm Lake Drive" must be changed to conform to the County 911 Emergency Response requirements.

Mr. Robert Titus, representing the applicant, wanted to know the requirements for the 911 System regarding names. He stated that in 1993 a sketch plan was submitted and since that time, the applicant has invested a lot of money in the name. Mrs. Deborah Taylor explained that the Mapping Department has an inventory of names and because of the 911 System, some roads were renamed (to avoid duplication and confusion). Plats are reviewed when submitted for preliminary plat approval. The Mapping Department staff reviewed this plat and found that based on the information in the system, the name needed to be changed.

Mr. Dru Doyal, President of Palm Lake Inc., gave a brief presentation. He stated that he submitted preliminary sketch plans in February 1993. At which time, he made changes due to the abandoned right-of-way located on Scouten Lane. He stated that there was no mention of any necessity to change the "Palm Lake" name at that time, and hasn't been until March 17th. Mr. Doyal stated that it seems "a little late in the day to require him to change the name of his subdivision." He stated that he has already invested in subdivision covenants, restrictions and advertisements. He has also submitted a loan request and all county submittals have been presented with the name "Palm Lake." Therefore, he was under the assumption that the name would not be a problem.

Mr. Doyal pointed out that before any corporation is formed, it is a requirement to send the name of the prospective corporation to the Secretary of State for approval. As a criterion, he suggested that the county require a name approval before anything is submitted. He stated that changing the name of the subdivision at this point would put a financial hardship on him and the development.

Mrs. Deborah Taylor explained that the 911 System was not in affect in 1993. However, when this preliminary plat was submitted, the applicant was advised in writing that the name would have to be changed. Mrs. Taylor stated that this is not a staff decision, it is the policy and procedure of the 911 System as set forth by the County Commission. She explained that the name change would not have any bearing on whether the applicant receives preliminary plat approval or not, but this would have to be worked out between now and final plat approval. She stated that staff is willing to assist Mr. Doyal with this matter.

Mr. Newbern stated that as soon as it was determined that the name was in conflict with the 911 System, he informed Mr. Doyal of the situation.

For clarification, Vice Chairman Altman stated that when the applicant submitted the initial request, the name was not reviewed because there was not a 911 requirement. However, since that time, there is a 911 requirement and the name is being reviewed because of the system.

Mr. Jim Bruner stated that there is a project under construction called "Palm Club Apartments" located off of "South Palm Drive." This has already caused a tremendous amount of confusion in the engineering office. (In essence, when a 911 emergency vehicle is dispatched, there could be a delay in getting to the injured/sick person if there are duplicate street names, apartment buildings, etc. in the system.)

Mrs. Touw asked if the Planning Commission has the authority to approve or deny a name change. Mrs. Deborah Taylor replied no, typically it is done administratively.

Vice Chairman Altman stated that according to Section 602.2 k) of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, "all streets within a subdivision hereafter established shall be named. No name shall be used which duplicate or be confused with existing street names." Mr. Altman suggested that the preliminary plat be approved without the stipulation to change the name. Mr. Jonathan Williams agreed. He stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to review and approve the development, not the name. Mr. Hart stated that the county is trying to ensure the safety and welfare of the citizens; however, he understands Mr. Doyal's concerns.

Mr. Bruner pointed out that currently, there are 8 "Palm" prefixes: 3 on St. Simons and 5 on the mainland.

Mr. Jeff Shell stated that if the Planning Commission were to approve this request, does this mean that the name change is being ignored. Mr. Altman stated that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to change the name.

Assistant County Attorney Keith Taylor explained that a name is required as part of the procedure for preliminary plats. He stated that he cannot comment on the 911 requirements because he doesn't have that particular

ordinance with him. He would have to review the ordinance for clarity as to whether the name change is a requirement or a request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request subject to a successful resolution to the name "Palm Lake Drive." However, following a brief discussion regarding the term successful, Mr. Hart withdrew the motion. He then offered a new motion to approve this preliminary plat subject to a resolution to the name "Palm Lake Drive." The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

Preliminary Plat

**Royal Oaks Subdivision, Phase II
17 Single-family lots, located
off Regal Drive, existing in
Phase I, near Exist 6 Interchange
U.S. Highway 17 South & I-95
Zoned R-20 One-Family Residential**

**William Gross-Catfish Properties,
Property Owner/Developer**

Mr. William Gross was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

This request is for a 17 lot development proposed as Phase II of Royal Oaks Subdivision. Royal Oaks, Phase I was originally approved as a final plat in March 1994, which includes 86 lots that were developed in the vicinity of the Little Satilla River along the Camden County border. Royal Oaks, Phase II is a new development that will be accessed by Regal Road which now dead-ends at Lot 60 in the original Phase I.

Royal Oaks, Phase II includes the extension of Regal Road into a temporary cul-de-sac, and the creation of Dunkirk Lane to serve the proposed lots. Both roads are proposed as public paved roads to be developed according to county standards for sub-collector streets (Section 602.4 a & b of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations).

The proposed lots meet the R-20 zoning requirements for lot dimensions, with the exception of Lot 7. Lot 4 contains wetlands that will be filled and modified in accordance with an Army Corps authorization letter that has been filed with the Planning and Zoning Division. Future development within the Royal Oaks Subdivision will require additional wetland documentation that addresses future modified areas.

The length of the proposed public road meets the requirements of Section 602.2(g) of the Subdivision Regulations, which requires that permanent dead-end streets must not be longer than 1,200 linear feet measured from the

centerline of the nearest intersecting through street, to the center of the turnaround. The measurement for the new street system is 1,199 linear feet.

The County Engineering Department, Fire Department, and Building Inspections Division have favorably reviewed this proposed plat.

Water & Sewer has favorably reviewed the plans, with the exception of the following condition: The Glynn County Environmental Quality Department must approve the location and dimensions of the water and sewer service lines and supporting pump stations.

Planning & Zoning has favorably reviewed the plat with the recommendation for the following condition: On the final plat, the lot width for Lot 7 must meet the 60 ft. lot width requirement at the minimum setback of 20 ft. This is pursuant to Section 501.21 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations.

According to the Trip Generation publication, the development of 17 lots will generate approximately 163 additional vehicle trips per day onto Highway 17 near the Exit 6 interchange (50% ingress, 50% egress).

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this request with two conditions:

1. The Glynn County Environmental Quality Department must approve the location and dimensions of the water and sewer service lines and supporting pump stations.
2. On the final plat, the lot width for Lot 7 must meet the 60 ft. lot width requirement at the minimum setback of 20 ft. This is pursuant to Section 501.21 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this request with the two conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

**Coastal Bank of Georgia
Located at 529 Beachview Drive,
Request to add an Atlantic Teller
Machine (ATM) in the front window,
west of the entrance door, zoned
General Commercial**

Mr. Larry Bryson, agent, was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

This is an application from the Coastal Bank to add an Automatic Teller Machine (ATM) to the front of the Village Branch on Beachview Drive. The ATM will be placed in the glass panel just west of the front door entrance.

The new ATM will require the removal of the glass panel and the installation of a cash dispenser with a yellow stucco surrounding that matches the rest of the building. This request is compatible with the St. Simons Village Preservation District, Section 709.8, Site Plans, Architectural Alterations, & Landscaping. Of particular note are two criteria, D & E of this section as follows:

- D) The consistence and compatibility with existing architectural design building exterior finishes used on neighboring properties or in the overlay zone.
- E) Exterior materials, exterior doors and windows, color schemes and other building elements which are considered compatible with neighboring structures in the overlay zone and appropriate for the area.

The proposed ATM installation is not in violation of any section of the Village Preservation District Ordinance. Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Jeff Shell.

Rafters

Located at 315 1/2 Mallory Street

Zoned General Commercial-Core

Jeffrey R. Irwin/M&J Industrial Sales, Inc., Applicant

- a) **Request to Amend the Special Use Permit to change hours of operation**
Hours Approved - 7:30 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.
Requested Hours - 5:30 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.
- b) **Request Approval of Exterior Painting**
When the exterior color (beige) for the business/building was approved in 1996, it was to remain beige. In March 1998 the building was painted red without review/approval. The applicant is requesting that the building be allowed to remain as painted.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

a) Request to Amend Hours of Operation

Rafters is requesting an expansion in their hours, as stated above. A portion of Rafters parking is located near the rear entrance gate of Strothers Inc., a nearby business. Strothers, Inc. has indicated that because their business and gate close at 5:00 p.m., Rafters opening at 5:30 p.m. should not affect their business operations.

The expansion of business hours will have no influence on the parking requirements. Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of the request to change the hours of operation.

Mr. Jeff Irwin stated that he is requesting the change of hours in order to sell more food and better serve his clientele.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Shell to recommend approval of the request to change the hours of operation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

b) Request Approval of Exterior Painting

On a separate issue, Mr. Irwin, President of Rafters, violated Sections 709.1 and 709.9 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance St. Simons Village Preservation District when he changed the color of the upstairs exterior of Rafters from beige-yellow to brick red. Though the new color may or may not conform to the Village Preservation District Ordinance, Mr. Irwin did not follow the correct procedure to perform this work. (A letter of apology from Mr. Irwin was included in the packages.) He should have filed a Village Preservation Ordinance application with the Planning and Zoning Division before proceeding. At the Planning Commission's discretion, this is a possible item that could be addressed with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Irwin stressed that he did not act in malice and apologized for having violated the Ordinance. He stated that he was trying to preserve the historic nature of the Village, and the rustic red color was more in keeping with the Village than the yellow color. Photographs of the building were distributed for the Planning Commission's review.

Mrs. Touw pointed out that Rafters front stairs changes were not reviewed or approved by the Planning Commission. She stated that several letters were sent to Mr. Irwin regarding this situation. She stated that there were to be no exterior changes without the Planning Commission's review (in accordance with the Village Preservation District). Mrs. Touw stated that to her knowledge, Mr. Irwin was not formally cited for this violation. Mr. Irwin explained that the stairs were not included on the original plans, but they were included on the plans submitted for the building permit. He stated that there was a problem with the length of the stairs meeting the fire codes, and therefore they had to be changed.

Mrs. Touw reminded Mr. Irwin of the guidelines of the Village Preservation District and urged him to follow those guidelines. Mr. Irwin concurred.

Mr. Bob Gilleski of 132 Bel Air Circle stated that he noticed a new neon sign at Rafters. Mr. Irwin stated that the sign is not neon, it is made of red oak wood and is very expensive. Mrs. Taylor pointed out to Mr. Irwin that he could not install a sign in the Village area without first coming to the Planning Commission. Mr. Irwin stated that it is the same sign, but a lot nicer; however, staff advised Mr. Irwin that any/all changes are required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission in accordance with the Village District.

Mr. Altman wanted to know if staff would have approved this request had the applicant gone through the proper channels. Mrs. Taylor replied yes because the brick color is compatible with the area.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the exterior changes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

GC-11-98

Request to rezone from R-6 One-Family Residential to Medium Residential, 2.072 acres known as a portion of the Julia Armstrong Estate. Property located at the end of Arnold Street, also described as being located 160.64 ft. east of George Lotson Avenue, 350 ft. west of Demere Road, north of County Park/Demere Park, Demere Landing Condos (under construction) and Willie Mae Bailey property, 170 ft. south of Proctor Lane on St. Simons Island.

H. A. Locke, Jr. Property Owner

Attorney Fleming Martin, agent, was present for discussion.

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

This request is to rezone a 2 acre tract located at the end of an existing private street which has a 30 ft. right-of-way. The right-of-way has narrowed down to only 14.07 ft. in width where the subject property abuts the end of the road.

In accordance with the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, in order to develop the property, additional right-of-way would be required (minimum right-of-way 40 ft.) At this time, only one residential structure would be permitted to be located on the property, if served by Arnold Street. However, if an alternative access way is provided to connect the subject property with an existing county road, the property could be submitted for single-family residential lots.

According to the rezoning application, if the property is rezoned to multi-family, an access easement would be obtained across a single-family residential lot fronting on Proctor Lane (owned by someone else); however, this access area was not included as part of the rezoning request.

The property owner is requesting to rezone the property to Medium Residential (16 units per acre) to allow a multi-family development. The concept plan indicates 20 multi-family units with the only access being via proposed access easement across the single-family residential lot. The property located to the south was rezoned to Medium Residential in 1974 with a condition that 25 ft. buffers would be provided along the single-family properties. Staff

recommended approval at that time because the property had frontage on George Lotson Avenue and Demere Road, and was lying between a Highway Commercial District and a Planned Development District that allowed multi-family. This created a transitional zoning between the two zoning districts.

The property being requested for rezoning at this time is surrounded by single-family residential zoning, with the exception of the property described above, and one duplex to the north. Due to the configuration of the property, (723.04 ft. in length and 142.59 ft. in depth), the property abuts 12 residential parcels. Staff feels that a rezoning to multi-family would be an encroachment into the existing single-family residential area.

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

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

No, single-family residential zoning and land use is located to the north, east and west.

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

The zoning would be an intrusion into the single-family area.

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

With the proper access, the property could be subdivided into single-family residential lots.

- **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;**

Increasing the residential density from 7.26 units per gross acre to 16 units per gross acre will increase the traffic volume and other public facilities.

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

Shown as low density urban. The proposed zoning is classified as medium density urban.

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

No.

Mr. Milburn stated that staff recommends denial of this request for the following reasons:

1. Intrusion into the single-family residential area;
2. Inadequate access; and
3. Request is not consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Mr. Hart had questions concerning traffic. He wanted to know an estimate of the amount of traffic generated by a medium residential development. Mr. Milburn stated that 6 or 7 trips per day per unit is standard. (Single-family vs. multi-family, times 6 or 7 trips per day.) Mr. Hart then asked how many single-family units would be allowed. Mr. Milburn stated that at this time, only one single-family unit would be allowed due to the access.

Mrs. Touw pointed out that as presented today, the applicant is requesting to rezone the property to multi-residential which is 16 units per acre for 2.07 acres, but in this application there is no access to accommodate the 16 units. Mr. Milburn stated that the applicant might have some type of option for an access easement.

Mr. Williams stated that previously, property owners who had frontage on Proctor Lane requested a back entrance to their property, but they were denied due to the limited amount of space. Therefore, approving this multi-family development would be a double standard.

Attorney Fleming Martin gave a brief presentation. He stated that this is a "red herring" because the applicant has no desire to use Arnold Street. He explained that Mr. Locke has a contract to sell the property to Dr. Robert Wiedemeyer who has an easement agreement to provide access from Proctor Lane with the necessary width for the development.

Mr. Martin stated that staff's comment about this development being an intrusion is a matter of point of view. This is not a spot zoning. He stated that his client is simply asking to extend the existing multi-family zoning into the 2 acres. In addressing the density, Mr. Martin pointed out that staff has indicated that his client applied for 21 units, as oppose to 7 single-family units. If approved, this would triple the density. He reiterated that his client has an agreement with Dr. Wiedemeyer to use the requisite width to access the development.

Mr. Martin stressed that staff has failed to show him any provisions of the Subdivision Regulations or Zoning Ordinance that states it is a requirement to rezone that particular tract of land; probably because there is no such requirement.

Mrs. Teresa Powell of 664 Proctor Lane presented a petition consisting of approximately 34 signatures of residents of Proctor Lane, Demere Road and Arnold Lane who are opposed to this request. Mrs. Powell stated that the residents would like to keep their neighborhood as one-

family residential. They are opposed to this request due to safety hazards, traffic problems and potential water & sewer problems.

Mrs. Sylvia Pittman of 653 Proctor Lane expressed opposition to this request. Mr. S. C. Anderson, St. Simons resident, was also present to speak on behalf of RUPA and himself in opposition to this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

GC-12-98

Request to Rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential to General Commercial, a parcel of land consisting of 0.9487 acres fronting 240 feet on the east side of Picric Street, beginning 200 feet south of Old Mill Trace and lying immediately north and west of property owned by J. P. Strickland.

Property owned by Kids First, Inc./Daniel Coty

Mr. Dan Coty was present for discussion.

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

This request is for a parcel of land located on the east side of Picric Street, which involves a GA Power Company easement (0.3439 acres) and adjacent property to the south (0.6048).

The immediate area consists of commercial and residential (multi-family and single-family) property. In March of 1997 the property to the north was rezoned to General Commercial in order to allow a childcare center. The property involved in this request is proposed as part of the childcare center development to be utilized for off-street parking and landscaping.

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

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

Yes because this will allow the Kids First, Inc. to expand their parking and landscaping. The adjacent property is to the south and west, Kids First, Inc. building is located on the north and CinDot Systems is north of Kids First, Inc.

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

No, Kids First, Inc. already exists. This proposal is only to expand the existing General Commercial District.

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

Yes if the remaining property in the R-9 District is developed for residential, but the Comprehensive Land Use Plan map designates this area as commercial.

- **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, these public facilities are adequate now. Schools would not be affected if zoned in a General Commercial District.

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

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this property as commercial.

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

No.

Mr. Milburn stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

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

GC-13-98

Request to rezone from R-12 One-Family Residential to General Commercial, a parcel of land consisting of 39,750 feet fronting at the end of Sapp Road and lying immediately west of Golden Isles Parkway.

Property owned by Helen T. Sapp.

Mr. Ron Sawyer, agent, was present for discussion.

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

This request is to rezone an existing parcel of land, which contains a single-family residential structure. The proposed buyer would like to rezone the property, remove the structure, and expand an existing shopping center located to the north and west known as "Scranton Landing."

The property developed as "Scranton Landing" was rezoned to General Commercial in 1983. Located to the south and west is the proposed development to known as Golden Isles Plaza, which was rezoned to commercial in 1988. Currently, a road for the Golden Isles Plaza is being constructed from Scranton Road to the proposed extension of Altama Connector. Off this road is an existing private drive known as Sapp Road that serves the subject property. If the property is rezoned and development, there would be two access points to serve the property; one from Scranton Landing and the other off of the Golden Isles Plaza roadway, which would be constructed to commercial standards.

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

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

The request would be an extension of the General Commercial District to the north, and would be compatible with the Planned Development-Shopping District to the south and west.

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

No, for the reasons listed above.

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

No because the subject property (zoned R-12 Residential) is surrounded by commercial zoning.

- **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 area has been planned for these public facilities to accommodate the commercial development.

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

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this property as commercial.

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

No.

Mr. Milburn stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

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

GC-14-98

Request to rezone portion of a tract of land located on the west side of U.S. Highway 341, northwest of Altamaha Park Road in the Everett City Community as follows:

Parcel A: Highway Commercial to Forest Agricultural 20,734 sq. ft. lying 180 ft. west of U.S. Highway 341 and 70 ft. south of Everett Baptist Church.

Parcel B: Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial 20,124 sq. ft. fronting 11.78 ft. on the west side of U.S. Highway 341, located immediately southeast of Parcel A and lying 210 ft. south of Everett Baptist Church.

Property owned by David and Patricia Douglas

There was no one present to represent this request. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to defer this item pending arrival of a representative. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

GC-2-98 G

Consider amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance to add a new section: Article XIV Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance.

A proposed Telecommunications Ordinance (prepared by the County Attorney's office) was distributed and included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

Attorney Jim Gilbert, representing BellSouth Mobility, explained that they (BellSouth) are not here to argue the ordinance. In fact, they believe that a Telecommunications Ordinance is a good idea; however, there are some problems in the ordinance that need extensive discussion. He stated that 23 separate issues were pointed out in a letter from BellSouth to the County Attorney. Mr. Gilbert suggested that a work session be held to discuss these issues before adopting the ordinance.

Mr. Mike Stephens, BellSouth, agreed with Attorney Jim Gilbert. He stated that they do not want to do anything to upset county government. He also suggested that a work session be held to further discuss the proposed ordinance.

Mr. S. C. Anderson, St. Simons resident, commented that the ordinance should cover all of Glynn County, including the Airport.

Assistant County Attorney Keith Taylor explained that the intent is to create an ordinance to cover all boundaries of the county and to not have visual intrusions,

etc. He stated that he is willing to have a work session to further discuss the ordinance. He also stated that technological input is needed and perhaps discussed with all agencies involved before the work session is held.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to have a work session to further discuss the Telecommunications Ordinance on Tuesday, May 12, 1998 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve the Minutes of the April 7, 1998 Planning Commission meeting with necessary corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Jeff Shell was absent for the April meeting and therefore abstained from voting.)

STAFF ITEMS

Mrs. Deborah Taylor advised the Accessory Use Committee meeting was held and a draft report will be presented at the next Planning Commission meeting.

COMMISSION ITEMS

Attorney Keith Taylor advised that he is still reviewing Supreme Court cases, federal & state laws, etc. relative to the Sign Ordinance.

Also under Commission Items, Mrs. Iris Touw read the following statement regarding Tabby Plaza. (It was noted that this has no reflection on the Planning Commission):

"I'd like to make a public apology to all the many citizens of St. Simons who called me when the Tabby Plaza Development became known. There were two questions; 1) What was the maximum height permitted? & 2) How was it determined? Using the Ordinance, I answered those questions, 35 ft. maximum above the natural grade. I feel obligated to let them know exactly what will be there. According to the building plans, the center building is 35 ft. as measured from 1 ft. below the finished floor to the peak of the roof. I don't know how much fill has gone in on that, but I would estimate the resulting height will be closer to 45 ft. than 35 ft."

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.