

# MINUTES

## GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION October 6, 1998 9:00 A.M.

-----

MEMBERS PRESENT: Glenda Jones, Chairman  
Richard Altman  
Lamar Cole  
Hal Hart  
Jeff Shell  
Jonathan Williams

Absent: Iris Touw

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

-----

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

-----

**Village Hotel**  
**Review for compliance/Height, Site**  
**Coverage and Exterior, located on**  
**the northwest corner of Mallory**  
**Street and Magnolia Avenue, SSI**  
**Zoned General Commercial**

**Stewart Commercial Investments, Inc.**  
**Property Owners**

Mr. Larry Evans was present for discussion.

Chairman Glenda Jones advised that the client of Stewart Commercial Investments, Inc. has requested a deferral until a later date.

-----

**540 Poplar Street  
New Single-Family Residence, located  
between Neptune Way and Oak Street  
Zoned R-6 One-Family Residential**

**Thea M. Jarvis, Property Owner**

Mrs. Jarvis and Mr. Robert Ussery were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review:

The applicant is proposing to build a 1,956 sq. ft. house on a vacant lot at 540 Poplar Avenue. The vacant lot is situated between two existing houses; 532 Poplar Avenue at the corner of Poplar and Neptune Way; and 544 Poplar Avenue.

The proposed house will meet the R-6 zoning requirements of 20 ft. front yard, 7 ft. side yard and 7 ft. rear yard. There are five (5) oak trees on-site that will be saved. Two Magnolia trees, one 12" in width and the other 8" in width, are proposed for removal. (Pictures were provided for review.) The Magnolia trees are located at the front of the property along Poplar Avenue, within 25 ft. of the right-of-way.

According to Section 709.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, trees that are 12 inches in diameter and within 25 ft. of the property line must secure Planning Commission approval in order to be removed. The 12 inch wide Magnolia tree definitely falls within the jurisdiction of Planning Commission review. Though the 8 inch tree does not fall within Planning Commission review, Ms. Jarvis is requesting the Planning Commission to approve the removal of both trees (prior to construction of the house).

The 1,956 sq. ft. structure is proposed as a two-story single-family residence with four bedrooms, one bedroom downstairs and three upstairs. The building footprint meets the requirements of Section 709.5 of the Village Preservation Ordinance, which requires that the footprint of the new structure not be increased more than the average footprints of the adjacent side lots. The house at 532 Poplar has a building footprint of 2,270 sq. ft., including the garage and porch, and the footprint at 544 Poplar Avenue is 1,858 sq. ft. The average of the two footprints is 2,064, which is more than the proposed 1,956 sq. ft. structure.

The proposed height of the building is 27 ft., 6 in. at the peak, which is less than 10 ft. higher than the average of the two adjacent structures. The two neighboring structures are 21 ft. at 532 Poplar Avenue, and 18 ft. at 544 Poplar Avenue. The average of the two is 19 ft. 6 in. The 27 ft. 6 in. height is less than 29 ft. 6 in., which is the maximum allowable height for the residence.

The proposed building exterior will be of lapped vinyl siding with white clad aluminum windows and a shingled roof. The exterior color will be a "cliffside gray." The structure at 532 Poplar is a neutral beige color, and the house at 544 Poplar has a light blue vinyl siding exterior.

Mr. Dick Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

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

Mr. Richard Altman asked if it is necessary to cut down the two Magnolia trees. Mr. Ussery replied yes because of the way the trees are shaped, and also because the trees are growing up through the canopy.

After discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted.

-----

**Site Plan**  
**Deck House Apartments**  
**64 Unit Apartment Complex,**  
**Located Carteret Road**  
**Zoned Planned Development-General**

**Harvey Anderson, Property Owner**

Mr. Chris Amos was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review:

This is a proposed 64 unit apartment complex development located in a 6.5 acre Planned Development District on Carteret Road. As shown on the site plan, the apartments will be developed in ten clusters. Five clusters comprising 36 units will be situated parallel with the eastern property line. One cluster of eight apartments will be located on the rear (north) portion of the property near the wooden bridge that crosses the county drainage canal. Two clusters, comprising a total of 16 apartments, will be located on the east side of the property. The last cluster, consisting of four units will be located on the east side near the entrance to the development.

The apartments are proposed as 29.5 ft. structures connected by load bearing fire walls within each cluster. The maximum height requirement is 35 ft. A total of 128 parking spaces will be located in a common parking and drive area, as shown on the site plan. The parking spaces and dimensions meet the requirements of Section 611 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed density meets the General Residential (GR) density requirements of no more than 10 units per acre. This is required in the PD text, Phase II, dated April 27, 1972. The proposed density is 64 units/6.5 acres equals 9.8 units per acre.

The development will be located near an office building complex that fronts on Carteret Road. The development meets the building setback requirements set forth in Section 723.7 (e) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires dwelling to be located at least 30 ft. from property lines.

A total of 2.9 acres is proposed as impervious area, or site coverage. Though there are no site coverage requirements, this represents 44.6% of the 6.5 acre site. This exceeds the ordinance minimum requirement of 20% in accordance with Section 706.48 of the ordinance.

There are no wetlands on the site. The Engineering Department recommends approval of the grading, drainage and traffic access for the site.

The site plan includes a two-site dumpster area on the north side of the property. At the rear of the site, the site plan includes a wooden bridge crossing a county drainage canal and a small lakeside park with picnic facilities.

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends approval of this site plan with the following three conditions:

1. Fire Department: Pursuant to Section 606.3 of the subdivision regulations, the water line on-site must be upgraded to an 8 inch water line main, and fire hydrant must be provided in the development no more than 500 ft. apart.
2. Building Inspections: Add a note on the site plan that "Not less than two of the 64 units shall meet all requirements for handicap accessibility."
3. Building Inspections: The floodplain notes on Sheets 3 & 4 of the site plan submittal must be changed to read: If a portion of the lot is Zone "X" shaded and another portion is AE (EL. 14'), then the subject property does not fully fall within the 100-year flood plain. Building clusters 2 through 10 are within the 100-year flood plain as per the submitted plat.

Mr. Jonathan Williams asked if the developer would be responsible for funding the water line upgrade. Mr. Amos replied yes.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Shell to approve this request subject to the conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

**Site Plan  
Stores at Hampton  
Submission of additional information  
1 acre tract located on the west side  
of Hampton Point Drive, north end of  
St. Simons Island, zoned Planned  
Development**

**Melvin Buck, Owner/Developer**

Mr. Buck and Mr. James Kent were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included for review:

At the September 1, 1998 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission voted to deny the site plan application submitted by Mr. Melvin Buck, applicant. The applicant had proposed the development of a 35 ft. tall, 5,944 sq. ft. neighborhood commercial center on a one-acre tract in the Hampton Plantation Planned Development District.

The 5,944 total sq. ft. included the first floor square footage of 4,732 sq. ft., plus a second floor area of 1,212 sq. ft. In addition to the 5,944 sq. ft. total, a 1,340 sq. ft. porch was proposed to be located in front of the first floor.

In this revision, the applicant is concerned that the Planning Commission was not provided enough valid comparative data for similar structures in the neighborhood. Therefore, he has provided the square footage of the heating and cooled space of six dwellings in the Hampton Point Drive and Hampton Plantation neighborhood. Furthermore, he is proposing to eliminate the use of the upstairs (1,212 sq. ft.) of his building to reduce the total heating and cooled space to only 4,732 sq. ft., rather than the original 5,944 sq. ft. total. Under his new proposal, the upstairs or the 2<sup>nd</sup> story of his building will simply not be used. It was to be used for office space.

For comparative purposes, the applicant has offered the following dwellings to show that his new commercial center is architecturally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood:

- 1) Proposed Stores at Hampton: 4,732 sq. ft. that are heated and cooled.
- 2) 920 Champney Drive: 4,450 sq. ft. heated and cooled.
- 3) 958 Champney Drive: 5,655 sq. ft. heated and cooled.
- 4) 146 Hampton Point Drive: 5,052 sq. ft. heated and cooled.
- 5) 140 Hampton Point Drive: 5,500 sq. ft. heated and cooled.
- 6) 204 Hampton Pint Drive: 4,238 sq. ft. heated and cooled.

In addition to providing this comparative data, the applicant claims that the building height, length, and width for the proposed Stores at Hampton are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood structures.

The applicant is proposing to develop a two-story, 35 ft. tall, 5,944 sq.ft. (4,732 sq. ft. heated and cooled) neighborhood commercial center on a one-acre tract in the Hampton Plantation Planned Development District. Specifically, the proposed store will front on Butler Lake Drive near the intersection of Butler Lake Drive and Hampton Point Drive. This one-acre site is located at the entrance to the Hampton Point Plantation development, which contains a mixture of upscale residential developments and related recreational amusement areas.

Development of this one-acre site is governed by two documents: 1)The Hampton Plantation Planned Development text dated March 17, 1987, revised May 1989 (specifically, pages 7-9); and 2)The PD amendment by the County Commission dated July 6, 1989 authorizing a convenience store to be located on the property. This amendment lists 21 items that must be followed in developing the parcel.

The proposed building will consist of a first floor area of 4,732 sq. ft. and a smaller second floor area of 1,212 sq. ft. A front porch area on the first floor will comprise 1,340 sq. ft. A handicap accessible ramp is proposed on the building design. The store will consist of four retail businesses: a convenience store, a real estate office, a postal shop, and a retail store. The four proposed retail businesses are allowed by the PD text dated March 17, 1987 and are not precluded by the County Commission PD amendment of July 6, 1989.

There will be 2 gas pumps to serve the convenience store. The tank for the pumps will be located underground on the north border of the property for the convenience of filling and maintenance. The tanks, pumps, and traffic flow around the tanks have met the Glynn County Fire Inspector's approval. The State Fire Marshal review and approval is pending.

According to the County Commission amendment of 7/6/89, no packaged liquor can be sold at this development. However, there is no language precluding the sale of beer or wine.

The proposed site plan meets the Planned Development requirements with regard to building height, setbacks, parking, loading/unloading, traffic flow, and traffic access. The site plan also meets the buffer requirement of a 15 ft. wide landscaped buffer on the front and a 10 ft. wide buffer on the sides and rear. The buffer, as stated on the plan, meets the 6 ft. height requirement. A 6 ft. wood fence will be installed at the rear of the property.

The screened dumpster site is located at the rear of the property as required by the County Commission amendment (7/6/89) and is located 10 ft. from the rear property line; outside the 10 ft. drainage easement, but it overlaps the 15 ft. rear setback. The applicant is proposing this dumpster site as the optimal location for locating the dumpster at the rear of the building.

The County Commission PD amendment (7/6/98) sets forth several aesthetic criteria that the development must fulfill, which require the proposed development to be

architecturally, materially, and visually compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. To meet these criteria, the applicant has furnished a building elevation showing the architectural rendering of the proposed facade and building design. He has also furnished a description entitled "Character of Development" for the Planning Commission's perusal. Pictures of several of the surrounding residential structures were included in the packages for review. A petition containing many signatures from persons opposed to this request was also included in the packages. The location is plotted on the Hampton Plantation marketing map.

The Planning and Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Engineering Department, Water and Sewer Division and Fire Department have reviewed the site plan and determined that it technically meets the functional elements of the PD and PD amendment. The aesthetic and subjective criteria concerning architectural, material and visual compatibility are presented as information for Planning Commission consideration.

Mr. Newbern stated that staff recommends consideration of this site plan application. Staff is not recommending approval or denial because of the subjective and aesthetic decisions that must be made with this site plan.

Mr. James Kent gave a brief presentation. He stated that the facility has a long history that started in 1989. He explained that the same development was proposed in 1989 and the same elevation. He then presented the site plan that was approved for construction in 1989. Mr. Kent also read a copy of the approval letter submitted to Mr. Buck by Mrs. Deborah Taylor on December 11, 1997.

Mr. Kent stated that the original PD was submitted by Mr. Bobby Boone who developed the subdivision. Within the subdivision there are residential sites, patio homes, townhouses and a breakfast/bed inn. The height of the townhouses and the breakfast/bed inn is limited at 45 ft. He stated that his client's structure is not any taller than any of the residences in the area. In fact, the structure is less than 35 ft. tall.

Mr. Kent stated that the original PD shows this area as a commercial site. The following are permitted uses in accordance with the original PD: convenience store, retail business, grocery store, antique store, appliance store, book store, clothing store and a hardware store. The PD was revised in 1989, which excluded liquor stores as one of the permitted uses.

Mr. Kent stated that his client has met all of the conditions. He further stated that this particular facility cannot be compared with any other development along Frederica Road or Hampton Point in that it has a minimum 15 ft. landscaped buffer between the road and the building. He then elaborated on the materials and color of the proposed structure, which he stated would blend in with existing structures in the area.

Regarding size of the building, Mr. Kent explained that the 1989 original PD recommendation states that the size, bulk, height and scale of proposed structure shall reflect the character of the existing single-family structures in the area. He stated that the PD does not reference air condition square footage. He pointed out that the proposed structure would be within the maximum height of 35 ft. His client has elected to reduce the square footage by eliminating the second-story.

Mr. Kent urged the Planning Commission to give a second thought to this development.

Mr. John Parker, resident of Hampton Plantation, stated that the Planning Commission is aware of the opposition to the development. He stated that it is imperative that the approved plan complies fully with both the letter and spirit of the two governing documents. He pointed out that the resubmittal still does not comply with items 2 and 12 of the PD amendment dated July 6, 1989.

Mr. Parker stated that the applicant has not changed the size of the building from the prior application. He has only removed the second-floor. He stated that the proposed structure exceeds the characteristics of existing single-family structures in the area.

Mr. Jack Lenz of 127 Butler Lake Drive stated that there is no doubt that eventually there will be a commercial facility at Hampton Point. However, the development should be in keeping with the existing structures in the area.

Ms. Polly Minick of Hampton Point asked if a store could be built from an out of date blueprint. The developer has stated that the upstairs would always be unfinished, but who has the job of enforcing this to ensure that it remains unfinished.

Regarding the out of date blueprints, Mr. Chuck Taylor explained that the blueprints presented today are dated August 1998 and are considered current drawings under the county's regulations. He stated that if this project were approved, it would be the responsibility of Community Development to enforce the square footage of the building. He stated that even after the structure is built, the applicant would not be allowed to finish out the upstairs because of the proposed restrictions. Chairman Jones stated that Mr. Ken Conley is the Senior Enforcement Officer who reports directly to Community Development.

Mr. Taylor further explained that if this development were approved, the architect would be required to submit construction plans that would show the upstairs area as being unfinished (uncooled and unheated).

Chairman Jones stated that during various stages of construction, the Building Inspections Office inspects the building. Mr. Ellis Carter elaborated on the procedure, including the Certificate of Occupancy process.

Ms. Minick stated that 90% of the homeowners are against this project. "To allow development of a business that most likely will not succeed is sad."

Dr. Scottie, 203 Rice Mill Road, stated that the proposed structure does not look like a house. The original approval simply stated that the development should blend in with existing structures in the area. He stated that this development overlooks the community pool and should have an architectural frontage of 16 ft. instead of 15 ft. He stated that we should not try to get around the requirements that were placed on the development by the original board.

Mrs. Mary Jo Shores of Hampton Point Drive stated that she and her neighbors are trying to protect the lifestyle, nature and character of a neighborhood that they love. By a show of hands (at Mrs. Shores' request), approximately 25 citizens were present to oppose this development.

Mr. Kent pointed out that the original PD states that "landscape buffer shall be required along the front, rear and both sides of the property. The front buffer shall be a minimum of 15 ft. wide, side and rear yard shall be 10 ft." He stated that his client has met those requirements.

For clarification, Mr. Jeff Shell asked if the request is being reviewed again because of the reduction in the square footage by eliminating the second floor. Mr. Kent replied yes. He stated that they do not intend to use the second floor. Also, the stairwells are being removed.

Mr. Richard Altman had questions concerning lighting. Mr. Kent explained that the front porch has been designed so that lighting is directed back toward the walls; nothing projects out on the front of the building. He then presented pictures of the light fixtures for the Planning Commission's review.

Mr. Hal Hart wanted to know if the residents discussed what would be acceptable to them in regards to square footage. Mr. Parker stated that this has not been discussed with the vast majority of the residents; however, from his perspective, he feels that the size, bulk, height and scale should be compatible with the existing structures in the area. He stated that the average size of the homes is 3,096 sq. ft. Therefore, something in that range would be more acceptable.

Mr. Robert Ussery stated that he was the author of the 1989 Text. When it was developed, he and Mr. Bobby Boone, along with Mr. Bishop discussed this with all of the residents of the area at that time. One of the requirements was that they come up with an appropriate design for this structure. He stated that to the best of his knowledge, Mr. Kent has followed suit with the initial design.

Mr. Hart stated that perhaps the developer would like to request a 30 day deferral in order to work out a compromise with the residents. Mr. Melvin Buck stated that this proposal has been dragged out long enough and he

doesn't think it would make a difference to the opposition. He stated he would like for the Planning Commission to proceed with a recommendation.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if the size of the development is the problem, or is it that the residents just don't want the development period. Mr. Parker stated that in his opinion, the size of the development is the major issue at this time.

Following a brief explanation from the Assistant County Attorney regarding Section 619 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance pertaining to procedure, review & approval process, Mr. Hart asked once again if the developer would consider a deferral for 30 days. Mr. Buck replied that he would rather have a vote today.

Mr. Lamar Cole stated he feels that the building orientation, size and scale do not fit within the single-family structure. Also, the lighting is not in keeping with the PD. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Cole to deny this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Richard Altman. Voting Aye (for denial): Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mr. Jeff Shell and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay (against denial): Mrs. Glenda Jones. The motion carried for denial.

-----

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:20 a.m.

-----

**Altamaha Loop North  
Road Approval Only  
Located east of Altamaha Blvd.  
Golden Isles Gateway Tract  
Zoned Planned Development-General**

**The Branigar Organization, Property Owners**

Mr. Jeff Halliburton and Ms. Amy Templeton of Thomas & Hutton Engineers were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review:

This is a proposed 527 lin. ft. county road segment in the "R-4" area of the Golden Isles Gateway Tract. The 7,828 acre tract is located west of the Glynco Jetport that is also known as the Branigar Tract, the area where the Branigar Organization plans to develop a variety of residential and commercial developments, and open space and wildlife areas.

The Altamaha Loop North road segment will tie onto the northwest side of the existing Altamaha Boulevard (150 ft. right-of-way), approximately one (1) mile north of Jetport Road. It is located approximately one fourth ( $\frac{1}{4}$ ) of a mile north of Altamaha Loop South, which was approved as a preliminary plat application at the September 1998 Planning Commission meeting. Altamaha Boulevard (150 ft. county right-of-way) was deeded to the county by the Branigar Organization. It has been paved to county standards and is county maintained.

The Altamaha Loop North road segment will extend in a northwesterly direction approximately 527 ft. and will end in a temporary cul-de-sac. The Loop North road segment is proposed as a minimum right-of-way of 80 ft. This right-of-way width conforms to Section 602.4 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. The road will ultimately be developed in a westerly direction towards I-95, and then turn south and tie into the new Altamaha Loop South. The specific road development will be guided by the single or multi-family developments that are eventually approved for this R-4 area, and by the PD text.

The County Water & Sewer Division will locate the proposed water and sewer lines within the public right-of-way boundaries. A small area of wetlands will transgress the road right-of-way on the western side near Altamaha Boulevard. The proposed filling of these wetlands has been approved by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The Altamaha Loop Connector will provide an opportunity for residential or multi-family development in the Golden Isles Gateway Tract. Once this segment is constructed and platted, it is very likely that a single-family subdivision or a multi-family site plan will be filed for review and approval. According to the PD text, the R-4 development area provides for both single-family residential and multi-family developments.

This project has been issued a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit as required by Section 703.2 (f) of the Subdivision Regulations.

Traffic counts on Altamaha Boulevard and Jetport Road will not be affected by this road segment. However, at the time a development is eventually proposed along the segment, traffic count impacts will be calculated.

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

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Richard Altman to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Summit Commercial  
Road Approval and Creation of 2 Lots  
9.064 acres, located near Spur 25/  
Glynco Parkway Intersection  
Golden Isles Gateway Tract, zoned  
Planned Development-General**

**Mitchell Land Company, Property Owners**

Mr. Tom Draff, representing the Mitchell Land Co., was present for discussion.

Mr. Dick Newbern explained that this item was placed on the agenda on Friday, October 2<sup>nd</sup> per direction of the County Administrator. Members of the Commission voiced concerns about not having enough time to review this item in that many of them did not receive this information until late Monday night. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to defer this item until the November 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-25-98**

**Request to amend 21-82 Planned Development Zoning Text and Master Plan. Amendment involves signage for the 7.001 acre site at "Nalley Brunswick," located on the southeast corner of F-009 Spur/Spur 25 and Altama Connector, known as Lot 3, Block J, Glynn Place Commercial Park.**

**Property owned by C. V. Nalley, III**

Mr. Mark Hall, representing Nalley, was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review:

This request is for an amendment to an existing Planned Development for the Regional Shopping Mall and Related Commercial Development Area, which was adopted in 1982. The subject property is "Nalley Brunswick," consisting of 7.001 acres located on the southeast corner of F-009 Spur/Spur 25 and Altama Connector, Glynn Place Commercial Park.

The Planned Development Zoning District and Glynn County Zoning Ordinance allows the following commercial signage:

- Four signs for the property, of which one (1) can be a pylon sign;
- No single sign shall exceed 378 sq. ft.; and
- Total signage for the property can not exceed 500 sq. ft.

According to the application submitted, the existing signage does not meet the requirements as outlined in the Planned Development Zoning Text and the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

Currently, there are 10 signs located on the property, five of which are pylon signs. The total signage is 546 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing to remove two signs having a total of 93 sq. ft., and replace them with two new signs having a total 148 sq. ft. In doing so, the square footage of signage would be increased.

The applicant is requesting that the Planned Development Zoning Text be amended as to the number of signs and square footage of signage allowed. The following outlines the allowed signage, existing signage, requested signage and staff's recommendation for signage:

Signage Allowed	Existing Signage	Requested Signage	Recommended Signage
3 Wall Signs	5 Wall Signs	5 Wall Signs	3 Wall Signs
1 Pylon Sign	5 Pylon Signs	5 Pylon Signs	4 Pylon Signs
500 sq. ft.	546 sq. ft.	601 sq. ft.	*500 sq. ft.

\*The 421 sq. ft. is what the 7 signs have in square feet.

According to Ken Conley, Ordinance Supervisor, records show that only four of the ten signs have been issued sign permits.

The applicant would like to amend the Planned Development Text to state the following:

...Nalley Brunswick, which will be granted five wall signs and five pylon signs, having a total of 601 sq. ft. as follows:

- Sign #1) Honda ID 3 ft. x 5 ft., 45 sq. ft.
- Sign #2) Jeep Eagle ID 8 ft. x 6 ft., 48 sq. ft.
- Sign #3) Quick Lube Readerboard 4 ft. x 6 ft., 24 sq. ft.
- Sign #4) General Motors ID 11 ft. x 11 ft., 121 sq. ft.
- Sign #5) Electronic Message Center 4 ft. x 20 ft., 80 sq. ft.
- Sign #6) Quick Lube Wall Sign 18 in. x 14 ft., 21 sq. ft.
- Sign #7) Service Wall Sign 18 in. x 10 ft., 15 sq. ft.
- Sign #8) Nalley Honda Wall Sign 6 ft. x 20 ft., 120 sq. ft.
- Sign #9) Used Cars Wall Sign 24 in. x 18 in., 36 sq. ft.
- Sign #10) Used Cars Wall Sign 24 in. x 18 ft., 36 sq. ft.

Mr. Milburn stated that staff recommends allowing Pylon Signs 1, 2, 4 and 5 (this would allow the applicant to have three more pylon signs than the Ordinance allows) and Wall Signs 6, 7 and 9. The total square footage would be a maximum of 500 sq. ft., which is the maximum square footage permitted in the Ordinance).

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if the applicant was allowed the privilege of selecting the signs that would be acceptable. Mr. Milburn explained that staff conferred with the applicant and specifically asked them to provide a plan with location of the structures, sizes and needs. However, after staff's final recommendations, staff did not confer with the applicant on the selection of signs.

Mr. Mark Hall gave a brief presentation. He stated that the purpose of the amendment is due to their need to meet the requirements for two manufacturers. Chrysler, with the 1998 model and calendar year, stopped manufacturing their car line referred to as Eagle.

Therefore, every Jeep-Eagle dealer in North America has to replace the Jeep-Eagle sign with a sign that just says "Jeep." Honda has a logo that they have had for the last 20 years that spells out the word **Honda**. For the last 18 months in North America, they have been introducing their new logo sign, which is a large letter "H."

Mr. Hall stated that the "Jeep" sign that they would be replacing the Jeep-Eagle sign with is exactly the same size or within inches. Unfortunately, the big letter "H" is a larger sign, which is the reason for the increase in square footage.

Mr. Hall stated that at this point, they have a square footage of 546; however, they could replace the "Jeep" sign and the "Honda" sign with the signs required by the factories, and remove some other signage that would bring them in at 529 sq. ft.

Mr. Altman wanted to know if the Planning Commission could approve something less than what is being requested. Mr. Chuck Taylor explained that the Planning Commission could state that the total sign area for the site cannot exceed what is allowed, and instruct staff to work with the applicant in bringing all of the signs into compliance.

At the Planning Commission's request, Mr. Hall demonstrated how the signage could be reduced.

Mr. S. C. Anderson stated that the applicant is in violation of the Ordinance by having three pylon signs. If the applicant were required to use one pylon sign, which would be more important, the brand recognition or the name of the ownership. Mr. Hall feels that all of the pylon signs are extremely important. He stated that he would rather remove some wall signage.

For clarification, Mr. Shell pointed out that the applicant would be allowed to have two new signs with the understanding that #9 and #10 would be removed, which would bring the square footage to 529. Mr. Hart wanted to know if any of the other signs are in violation of the Ordinance. Mrs. Deborah Taylor explained that signs 3, 5, 9 and 10 have been permitted. Whether the applicant would be required to obtain permits for the other signs is dependent upon the Planning Commission's action.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Shell to approve the replacement of signs 1 and 2 with the understanding that signs 9 and 10 would be removed for a total square footage of 529. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

-----

GC-26-98

Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial two tracts of land, tracts being divided by Sunbelt Way. Tract A located to the northwest and Tract B located to the south.

Tract "A" 1.669 acres located southeast of Willow Creek Plantation, north of Deer Wood Way (Pinemeadows Subdivision) and west of Sunbelt Way;

Tract "B" 10.189 acres located on the northeast corner of U.S. Highway 17 (471.65 ft. of frontage) and Deer Wood Way (375.14 ft. of frontage); subject property beginning approximately 1,800 ft. east of Buck Swamp Road and 3,000 ft. west of Highway 82 and U.S. 17 intersection.

Property owned by Sunbelt, Inc.

Mr. Robert Jenkins and Mr. Bill Kirby were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review:

The subject property is located within an area that has encountered growth within recent years. The property owner has developed residential subdivisions to the south and west of the tracts of land involved in this request.

Presently, the tracts only consist of scattered pines and hardwoods. The applicant proposes to rezone the property to allow the development of needed services within the area. The application states that these type uses would provide goods and services, possibly a grocery store, drug store, bank, etc. The concept plan submitted only shows proposed buildings and parking.

According to the information submitted, there is only one access drive being proposed to serve Tract A, which would be from Deer Wood Way. Deer Wood Way would also serve access to Tract B. According to the property owners, they have not requested an access drive from the Georgia Department of Transportation onto U.S. Highway 17 nor do they propose one.

Along this section of U.S. Highway 17, between Belle Cut Off Road and Buck Swamp Road, there are several zoning classifications and land uses; commercial, industrial, and residential (site-built homes, mobile homes and manufactured homes). The subject property is located approximately 450 ft. south of a Highway Commercial District and 700 ft. north of a 1.71 acre tract of land that was rezoned in 1988 to Limited Industrial with conditions regarding access and buffering. Directly across U.S. Highway 17 is a tract of land zoned Forest Agricultural, but undeveloped at this time, with the exception of the construction of a road known as South Port Parkway. This road also serves the new elementary school, Satilla Marsh Elementary.

Mr. Ron Milburn stated that in conformance with Section 1103. of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following facts 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;**

Tract A: No, because of the residential homes surrounding the tract, except on its east side which is Tract B.

Tract B: Yes, it fronts on Highway 17 and has only three adjacent homes.

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

Tract A: Yes, because of the surrounding residential homes.

Tract B: No, because it fronts on Highway 17 and there is a Welding & Machine Shop to its east.

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

Tracts A & B: The property is zoned Forest Agricultural and could be subdivided for residential homes.

- **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;**

Tracts A & B: No, U.S. Highway 17 is a major highway and schools will not be affected. New schools have been built to accommodate the new residential growth in this area.

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

Tracts A & B: No, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan map indicates that this property is low density residential. If Tract A and/or B were rezoned to Highway Commercial, the Comprehensive Plan would have to be changed.

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

Yes, the area is growing in Planning Districts 3, 4 & 5 with new residential units. From January 1991 to July 1998, 690 single-family residential building permits were issued. During this same time period, the surrounding area along U.S. Highway 17 between Belle Cut Off Road and Buck Swamp Road, there have been 9 residential subdivisions approved (198 single-family residential lots).

Mr. Milburn stated that staff recommends denial of Tract A, but recommends approval of Tract B.

Mr. Russ Edgy, adjacent property owner, expressed genuine concern for his neighborhood. He presented a petition consisting of approximately 42 signatures of homeowners opposing Tract A of this request. He stated that when he learned about the rezoning, he rode his bicycle around the neighborhood in the rain collecting signatures

on the petition. In defending his neighborhood against the commercial rezoning, Mr. Edgy stated that they "don't live in Hampton Point. They live in trailers, but they live in a clean neighborhood." He stated that he is not opposed to Tract B, but would like a buffer between the commercial property and the residential area.

Ms. Nelda Wilburn of 119 Deer Wood Way stated that there is only one access to the property. She is opposed to Tract A due to traffic problems and for safety reasons.

Mr. Rhett Sexton, 110 Sunbelt Way, stated that he is opposed to Tracts A and B. As pointed out by Mr. Edgy, they live in a nice clean neighborhood. School buses need to get in and out. He stated that if this area were rezoned for commercial development, it would increase crime and traffic and would decrease their property value.

Mr. Robert Jenkins stated that the property does have another access off of Bumgardner Road. He stated that in light of the opposition and staff's recommendation, he would like to withdraw the request to rezone Tract A and concentrate on rezoning Tract B at this time. Mr. Kirby stated that they would be willing to place a 20 ft. undisturbed natural buffer adjacent to the residential subdivision. The residents concurred with this recommendation.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of Tract B subject to a 20 ft. undisturbed natural buffer being provided adjacent to residential property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-98 J**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Section 619. Site Plan Approval Regarding documentation, process and number of plans to be submitted**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. (Language highlighted has been added and language with lines drawn through has been deleted.)

619.2 Requirements - The site plan shall include the following information:

- 9) **Site lighting fixtures, poles and direction of light.**
  - i) Location of signs, **or note that no signage is proposed.**
  - j) Tree survey showing all ~~specimen~~ **mature** trees with a trunk diameter of 24 inches or more measured 4.5 ft. up from the base.
- 1) **The final version of the site plan must also be provided on an 11 x 17 page.**

\* In the case of a site plan for property already zoned for multi-family use and the total property or development project in one-half acre or less in size, it shall be considered a minor development. This will require only an administrative review and approval by the Planning Official within five (5) working days after submission. Minor developments must meet the requirements of Section 619.2 a) through k).

\* **Note:** If proposed amendment **GC-2-98 K** is approved, the above paragraph would not read as stated but as proposed in the next amendment.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of the amendment to Section 619. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-98 K**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance - Proposed amendment to require all multi-family & commercial developments for Planning Districts 10, 11, 12 and 13 to receive Site Plan Approval by the Glynn County Planning Commission.**

**The following sections to be amended:**

**Section 619. Site Plan  
Section 710. Office Commercial  
Section 711. Local Commercial  
Section 712. General Commercial  
Section 713. Highway Commercial  
Section 714. Freeway Commercial**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. (Language highlighted has been added.)

**PROPOSED TO READ:**

**In all Planning Districts except 10, 11, 12 and 13, site plan for property already zoned for multi-family use and the total property of development project is one-half acre or less in size, it shall be considered a minor development...**

**In Planning Districts 10, 11, 12, and 13 all property zoned for multi-family will require site plan approval by the Planning Commission.**

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that members of the commission should review site plans in all planning districts. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Richard Altman to recommend that the Planning Commission review site plans in all planning districts. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Shell and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SR-5-98**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, Section 703. Preliminary Plat, Regarding the number of plats and information to be submitted for review.**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Richard Altman to recommend approval of the amendment to Section 703. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Shell and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SR-6-98**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, Section 704 Final Plat, regarding information required to be submitted**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Richard Altman to recommend approval of the amendment to Section 704. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----

**MINUTES**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Lamar Cole and seconded by Mr. Richard Altman, the Minutes of the September 1, 1998 regular meeting and the Minutes of the August 27, 1998 public hearing were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

**STAFF ITEMS**

At the September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Planning Commission granted permission for Mr. Chuck Taylor to draft changes to the Exterior Lighting, Landscaping & Buffer Requirements. At this time, copies of the Landscape Ordinance were distributed for review.

The draft, entitled "Landscaping Ordinance of Glynn County," contains changes proposed by Mr. Taylor to include definitions, applicability, plan review process, information on minimum plant requirements, design criteria, maintenance, enforcement and legal status provisions. Each of these were reviewed and briefly discussed. The Landscaping Ordinance will be advertised for formal action at the November 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Taylor stated that he would draft proposals on Exterior Lighting, Buffers, Tree Save and Architectural Guidelines for review and comments at the November 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

-----

Also under Staff Items, Mr. Taylor presented a copy of a memo and attachments from Mrs. Deborah Taylor outlining proposed amendments that are currently under review (for informational purposes).

-----

### **COMMISSION ITEMS**

Referring back to the proposed Island Planning Commission, Mr. Jeff Shell stated that St. Simons residents want more regulations concerning island planning and development issues. He stated in his opinion, perhaps there is a need to expand the ordinances, membership, etc. Along those same lines, Chairman Jones stated that several areas of Glynn County have unique needs. She advised that she has appointed a seven-member committee to review and make necessary changes to county ordinances and regulations. The committee would include four members from District 2 (St. Simons, Little St. Simons and Sea Island), and three members from the mainland.

A list of the committee members and meeting schedule is forthcoming.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12:17 p.m.