

# MINUTES

GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 2, 1999 9:00 A.M.

-----

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

STAFF PRESENT: Chuck Taylor, Director  
Cindy Olness, Acting Planning Official  
Lee Thomasson, Planner  
Deborah Taylor, Zoning Administrator  
Ellis Carter, Building Official  
Jim Bruner, County Engineer  
Janet Loving, Administrative Secretary

-----

Chairman 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, Chairman Altman announced that Agenda Item #5 Application GC-5-99 (**Proposal for Asphalt Plant**) would be heard at 1:45 p.m.

-----

**Preliminary Plat  
Skylane Court  
Located in the Malcolm McKinnon Airport, SSI  
1.868 acres, 80 ft. right-of-way, Skylane Court  
3 Commercial Lots, Zoned Planned Development-  
General**

**Glynn County Airport Commission, Developer**

Mr. Steve Brian, Managing Director for the Airport Commission, was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Lee Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of 1.868 total acres (81,379 sq. ft.) to be subdivided into three lots comprising 1.662 acres (72,379 sq. ft.). Also proposed is a 50 ft. right-of-way encompassing 0.344 acres (9,000 sq. ft.) to be entitled Skylane Court. This new roadway is to be improved to county standards and then dedicated to Glynn County. The three lots average 24,126.33 square footage.

The water source, as well as the sewerage treatment service, will be provided by the Glynn County Environmental Quality Department. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit is not required for this development.

The Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Fire Department, Engineering, GIS and Environment Quality have all favorably reviewed this project.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends approval of this request with the condition that an additional width measurement be provided for Skylane Drive south of its intersection with the proposed Skylane Court and shown on the final plat.

Mr. Hal Hart had questions about the 50 ft. buffer and the 25 ft. buffer as to the type buffers being proposed. Mr. Thomasson stated that there is a non-disturbed buffer proposed in the rear, which is required per the PD Text. The 25 ft. buffer along Island Drive is a non-access natural buffer.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request with the condition stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----  
**Preliminary Plat**  
**Morgan's Mill Subdivision**  
**Located on the west side of U.S. Highway 17**  
**Approximately 358 ft. north of Deerfield Drive**  
**35.4958 acres, 60 ft. right-of-way, Willow Pond**  
**Way, 57 Single-Family Residential Lots**

**Worthing Road, L.C.C., Developer**

Mr. John Hunkley, Coastal Engineering Consultants, was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of 35.4958 total acres to be subdivided into 57 lots comprising 29.887 acres. Also proposed is a 60 ft. right-of-way to be entitled Willow Pond Way and encompassing 5.609 acres. The common area, including the pond, occupies an area of 40,491 sq. ft. Willow Pond Way is to be improved to county standards and then dedicated to the county. The lot size average is 22,121.54 sq. ft.

The water source, as well as the sewerage treatment service, will be provided by the City of Brunswick. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit has been granted by the Building Official on January 21, 1999 (Permit #9901118).

The Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Fire Department, Engineering, GIS and the City of Brunswick Water /Waste Water Department have all favorably reviewed this project.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends approval of this project with the condition that an additional width measurement be provided by U. S. Highway 17 (north of its intersection with the proposed Willow Pond Way) and shown on the final plat.

Mrs. Touw stated that the Water and Sewer Department has given a favorable recommendation. They have reviewed the preliminary plans, but they want the final plans reviewed before construction. Mrs. Touw asked if that should be made a condition of approval. Mr. Thomasson replied yes. He agrees that it should be a condition. Mrs. Touw then asked if the applicant has approval from DOT for the cut onto Highway 17. Mr. Thomasson replied yes, and the letter is on file.

Mr. John Hunkley gave a brief presentation. He stated that they have no problem submitting final construction plans on the water and sewer, but the City of Brunswick has not given any comments indicating what needs to be different. In lieu of comments, he stated that their position is that they have final plans in their possession.

Mr. Thomasson explained that one of the contributing issues to this was the time restraint of receiving the information from the city, therefore staff had to rely on a verbal exchange with Mr. Powell.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this request subject to a letter of approval from the City of Brunswick. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **Site Plan**

#### **Stores at Hampton**

**Located on the west side of Butler Lake Drive at the intersection of Rice Mill, 1 acre, 5,044 sq. ft. building with 17,261 sq. ft. of parking, drives and other site improvements, Zoned Planned Development-General**

#### **Custom Classic Design, Inc., Developer**

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of one acre (43,560 sq. ft.), a proposed 30 ft. driveway, a parking lot with 21 spaces, and walkways encompassing 17,261 sq. ft. This site development plan also includes a single building with a footprint of 5,044 sq. ft. for a total site coverage of 51%. The building has 4,530 sq. ft. of floor area and will include one retail store and two individual spaces for either retail stores or offices. This total includes a 400 sq. ft. office located in the attic. Parking is sufficient per the ordinance.

The water source, as well as the sewerage treatment service, will be provided by Glynn County Environmental Quality Department. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit is not required for this development.

The Planning & Zoning Division, Building Inspections, Fire Department, Engineering, GIS Department and Environmental Quality have all favorably reviewed this project.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends approval of this request as to its technical compliance including all items of recommendation from both the County Commission and the Planning Commission per the conditions outlined in the Planned Development Zoning Text dated July 6, 1989. Additionally, staff recommends approval of this site plan for its reasonable alignment with the more subjective criteria of the staff recommendations within the same Text.

Mr. Robert Ussery gave a brief presentation. He stated that he met with several residents of Hampton Point in an effort to develop a suitable plan. He pointed out that the differences between this plan and the previous plan are: relocation of the gas pumps (moved from the front of the property to the back), one entrance has been eliminated, reduced parking from 36 to 21 spaces, reduced site coverage from 61% to 51%, reduced footprint of the building from 6,790 sq. ft. to 5,044 sq. ft., reduced heated and cool square footage from 7,156 sq. ft. to 4,530 sq. ft. and reduced height of the building from 34 ft. to 26 ft. 6 in.

Mr. Ussery presented photos of existing homes in the area for review and comparisons of the elevation of the store to the elevation of several homes in the area for similarities and compatibility in size.

It was noted that approximately 30 residents were present to oppose this request.

Mr. John Parker, 187 Rice Mill Road, was present to speak on behalf of the Hampton Point and Hampton Plantation homeowners. He stated that significant progress has been made since the last denial of this request. The visual size of the building has been reduced, the building height has been reduced, the footprint of the building has been reduced and the gas pumps have been moved, etc. However, the heated and cool square footage of 4,530 sq. ft. still exceeds that intended in Item 2 of the Planned Development Amendment of July 6, 1989. Mr. Parker stated that the size of the store still does not meet the characteristics of the existing homes in the area. He explained that the simple elimination of one of the shop offices producing a building containing a convenience store and one shop office would reduce the size to approximately 3,748 sq. ft. which would fulfil Item #2. If the applicant would agree to that change the homeowners of Hampton Point and Hampton Plantation would recommend approval of the site plan. Without that change, the plan should once again be denied.

Ms. Nannette Blumenfeld of 166 Rice Mill Road stated that she is opposed to this development being allowed at the entrance of a gated community. She pointed out that the residents only have one pool and one recreational facility to enjoy, but there are three other convenience stores only moments away. She invited the Planning Commission members to visit the facility for a better description.

Mr. Hal Hart commented that the convenience store is already included as an approved use in the July 6, 1989 text.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the site plan for the Stores at Hampton. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-3-99**

**Request to rezone from Resort Residential and R-6 One-Family Residential to General Commercial, 18,173 sq. ft. known as Lots 25 and 26 Kaufman Tract, portion of Lot 285 St. Simons Beach Subdivision and additional land. Subject property located on the northeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and 12<sup>th</sup> Street and further described as lying immediately west of 11<sup>th</sup> Street (unopened right-of-way also known as Oleander Drive) and north of St. Simons United Methodist Church, former site of NationsBank (previously known as First Federal), 621 Ocean Boulevard. The property is located within the St. Simons Village Preservation District.**

**NationsBank, N. A., Property Owner  
Attorney Carroll Palmatary, Agent**

Attorney Carroll Palmatary was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages and was presented by Ms. Cindy Olness as follows:

This request was submitted and heard at the Glynn County Planning Commission's meeting on January 5, 1999. Following presentation of the staff's report and discussion, the Planning Commission deferred the request. The applicant's agent, Attorney Palmatary, concurred with the deferral. The following are new staff comments, after staff's review of additional information that has been submitted since the Planning Commission's January meeting.

The subject property is located on the northeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Located on the property is an existing commercial structure consisting of 3,418 sq. ft. The structure has previously been the site of First Federal Savings and Loan and is currently known as the NationsBank property. The structure has been utilized as commercial for numerous years and is considered a non-conforming use.

The subject property currently has two zoning classifications, Resort Residential and R-6 One-Family Residential. The applicant is seeking to rezone the entire property to General Commercial and utilize the structure for commercial.

The applicant has submitted a letter stating that they desire to continue with their rezoning request to General Commercial. The letter outlines the commercial zoning districts within the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance and states why these requirements for these districts cannot be met. The letter further states that the applicant is willing to voluntarily limit the future use of the existing building, for the following commercial uses:

- Photographic Studio
- Bank, savings and loan, personal loan agency, financial institution or branch
- Insurance Agency
- Office for governmental, business, professional or general office purposes
- Real Estate Agency
- Travel Agency
- Advertising Agency
- Church or church related uses

The letter further states that the applicant agrees that the footprint of the existing building will not be changed, and that no trees will be cut or removed to enlarge or increase parking areas. If at any time in the future any changes may be made to the building, they will protect and maintain the existing trees to enhance the residential buffer to meet the Village Preservation overlay criteria.

During the January meeting, it was expressed by the Planning Commission that this rezoning request should not just be considered for utilization of the existing building and property, but for the future use of the property in the event that the building is removed. Staff's consideration was determined by considering both the existing situation and future land use patterns in the general area.

The concept plan submitted shows the property currently having 11 parking spaces on site with an additional 8 parking spaces which are located entirely within the county rights-of-way of Ocean Boulevard and 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Based on the area of the existing structure, a total of 17 parking spaces would be required to utilize the building for office use (1 space for each 200 sq. ft. of floor area). Based on this, additional off-street parking would need to be provided on-site if the property is rezoned to commercial and renovated for office use. The subject property is located within the St. Simons Village Preservation District, which would require site review by the Planning Commission for compliance with the district.

Located immediately to the east of the subject property is an existing right-of-way known as 11<sup>th</sup> Street a/k/a Oleander Drive. On the other side of this right-of-way is a parcel of land zoned General Commercial. This is the site of Denny Silva's accounting office. The Silva property was zoned from R-6 Residential to Office Commercial in the early 1960's and then rezoned from Office Commercial to General Commercial in 1984.

Located along Ocean Boulevard to the west and south is Resort Residential. The property to the west is a residential structure and to the south is the St. Simons United Methodist Church. To the north is R-6 One-Family Residential with a single-family residence and a vacant lot.

Staff supports the rezoning of the subject property with the clear understanding that in order for the structure to be used as commercial, the requirements of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance would have to be met.

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact 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, the proposed uses with conditions as stated in the staff's recommendation, are compatible with the uses in the area.

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

No, a buffer as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance is provided. A buffer would be required on the northern property line where the property abuts the residential district to insure separation and screening.

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

Yes, the property is zoned to allow residential development; however, to develop the entire property for multi-family residential or a motel/hotel under Resort Residential, would require that the R-6 Residential portion be rezoned to Resort Residential.

- **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, since the property has been utilized as commercial for numerous years. The types of uses listed in the staff's recommendation would not have any more impact than the previous use as a bank. As for the impact on the road right-of-way, the removal of the parking on the county's right-of-way for the new use would be an improvement. It has been expressed that this parking on the county right-of-way has caused traffic problems in the past.

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

Yes, the property is shown on the Land Use Map 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;**

None that staff is aware of.

Ms. Olness stated that staff recommends approval of this request subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Set back requirements for any new development be established as follows:

Front: Twenty (20) feet

Side: Ten (10) feet

Rear: Ten (10) feet

- 2) Limit commercial uses as stated in the applicant's letter and outlined in the staff comments to the following:

- Photographic Studio
- Bank, savings and loan, personal loan agency, financial institution or branch
- Insurance Agency
- Office for governmental, business, professional or general office purposes
- Real Estate Agency

- Travel Agency
- Advertising Agency
- Church or church related uses

3) Development to meet the requirements outlined in the St. Simons Village Preservation District.

Chairman Altman asked if it is legal to accept a letter stating that this is all that the owner will do with the property. Ms. Olness replied that staff is not actually accepting their letter. She explained that staff reviewed the letter but has also put on other conditions that would be appropriate. If the owner were to sell the property, Chairman Altman asked what would prevent the new owner from putting another type of General Commercial use on the property. Ms. Olness explained that a future owner would be restricted by the same conditions. Chairman Altman then asked if this is legal. Ms. Olness replied yes.

Attorney Carroll Palmatary gave a brief presentation. He stated that the primary purpose of this request is to bring the property into a conforming use. It has been non-conforming for over 30 years. They simply want to make it conform to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Palmatary stated that the existing building would not meet any other zoning criteria in the ordinance because of the location, the setbacks and the way the building is positioned on the lot. General Commercial is the only classification that would apply in this case.

Attorney Palmatary stated that there were some concerns at the last meeting about what could possibly happen. He stressed that the applicant would like to assure the Planning Commission and the citizens of Glynn County that there would be no changes to this. They will use the existing building as it is with no modifications, and for that reason, the applicant is willing to allow the Planning Commission to put additional conditions and stipulations upon the rezoning, which the Planning Commission is entitled to do under Section 709 of the Zoning Ordinance. As outlined in his letter on behalf of NationsBank, they have absolutely no problem with that.

Mr. Clarke Adickes, adjoining property owner, stated that last month he spoke against this proposal because it appeared that anything could be done. He has since listened to the staff's report and he has no problem at all with office use for this property.

Ms. Reba Jackson, adjoining property owner, stated that she is concerned about the noise problem at night. She just wants assurance that the conditions will hold and the applicant will not have any loud night activity. Attorney Palmatary explained that they have no plans for any nighttime operations and they are agreeable to the stipulations.

Mrs. Touw stated that Planned Commercial cannot be done because the setbacks are not sufficient, but the Planning Commission is being asked to take General Commercial and put on four or five very important conditions. She stated that conditions have a tendency to slide. A zoning text, such as a Planned Commercial Zoning Text, is an ordinance for that property, and the only way exceptions can be made is by coming through the process. She stated that she understands what is being said; however, she does have concerns about how this will hold up down the line.

Ms. Olness explained that if conditions are set by the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners set those same conditions or additional conditions, they have the same weight as a Planned Development Text would have. The reason for not going to Planned Commercial was because setbacks were already specified, which meant that the existing building would be a non-conforming building. Rezoning the property this way would allow them to consider the existing building as conforming within the current district and any new construction would be required to meet the setbacks.

Mrs. Touw had questions about the statement in the applicant's letter that they agree that the footprint of the existing building will not be changed. She asked if this means that the building will not be enlarged, or does it mean that no building on the property will ever be larger than the footprint of the current building. Ms. Olness stated

that the only conditions listed are those listed in the staff's recommendation, which did not include anything related to the footprint. The building is within the Village Preservation District, which means that the entire site coverage cannot be greater than 50%. Therefore, what the applicant has included in the letter would not be the conditions that the Planning Commission set. The conditions that the Planning Commission set would be stated in the motion.

Mr. Jeff Shell pointed out that in the letter from the applicant, the applicant has stated that "if at anytime in the future any changes may be made to the building they would protect and maintain the existing trees." For clarification, Mr. Shell wanted to know if in fact any changes are made in the future, would the applicant have to come before the Planning Commission. Ms. Olness stated that for Village Preservation, the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hart stated that Mr. Shell's point is listed in the staff's comments but it is not being made in the recommendation. Ms. Olness stated that is correct, staff did not put that in the recommendation, but the Planning Commission could add it as a condition.

Mr. Hart pointed out that staff's comment which states "staff supports the rezoning of the subject property with the clear understanding that in order for the structure to be used as commercial, the requirements of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance would have to be met," is contradictory because in order for the applicant to meet the requirements we'd have to give him certain rules and conditions, and in order for him to be commercial, he has to meet the ordinance. Ms. Olness explained that the only thing that is different is that any future new development would have to meet the setbacks if the Planning Commission chose that as a condition. The applicant would also be limited to the uses that staff has outlined if the Planning Commission chose that as a condition of the rezoning. She stated that everything else related to parking requirements, unloading spacing, etc. would have to be met. However, Mr. Hart contends that in his opinion, staff's comment is contradictory.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this request subject to the three conditions outlined by staff and subject to an additional stipulation that any changes to the building and/or property including trees must be approved by the Planning Commission and the County Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Shell. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mr. Jeff Shell, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Hal Hart.

-----

**GC-7-99**

**Request to rezone from Conservation Preservation to R-20 One-Family Residential, an island consisting of 2.938 acres lying adjacent to Dunbar Creek and being located 292.25 ft. north of the easterly portion of Hawkins Island off of Sea Island Road.**

**Property owned by Sea Island Company**

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Attorney Jim Gilbert were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

This request is to rezone an island located along Dunbar Creek and 292 feet north and east of Hawkins Island.

In 1997, a preliminary plat was approved for the development of Hawkins Island, which is located on the north side of Sea Island Road. The development has been final platted in several phases. The proposed access to the island would be from Hawkins Lane, which has not been final platted at this time. The developer proposes to construct a

bridge from the end of the subject road, which is a proposed cul-de-sac, to the Island. Construction for access would have to meet all requirements of the Glynn County Engineer as well as the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Under the current Conservation Preservation zoning classification, the island could be utilized as zoned for several permitted uses and conditional uses, such as a private non-commercial dock or boathouse or a commercial marina or bait house. The property could not be developed for residential, as desired by the owner, unless the property was classified as a wildlife refuge and then a caretaker's residence could be permitted as an accessory use.

The application submitted states that public water and sewer would be provided to the Island.

Within the last year, two hammocks have been rezoned from CP to Residential, one off Cart Subdivision (South Harrington Road area) and the other off Ocean Boulevard (existing boathouse).

As outlined in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, it is the intent of the Conservation Preservation District to be established and maintained to preserve and/or control development within certain land, marsh and/or water areas of Glynn County which 1) serves as wildlife refuges; 2) possess great natural beauty or are of historic significance; 3) are utilized for outdoor recreation purposes; 4) provide needed open space for the health and general welfare of the county's inhabitants; or 5) are subject to periodic flooding. The regulations which apply within this district are designed to reserve such areas for the purposes outlined herein and to discourage any encroachment by residential, commercial, industrial or other uses capable of adversely affecting the relatively undeveloped character of the district.

Based on previously approved requests and the subject request, staff and the Planning Commission need to consider the possible affect zoning changes could have on other small islands or land zoned Conservation Preservation. Staff continues to recommend that the Comprehensive Land Use Plan's "Future Land Use Map" be reviewed to insure that the county's policy regarding these hammocks is reflected.

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact 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, if the island is zoned and developed for single-family residential, it would be considered as an extension of the residential development being platted. There is a 292 ft. distance between the two islands.

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

No, if developed as single-family residential, it would be compatible with the existing single-family use on Hawkins Island.

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

Yes, the Conservation Preservation Zoning District allows the following permitted uses: 1) private non-commercial dock or boathouse; 2) government owned or operated use, facility or land; 3) farm for the growing of rice or other agricultural products including timber; 4) wildlife refuge including caretaker's residence as an accessory use; and 5) swimming beach.

- **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 significant burden is realized by the proposed zoning or residential use.

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

Yes, shown as low-density residential. As stated, staff continues to recommend that the Future Land Use Map be reviewed to insure that the county's policy regarding hammocks is reflected.

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

None that staff is aware of.

Ms. Olness stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Attorney Jim Gilbert gave a brief history of the area. He stated that on September 15, 1949 Sea Island Company purchased Hawkins Island and the entire tract of land. In 1986 the company began the low-density subdivision known as Hamilton Landing. In 1993 the company applied for a bridge permit, which was granted by the State of Georgia. In 1998 when that permit was to expire by the terms of the regulation, Sea Island had it extended through the year 2003. Now that these lots are being sold and Hawkins Island is planned for development, Sea Island is ready to sell the island to one individual.

Mr. Gilbert pointed out that there are a lot of other hammocks in the area owned by the Sea Island Company that should remain Conservation Preservation. However, the company had planned for many years to sell this particular hammock to one individual. He stated that since 1967 there have been 11 rezonings from CP to PD, R-6, R-12 and one Local Commercial. Since rezonings like this began Sea Island has never asked for a parcel of land to be changed from CP to a residential use and never will again, but as previously stated, this is one that they had planned to use for a residence.

Mr. Henry McGrath, Vice President of RUPA, was present to speak on behalf of RUPA in opposition to this request. In a letter from RUPA, Mr. McGrath outlined the importance of Conservation Preservation and why it is unnecessary to develop salt marsh hammocks. He urged the Planning Commission to deny this request and not allow the destruction of the last area of land, which has remained relatively free from development. He also urged the Planning Commission to abolish the current Zoning Ordinance, which allows salt marsh hammocks to be developed. Chairman Altman advised that changing the ordinance would have to be handled by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Frank Quinby wanted to know if a deed restriction could be required to insure that there would only be one residence with no further lots being subdivided. Mr. Gilbert replied yes, he would prepare a deed restriction, and if there is ever more than one lot, he would quit representing Sea Island. He stated that he has represented Sea Island Company for 30 years and they have never told him a lie.

Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that he understands RUPA's concerns about the marsh; however, he has enough faith in Sea Island to hold them accountable for their word.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Shell to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams; however, the motion was amended to add a stipulation that a deed restriction be prepared by the developer to insure that the property is limited to one residence. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mr. Jeff Shell, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman.

-----

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

-----

**GC -2-98N**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance  
Create new section to be known as Section 405. Glynn  
County Planning Districts; will include the adoption of  
a Glynn County Planning District Map and description,  
subject map proposed to consist of 13 districts.  
Initiated by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners**

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

**Section 405. Planning Districts**

With the adoption of this ordinance the Glynn County Board of Commissioners adopts certain Planning Districts which are shown on a separate map entitled "Glynn County Planning Districts." Said map shall be signed and dated by the County Commission Chairman and shall be kept with the Community Development Department of Glynn County. Amendments to said map shall constitute an amendment to this ordinance. These districts are intended to be used to write and enforce ordinances that may differ from one district to the next.

Mr. Lee Gilmour stated that several public hearings were held to discuss this proposal and based on those public hearings, there seem to be a consensus that 13 was too large of a number. Boundary locations were also discussed at length at the public hearings.

Mr. Boyce Mann, owner of Golden Isles Marina, stated that he is not really in favor of the zoning districts; however, if adopted, he would like to request that the boundary line be placed in the Frederica River and that Golden Isles Marina remain in the county.

Mr. Frank Quinby stated that the whole concept is a much better idea than having one Zoning Ordinance to encompass the entire county. He stated that he fully supports the idea of 4 or 5 districts.

Mr. Robert Ussery wanted to know if the county is under a mandate to have planning districts. Chairman Altman stated none that they are aware of to date.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of four (4) planning districts and to recommend that the boundary be moved from Back River to the center line of Frederica River. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Discussion continued. Afterward, the motion was amended to include the intent of the Planning Districts and also that the four (4) districts be numbered as follows: Mainland #1; St. Simons Island #2; City of Brunswick #3 and Jekyll Island #4. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-99 D**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance**

**Section 619. Site Plan Approval, to add the following language: "Inasmuch as St. Simons Island and Sea Island are designated as areas of Scenic Beauty and Historic Interest, all multi-family and commercial uses shall comply with this section of the ordinance." Other sections to be amended stating site plan approval is required, are 705.4 Resort Residential; 706.4 General Residential, 707.4 Medium Residential; 710.4 Office Commercial, 711.4 Local Commercial; 712.4 General Commercial; 713.4 Highway Commercial, and 715.4 General Commercial-Core**

**Initiated by the Glynn County Planning Commission**

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. Mr. Chuck Taylor stated that we now have a proposed map that clearly defines the limits of St. Simons Island. He stated that staff needs to know if there is any interest to amend this text to describe St. Simons Island as defined on the map. If the map is adopted, this ordinance can also be adopted and can be listed as an alternate.

Mr. Frank Quinby stated that the St. Simons Island Ordinance Review Committee unanimously recommends that the Planning Commission approve this amendment. They feel that it is a step in the right direction.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment, and if the Planning District Map is adopted, the designated numbers will be inserted into the amendment. (During discussion, Mrs. Jones wanted to make sure that the Planning District Map for District 2 reflects the boundary as the centerline of Frederica River). The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

-----

**GC-2-99E**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance**

**Section 803.5.3 Fluttering Ribbons and Banners; and  
Section 813 Areas of Scenic Beauty and Historic Interest**

**Initiated by the Glynn County Planning Commission**

Following review of the amendment, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment with the stipulation that if the County Commission adopts the Planning District Map, alternate language should be provided to describe St. Simons Island as shown on the map. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SR-8-98**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations**

**Delete Article VII in its entirety and replace with a new Article VII  
Process for Subdivision Plat Approval**

The amendment was included in the packages and the following changes were made: (words highlighted were added; words with lines drawn through were deleted.)

**Section 703 Preliminary Plat Requirements**

1. The proposed name of the subdivision and proposed street names **indicated as being public or private...**

Section 705 Construction Plan

5. If wells and/or septic systems are proposed, a copy of the application for approval by the Glynn County Environmental Health Department must be included. (Mr. Taylor suggested adding the following sentence: **Approval of the permit is required prior to land disturbance activity.**)

Section 706 Construction Plan Requirements

6. ...Show trees on county rights-of-way and adjacent to the tract to be subdivided and within county rights-of-way affected by utility **or other** construction.
8. Site grading and storm drainage ~~information plan~~ including ~~the following~~
  - b. A Hydrology Report **as required by the County Engineer prepared by professional engineer registered in the State of Georgia.**
  - j. The size **and** type of class of drainage...
  - l. Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control plans and details per ~~the latest edition of "The Manual for Erosion Control in Georgia."~~ **the Glynn County Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance.**
9. g. When a street **temporarily** ends...

Section 707 Construction Plan Review and Approval Procedures

...If no review comments have been generated during this time, the Community Development Director or his designee shall **either** approve the plan as submitted or report to the applicant in writing... **Revised** plans shall then be redistributed... Within 15 calendar days after re-submittal, the Community Development Director or his designee shall **either**...

Section 708 Final Plat

5. Record drawings of the water and sewer system as well as storm water management facilities **which shall bear the seal and signature of surveyor or engineer registered in the State of Georgia.**
7. **Results of tests and inspections required for construction.**

Section 709 Final Plat Requirements

9. Exact locations, widths, and names of all **public and private** streets...
- ~~10. Street centerlines showing angles of deflection, angles of intersection radii, length of tangents and arcs, and degree of curvature with basis of curve data.~~
12. Note: **county required** building setback dimensions ...

Section 710 Final Plat Approval

Note: Add **Environmental Quality Director** throughout this section

At the time for final plat approval...**The County Engineer and Environmental Quality Director shall have five (5) working days from notification of completion by the subdivider to perform an inspection of the improvements and notify the Director of Community Developer of the results...** The period within which required improvements must be completed shall be specified by the County Commission in the resolution approving the final plat ~~and shall be specified by the County Commission in the resolution approving the final plat.~~

**Inspection of Improvements for Benefit of Applicant.** Where a bond has been posted the County Commission shall provide, upon the applicant's request, an inspection of required improvements during construction to insure their satisfactory completion and to reduce the bond. In this event, the applicant shall pay to the county an inspection fee of one-half of one percent (1/2 of 1%) of the amount of the performance bond or \$50.00, whichever is greater. Fees shall be due and payable upon demand of the county and no certificates of occupancy shall be issued until all fees are paid.

If the County Engineer finds, upon inspection, that any of the required improvements have not been constructed in accordance with the county's standards and specifications, the applicant shall be responsible for completing the improvements. Wherever the cost of installing improvements is covered by a bond, the applicant and the bonding company shall be individually and jointly liable for completing the improvements according to specifications.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment subject to the changes being made and copies being provided to the Planning Commission in ample time to review prior to being forwarded to the County Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SR-1-99**

**Consider Amending the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations  
Article VIII, Section 801, Minor Subdivisions, Section 801.1  
Procedural Requirements, Section 802 Resubdivision of Land  
And Section 602.6 Private Access Easements**

The amendment was included in the packages for review; however, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission that additional time was needed to review the amendment. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to defer this item and invite the County Attorney to attend the next meeting for further discussion and to answer questions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----

At this time (12:40 p.m.) the Planning Commission recessed for lunch. The meeting resumed at 1:50 p.m.

-----

**GC-5-99**

**Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural and Basic Industrial to Planned Development-Industrial, 79.7 acres having an average depth of 3,900 ft. and fronting 875 ft. on the north side of Perry Lane Road; subject property lying immediately west of Ridgewood Subdivision (Southern Railroad dividing the subdivision and property), approximately 4,000 ft. east of New Jesup Road/Highway 341 and immediately north of Escambia Treating Company.**

**Property owned by J. D. Moore  
Attorney Jameson Gregg, Agent**

Attorney Gregg, Mr. J. D. Moore and Mr. & Mrs. Tom DeWitt were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

Several years ago the applicant requested that a portion of the subject property, acreage that is currently zoned Basic Industrial, be rezoned to Forest Agricultural but the application was denied due to existing industrial uses within the area that would not be compatible.

This request was heard at the January 5, 1999 Planning Commission meeting. At that time, Attorney Jameson Gregg (representing the property owner) stated during his presentation that if the rezoning request were denied, the plant could be located on the front portion of the subject property, which is currently zoned Basic Industrial.

Section 719. Basic Industrial, Subsection 719.2 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance states the following:

- 1) Any industrial use which involves manufacturing, processing or assembly operations, or the storage and sale of heavy materials, products or equipment; but not including junk or salvage yards or uses which may cause injurious or obnoxious noise, vibration, smoke, gas, fume, odor, dust, fire hazard, dangerous radiation or other conditions objectionable to adjacent or nearby areas.

Following discussion, the Planning Commission adopted a motion to defer the request for further information on traffic, environmental impact and for further information as to whether or not the proposed operation could be put on the front part of the property.

To answer the question of whether or not the plant could be located on Basic Industrial property a finding of fact regarding the use must be made. This finding of fact involved the staff from Glynn County Community Development and Environmental Health, and Planning Commission Members, as well as others, to make on-site visits to these type operations to obtain additional information. The following memos were included in the packages for review:

- Memo dated 1-21-99 from Ordinance Supervisor to Acting Planning Official  
Subject: Noise Survey of PAVE-TEC Asphalt Plant, Savannah, GA
- Memo dated 1-22-99 from Acting Planning Official to Planning Commission  
Subject: Asphalt Plants in BI Zoning Districts
- Memo dated 1-26-99 from Wayne Nuenke, Glynn County Environmental Health to Mr. Virgil Fancher, District Environmentalist Coastal Health District  
Subject: Asphalt Plant Visit Findings.

To address traffic, staff reviewed transportation data but has not found comparable traffic generating land uses in the ITE Manuel to do a comparison. The number of trips per day would vary depending on what contracts the company had at any given time. However, at January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, it was pointed out by Mr. David Brisley, Operational Service Manager for Martin Marietta, that there would be approximately 50 trucks per day or 100 trips per day (in and out) but there could also be times when traffic will increase to 220 to 230 trucks per day.

As stated at the January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, this request is to rezone 79.688 acres, of which currently 48.171 acres is zoned Forest Agricultural and 31.517 acres is zoned Basic Industrial. The request is to rezone the property to Planned Development-Industrial to allow industrial uses. According to the Planned Development Zoning Text, the property is proposed to be divided into two development tracts, as follows:

- Tract I: Will consist of 19.3 acres fronting on Perry Lane Road. Proposed to be developed for Limited Industrial uses (as outlined in Section 718 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.)
- Tract II: Will consist of 60.4 acres located immediately north of Tract I. Proposed land uses are for the establishment of rock aggregate stockpile areas, the construction and operation of a ready-mix concrete plant and asphalt plant, the construction and operation of a scale house and parking area for all of said uses and the construction of a railroad siding. The other uses would be the uses that would be incidental to the operation described. The other requirements are those outlined in Section 719.4 General Industrial.

Staff has evaluated the industrial land available and advises against additional industrial zoning along this section of Perry Lane Road.

With this request, the Planned Development would re-designate 19 acres of the 31 acres to allow less intense industrial uses (Limited Industrial) with the remaining 12 acres being designated for more intense industrial use (General Industrial). The remaining 48 acres involved in this rezoning request, which is currently zoned Forest Agricultural, would be incorporated with the 12 acres.

The Planned Development Zoning Text and Master Plan details the proposed land uses and development standards, open space and common areas, utilities, access, signs and buffers, development schedule and assurances for installation and maintenance of improvements.

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact 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, would have an impact on the adjacent Forest Agricultural zoned property, which is developed as residential. Would not have an impact on the adjacent property owned by Glynn County, which is the previous landfill.

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

Yes, the operation of an asphalt plant and ready-mix plant by Martin Marietta Materials, Inc. would have an impact on adjacent residential properties.

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

Yes, the rear portion (48 acres) could be developed under the Forest Agricultural zoning with adequate buffers from the front portion of the property (38 acres) that is already zoned for industrial uses. The FA district allows for a variety of land uses including 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;**

Yes, an additional 48 acres of industrially zoned land would have an impact on Perry Lane Road. Perry Lane Road is scheduled to have road improvements but would not involve widening the existing 60 ft. right-of-way. The road improvements would consist of intersection modifications at Spur 25 and Perry Lane Road (long range). There would be modifications to intersections and railroad crossings to improve motor vehicle safety.

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

The land use map shows this area as residential/agricultural. Recent development trends in this area lean toward residential. A rezoning request previously submitted by the owner for industrial portion of the land to become residential failed because located across Perry Lane Road is a polluted site being cleared up with superfund moneys. Once that site is cleared, staff feels that the industrial acreage owned by Mr. Moore could be rezoned to allow a residential development.

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

None that staff is aware of.

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending denial of this request.

Attorney Jameson Gregg was present to represent Mr. J. D. Moore who has owned the property for 35 years. He explained that this request has evolved into two issues. The first issue initially submitted was the rezoning issue. As stated last month, it is their premise that the project could go on the front 31 acres that is already zoned Basic Industrial, but is it better planning to put the project on the back of the property. He stated that they could down zone the front property and put the project on the back portion where it would be adjacent to the Cate Road Landfill, would be less intrusive to the surrounding property, and would have more available space for buffers.

Mr. Gregg stated that the second issue is whether or not this project could go on the front of the property. He stated that there was not a specific site plan submitted, but he does have the same proposed site plan from last month's meeting, which shows the front 31 acres currently zoned Basic Industrial. He stated there is no question that the project could go on the front portion of the property if they were to pass the test in the Zoning Ordinance involving permitted uses, which he feels strongly that Martin Marietta can pass.

Mr. Gregg then referred to the three reports included in the planning packages as a result of the county's visit to several asphalt plants in the surrounding areas. He stated that the noise issue is perhaps the only objective quantitative element in the lists of dangers. In Mr. Ken Conley's report on the noise survey of PAVE-TEC Asphalt Plant in Savannah, Mr. Conley listed the maximum decibels allowed under the Noise Ordinance at the property boundary. Also according to the report, 90% of the time the decibels were below the day time limits. Mr. Gregg pointed out that when Mr. Conley performed the noise detection test he was in the open area. Martin Marietta officials are proposing that by using earth and berm buffering they are confident that they can comply with the decibel requirement in the Noise Ordinance.

Referring to the second report from Mr. Wayne Nuenke of Environmental Health, Mr. Gregg stated that Mr. Nuenke's task was to look at environmental concerns, i.e., vibrations, smoke, gas, fume, odor, dust, fire hazard, dangerous radiation, etc. According to Mr. Nuenke's report of the PAVE-TEC plant in Savannah, "the entire processing area was paved, eliminating a major portion of any possible dust production." Mr. Gregg stated that if Glynn County wants Martin Marietta to pave the area, then they would do so. Also according to Mr. Nuenke's report on odor, he stated that the "odor was only slightly noticeable." Mr. Nuenke suggested that a containment plan be used for all compounds.

On the second plant, APAC in Savannah, Mr. Nuenke mentioned that a mechanical winch was used to move full rail cars for unloading. Mr. Gregg stated that a mechanical winch would be used with this particular project as well. Plant #3 APAC in Kingsland is a temporary site located on 8 acres. The acreage for the project being proposed by Martin Marietta is 31 acres if it goes on the front and 60 acres if it goes on the back. Mr. Nuenke pointed out in his report that there was more dust at the plant in Kingsland because it was not paved, and perhaps it was not paved because it is a temporary site. Martin Marietta would do all necessary paving to keep the dust below the problematic levels.

Mr. Gregg stated that in Mr. Nuenke's conclusion, he states that "as you can tell from these observations, not too many public health risks were found at the plants visited. Most of what I found would probably fall into DNR-EPD's area of coverage with a few falling under various county offices." Mr. Gregg stated that the project being proposed by Martin Marietta would fully comply or exceed all EPD and EPA standards.

Mr. Gregg then referenced Ms. Olness' report regarding the BI Zoning Districts. He stated that the question is what is the standard for preventing someone from using his/her property under this section of the ordinance. The standard for preventing this would be if there were a substantial risk or a substantial problem. He pointed out that a minimal or incidental problem is not enough to allow the county to constitutionally prevent someone from using his/or property under this section. This section must be complied consistently and you cannot discriminate in the application of this section, which means that if Mr. Moore is denied the right to use his property based on this section, then this would have to be consistently applied to everyone.

Mr. Gregg stated that Ms. Olness concludes that "staff has determined that it is not likely that these uses can be located on the front portion of the property being considered for rezoning." He stated that this conclusion was based on *conditions objectionable to adjacent or nearby areas*. Mr. Gregg stated that he questions the constitutionality and the legality of this provision of the ordinance in that the "Georgia Supreme Court has held repeatedly that objections to rezoning by neighboring residents is not a sufficient reason to justify a denial of a rezoning application."

Mr. Gregg then addressed the letter from Mr. Harlan Hambright of the Board of Education regarding traffic. In his letter, Mr. Hambright expressed concerns about the children's safety in the school zone. Mr. Gregg explained that the trucks servicing the asphalt plant would not go by the school (Golden Isles Elementary School). The trucks would come within approximately one half mile of the school. One of the access routes to the plant is shared with one of the access routes to the school.

In conclusion, Mr. Gregg stated that they are not introducing industrial zoning to the area. He reiterated that it would be better planning to put the project on the back portion of the property because it would be closer to the landfill, it would be less intrusive to the surrounding property, and there is more acreage in the back to allow for buffers.

Mr. David Brisley, Operational Service Manager for Martin Marietta, addressed the hours of operation, which he stated was blown out of proportion. He explained that paving contractors would prefer to pave during daylight hours; however, there are constraints on major roads. The Department of Transportation determines what kind of impact a project has on traffic on major roads, i.e., I-95. The paving contractor has to take daily traffic counts and if the number gets to a certain level, he has to stop paving during the day and start paving at night.

Mr. Brisley stated that during 1998 the Camden County plant (which is proposed to be moved to Glynn County) paved a total of six weeks at night. He explained that in order to operate 24 hours a day, additional paving crew and operating crew would have to be brought in. The crew would pave at night and go home to sleep during the day. The plant does not run continuously 24 hours a day.

In addressing the rail service in relation to disruption to traffic, Mr. Brisley explained that the yard would be serviced once a day. The empty cars would be pulled out and loaded cars would be placed in the yard, which takes 15 or 20 minutes. The locomotive then leaves with the empty cars. He elaborated on the procedure of using a winch to unload the cars, which he stated does not generate any noise.

To further address traffic, Mr. Brisley presented the most recent DOT traffic count report for Glynn County dated 12-5-97 with emphasis on the local schools.

Mr. Tom DeWitt gave a brief presentation on behalf Mr. Moore (who is his father-in-law). He also elaborated on the history of Mr. Moore's property and the importance of approving this request.

It was noted that there were over 50 people present to oppose this request. A spokesperson was designated; however, Chairman Altman advised that anyone wishing to speak for or against this request would have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Mathew Lieurance stated that he is opposed to this request due to the increase of traffic, especially near Glyndale Elementary School. He is also concerned that this proposed project would devalue his property.

Others present to speak in opposition of this request due to traffic, dust, noise and their children's safety were Ms. Miranda Smith, Mr. Chris Kennedy and Mr. Loy Mallard. Mr. Paul Reddick was also present to oppose. He stated that he is not against growth, but the Escambia Treating Company proved to be bad neighbors and he doesn't want to see this happen again.

Mr. Don Kirkland stated that he is not against industry coming into Glynn County but he is against this coming into his neighborhood, as would anyone on St. Simons or Sea Island. He stated that they are trying to protect their children and their neighborhood. He took particular exception to Mr. Gregg's statement regarding the courts ruling that public opposition was not enough to deny a request. Mr. Kirkland presented petitions consisting of 900 signatures of citizens who are opposed to this request, and stated that he disagrees with the courts ruling. He stated that there isn't a Supreme Court Judge that lives within 20 miles of an asphalt plant. Mr. Kirkland stated that he and the other property owners would not be satisfied with this proposed project being on the front or back of the property because either way, the same problems would exist. He stressed that he is sorry that Mr. Moore has not been able to do anything with his property, but they don't want an asphalt plant in their neighborhood.

Chairman Altman stated that they visited two plants in Savannah and one plant in Camden County. The two plants in Savannah were expecting them but the plant in Camden was not. All three plants for the most part were clean and had very little odor. Mr. Altman's personal opinion was that he would not categorize the three asphalt plants with the Escambia Treating Company. He then presented photos of the three plants.

Mr. Hal Hart had questions regarding the noise test. He stated that after the plant has opened and if they were to exceed the noise level, odor or any nuisance, can they be legally shut down. Mr. Ken Conley explained that industrial uses are not included in the Noise Ordinance, but if the applicants had a PD Text the county would have some enforcement capability because it could then be related back to the Glynn County Code of Ordinances, which does include noise.

Mr. Jonathan Williams noted that there is a lot of speculation, i.e., traffic, the amount of trucks going in and out, whether or not the project can go on the front or back, etc.; however, the Planning Commission's recommendation must be based on knowledge and not speculation. He stated that personally, he does not feel comfortable making a determination as to what a neighborhood should or should not have. He pointed out however, that we do need to decide if we're going to progress or not.

Mrs. Iris Touw stated that the Planning Commission is not really negotiating which is better, front or back, but are being asked to rezone the back portion of the property and a portion of the front. In doing so, Mrs. Touw stated that it would include making the front portion Limited Industrial, which still covers almost every industrial use.

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

-----

## MINUTES

### December 1, 1998

A motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the Minutes of the December 1, 1998 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mr. Jeff Shell and Mrs. Iris Touw. (Mr. Williams was absent for the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and therefore abstained from voting.)

### January 5, 1999

A motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve the Minutes of the January 5, 1999 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Shell was absent for the January 5th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.)

-----

Under Staff Items, Mr. Taylor was advised to draft language regarding a method of introducing changes proposed by the two Ordinance Review Committee's and report back to the Planning Commission.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.