

MINUTES

GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 5, 1999 9:00 A.M.

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

ABSENT: Jeff Shell

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

ALSO PRESENT: Lee Gilmour, County Administrator
County Commissioner Gerry Robertson
County Commissioner Henri Woodman
County Commissioner Jeff Chapman

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

At this time, Mr. Chuck Taylor advised that rezoning application #GC-6-99 was withdrawn by the applicant.

**St. Simons United Methodist Church
Thorpe Building, addition to building,
located on the west side of Beachview
Drive, Zoned Resort Residential**

St. Simons United Methodist Church, Owner

Mr. James Meadows was present for discussion.

Ms. Cindy Olness presented the staff's report as follows:

This proposal is to add approximately 1,623 sq. ft. addition to the eastern side of the Thorpe Building, which is located on the west side of 11th Street (abandoned) between Beachview Drive and Oglethorpe Avenue.

The exterior appearance will remain essentially the same as the existing building. The new gable roof will be pitched to match that which is existing. The exterior block will be white while the asphalt shingles will be gray.

The applicant requests a variance from the requirements of Section 709.5 of the Zoning Ordinance, related to the requirement that no building footprints may be increased more than the average of the building footprint of the building and structures on the adjacent side lots. The adjacent-lots do not have comparable structures or uses. Lot 172 contains a house while Lot 170 contains a parking lot. If this application and variance are granted, the lot coverage would be greater than 50% and would also require that a variance be granted for relief from the 50% site coverage requirements.

The applicant also requests a variance from the requirements of Section 709.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, related to the protection of large trees. The applicant would like to remove two camphor trees in order to construct the proposed addition. One of these trees is within 25 ft. of the property line. Ms. Olness stated that Randy Dobson of the Tree Advisory Board has gone out and looked at the trees. He believes that they are high quality, mature specimen, camphor trees and he does not want to see those removed.

The Quitclaim Deed for the former Eleventh Street right-of-way contains the following conditions:

1. That the public be allowed to park in the area conveyed herein so long as the property is not needed for parking for church related activities; and
2. That this property be used by the St. Simons United Methodist Church only.

Ms. Olness stated that the County Attorney's office has asked staff to add an extra condition if approval is granted, as follows: The use within the former right-of-way would need to be approved by the Board of Commissioners. The conditions on the Quitclaim deed would need to be changed.

The proposed addition will not remove any parking spaces or maneuvering areas currently located within the abandoned Eleventh Street right-of-way. A portion of the proposed addition will encroach into the former right-of-way. The plans meet all other requirements of the St. Simons Village Preservation District and the Resort Residential District.

Ms. Olness stated that staff recommends consideration of this St. Simons Village Preservation District application with the following conditions if approval is granted.

1. A new building service lateral to be constructed in accordance with the Plumbing Code to serve the Thorpe Building and its proposed addition.
2. That the existing 8 inch vitrified clay pipe sewer be abandoned in accordance with Glynn County construction specifications at the time the addition to the Thorpe Building is constructed.
3. A building permit must be obtained.
4. Approval by the Board of Commissioners for the use of the former right-of-way and any appropriate change in the Quitclaim Deed must be obtained.

At this time, Mr. James Meadows read the attached prepared statement for the record:

Mr. Meadows stated he feels that the content of the Quitclaim Deed is a misinterpretation, and they are willing to work this out with the County Attorney and the Board of Commissioners.

Regarding the variance request for site coverage, Mrs. Touw asked if staff had any figures of what the site coverage would be if the variance is granted. Ms. Olness replied that staff does not have the exact figures at this time, but as it stands now, the coverage is more than 50%. She explained that the parking spaces are not increasing but they have to be considered in the existing site coverage, which is excessive. Mrs. Touw stated that if they are expected to approve or disapprove a variance, it would be better to have figures on hand.

From an engineering standpoint, Mrs. Touw asked Mr. Reese if he had done any calculations on the run-off and the capacity for the sump-pump. Mr. Reese replied no, he did not do calculations; however, the church has put in larger pumps and they have submitted a letter stating that the pump has a capacity for additional run-off.

Mrs. Jones had questions regarding the Quitclaim Deed. In approving this, she asked if the Quitclaim Deed should be changed prior to the Planning Commission's approval. Mr. Chuck Taylor stated that the County Attorney's office indicated to staff that the Planning Commission could make this a condition of approval based on the applicant receiving approval by the Board of Commissioners.

For clarification, Mrs. Jones wanted to know if the building extends 17 ft. Mr. Meadows pointed out that in his presentation, he stated that the building extension is approximately 17 ft.

Mr. Chuck Taylor stated that in the applicant's written proposal, the church has offered to replace the camphor tree with two small live oak trees. He stated that if the Planning Commission approves removal of the camphor tree, he would recommend that the size of the replacement be a minimum 2 inch caliber live oak tree.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to approve this request with the stipulation that the Quitclaim Deed be updated to specify the changes requested by St. Simons Methodist Church. Also, subject to the three conditions stated by staff, and with the stipulation that the camphor tree be replaced with two 2" caliber live oak trees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman and Mrs. Iris Touw. It was noted that Mrs. Touw voted against the motion for the following reasons: 1) drainage was not evaluated by staff; and 2) Planning Commission is being asked to review three variances without detailed information, i.e., coverage.

**416 Magnolia Avenue
Addition to single-family residence,
Located on the west side of Magnolia
Avenue, between Mallory Street and
Kings Way, Zoned R-6 One-Family
Residential**

Mr. Delton Altman, owner, 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 proposed project is located in the Village Preservation District at 416 Magnolia Avenue, St. Simons Island. The application is to allow an extension of approximately 5 ft. x 12 ft. to an existing patio, which will then be enclosed. (Reason for the use of the term "approximately" is that the existing patio appears to be larger in the photographs provided than the measurements listed on the site plan.)

The location of the patio is off the backside of the existing residence at the southwest corner of the building. The size of the patio appears to be larger by 2 to 3 ft. than the measurements shown on the site plan. The project also includes adding an extension of 7 ft. x 11 ft. to an existing utility room. The total square footage of the footprint of the existing residence is 2,089, while the total square footage of the addition is 197. There will also be a new roof for the entire area extending off of the existing roofline.

The lot is bordered on the south by a two-story condominium complex with a total footprint of 4,608 sq. ft. and on the north by a residence with a 1,600 sq. ft. footprint.

There will be no trees removed for this project. All building setback lines are met and existing landscaping will not be changed. The lot coverage would be less than 22%. The home is a single-story red brick structure with white painted lap siding on the gables. The addition will match the existing lap siding. (Photographs and drawings were included in the packages for review.)

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends consideration of this request.

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

Mrs. Glenda Jones wanted to know if there is a reason why staff is recommending consideration of this request, rather than a specific recommendation. Mr. Chuck Taylor explained that the Village Preservation District has some very broad subjective decisions to be made and due to the weight that is carried with the decision, staff feels that it should be made by multiple decision-makers rather than by one or two staff members. However, he stated that at the Planning Commission's request, staff could reconsider and make a specific recommendation.

After discussion, the motion for approval was unanimously adopted.

426 Park Avenue
Existing Duplex, addition of a swimming
pool, located on the south side of Park Avenue
between Mallory Street & Magnolia Avenue,
Zoned General Residential

Joe & Alice Bradford, Owners
L. B. Pickren, Applicant

Mr. & Mrs. Bradford and Mr. Pickren were present for discussion.

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

This proposal is to build a pool of approximately 35 sq. ft. (29' x 15') surrounded by a concrete deck extending for 10 ft. all around the pool. The entire pool and deck area will be surrounded by a 4 ft. 8 in. high lattice fence (with a gate). This project lies within the Village Preservation District and is located at 426 Park Avenue. A duplex residence is also located on this lot.

Parking for the proposal totals 4 spaces and meets the requirements of the Ordinance. The parking is situated directly off of Park Avenue in the front center of the lot. The Building Official approves the use of the right-of-way for maneuvering. No trees will need to be cut, and the lot coverage including the proposed pool and deck is 45.6%

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends consideration of this request.

Mrs. Touw had questions about the parking. She wanted to know if the three duplexes were included in the parking area. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff received a minor plat application that showed three lots (7, 8 & 9) in the tract. Lot 7 has a duplex that faces the pool area. The lot located on the right hand side also has a duplex that faces the pool area. At one point, there was a circular drive that each duplex faced. However, the circular drive will be removed when construction commences. At that point, there will be a sidewalk area down each side of the pool to the three parking areas; four spaces in front accessing maneuverability to Park Avenue for each of the three lots in question.

Mrs. Touw had further questions as to the location of the right-of-way. Mr. Thomasson stated that currently, there is a curb that forms the island of the driveway, measuring from the existing edge of the pavement at 27 ft. Measuring from the right-of-way to the curb is 22 ft. There is actually 2 ft. of extra space from where the curb currently sits.

Mrs. Touw stated that she is curious as to whether anyone had established the location of the right-of-way. She is concerned that this would affect the adjacent building by making a decision without any effort to establish where they would then park. She feels that they should have all been together. Mr. Thomasson explained that the combination of the parking together would have violated the multi-family aspect of the Village Preservation District.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mrs. Touw asked that the motion be amended to include that the County Engineer is to verify setbacks and the location of the right-of-way to ensure that all parking is outside of the right-of-way. The amendment was accepted. However, discussion continued.

Mr. Jim Bruner explained that the proper procedure would be for the applicant to hire a professional land surveyor to make the right-of-way determination. From an engineering standpoint, he stated that his office could only identify the property corners. Mr. Thomasson pointed out that the minor plat did include a registered surveyor and the information is on file. However, due to the application being a minor plat, it was administratively handled.

Chairman Altman noted that the motion is for approval subject to staff verifying the location of the right-of-way. Mr. Bruner stated that if the survey is on file the information could be verified from the plat.

After discussion, the motion for approval with the amendment was unanimously adopted.

**Preliminary Plat
Thompson Cove/Revision & Addition
Located off of Thompson Cove Road
34,989 sq. ft., Four Single-Family
Residential Lots, Zoned R-6 One-Family
Residential**

Richard Thompson, Property Owner/Developer

Mr. Don Hutchinson was present for discussion.

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

This project calls for the addition of two lots to the existing Thompson Cove Subdivision. Lots 12 and 13 of the subdivision are being combined with an adjacent tract to create a total of four lots (12A, 12B, 13A and 13B). The total size of the combined parcel is .803 acres. All four lots will access the Thompson Cove right-of-way. Additionally, an existing drainage easement across lot 12B is to be abandoned.

An existing structure on an adjacent lot owned by Tommy Lloyd Crumb has a rear porch encroaching on Lot 12A. This porch will be removed and plans are to eventually remove the entire residence.

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

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

Mr. Hart wanted to know if there is any type of mechanism to ensure that the porch is removed. Mr. Thomasson stated that the Building Inspection's office will verify this at the time that a permit is required for the property.

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

**Preliminary Plat
Shadowlake Subdivision, located off
of Altamaha Boulevard, 33.197 Acres,
60 Single-Family Residential Lots,
Zoned Planned Development-General**

**Inland Enterprises, Inc., Owners
Altamaha Partners, Developers**

Mr. Ray Richard and Mr. Gary Nevill were present for discussion.

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

This subdivision project is part of the Golden Isles Gateway Planned Unit Development. Shadowlake Subdivision consists of 38.22 acres to be divided into 60 single-family residential lots. The public right-of-way of the project is composed of 3 cul-de-sacs totally 3.309 acres. All water, sewer and storm drainage is planned to facilitate further development of the Golden Isles Gateway development.

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

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff recommends approval of this request on the condition that Altamaha Loop North be completed, final platted and open to the public before approval of the final plat for Shadowlake Subdivision.

Mrs. Touw stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve a longer cul-de-sac, but she'd like to know how long is this particular cul-de-sac. Mr. Thomasson stated that the developer did not provide that information, but during the process he measured it and it is slightly over 1800 ft. in length.

Mrs. Touw explained that the one thing that is required prior to preliminary plat approval is a Soil Erosion Permit. She then asked if one had been obtained for this project. Mr. Ray Richard replied yes.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if the Ordinance permits the Planning Commission to approve a preliminary plat that does not have access. Mr. Thomasson stated that the condition was expressed to indicate that there is no access and staff is recommending that the developer not go any further with the subdivision for final platting until that access is final platted and opened. However, Mrs. Touw stated that her question pertains to preliminary plat, not final plat.

Mr. Taylor explained that Altamaha Loop North is under construction and has not been accepted by the county. Staff felt that during the initial review that it was feasible to allow a preliminary plat in order to allow construction to start. At the time of final platting, the developer would have to deed Altamaha Loop to the county and the county would have to accept it. Mrs. Touw stated that she would rather see the preliminary plat approval after there is an access to the property. Mr. Taylor pointed out that the developer does have construction access.

Mr. Richard explained that the road has been under construction for a couple of months. He stated that he was on the site three weeks ago and was able to drive down the road. Mrs. Touw stated she is concerned that approving this request allows the developer to go in and out of the road with equipment. She feels that there should at least be a condition that no work starts until the road is completed and accepted by the county.

Mrs. Jones wanted to know how long the cul-de-sac would be. Mr. Richard stated that the lots are about 70 ft. long. The cul-de-sac would be approximately 1900 ft. long. (Less than 2000 ft. and closer to 1800 ft.)

Referring back to Mrs. Touw's concerns about the road, Mr. Richard explained that there are plans to coordinate the work on the subdivision with the construction along Altamaha Loop North. They also saw some advantage, if necessary, in being able to cut some of the timber off of the property before the road is actually paved.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this request with a condition that the developer work with the county and have permission to use the road during the paving construction process or coordinate the times that they use it with the County Public Works Department. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones 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.

Property owned by NationsBank, N. A.

Attorney Carroll Palmatary, agent, was present for discussion.

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

This request is to rezone property located on the northeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and 12th Street, which has an existing vacant structure. The commercial structure consists of 3,418 sq. ft. and has previously been the site of First Federal Savings and Loan, 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 concept plan/survey submitted shows the property currently having 11 parking spaces on site with an additional 8 parking spaces located entirely within the county rights-of-way of Ocean Boulevard and 12th Street. Based on the square footage 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. However, in that the property is located within the St. Simons Village Preservation District this would be something that could be addressed during review for compliance with the district.

Located immediately to the east of the property is an existing right-of-way known as 11th Street a/k/a Oleander Drive. On the other side of this right-of-way is a parcel of land that is zoned General Commercial and 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 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;**

Yes.

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

No, not with a buffer as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. A buffer would be required on the northern property line where the property abuts the residential district to ensure a buffer separation.

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

Yes, the majority of the building located on the property is zoned Resort Residential (approximately 11,00 sq. ft.) which would allow for multi-family residential. 7,298 sq. ft. of the property (Lots 25 & 26) is zoned R-6 Residential, which consists of a small portion of the building and the off-street parking lot. The subject lots that are zoned single-family residential were originally platted to have access from 11th Street; however, the subject right-of-way is unopened and therefore the only access to the lots is via the Resort Residential portion of the property fronting on Ocean Boulevard. To develop the entire property for multi-family 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. A different type commercial use should 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 extreme improvement. It

has been expressed that this parking on the county right-of-way has created problems in the past. If the parking is removed from the right-of-way and relocated on site, it may be that they would still be allowed to maneuver within the right-of-way along 12th Street only, but the parking would not be located on the right-of-way.

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

Yes, 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;**

No.

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

Mrs. Touw pointed out that the question before the Planning Commission on this application is a change in zoning. Whether this structure is used or not used is not of any consequence. She stressed that they are only reviewing the request for a General Commercial zoning, which has various uses and no setback requirements. Mrs. Touw stated that she appreciates the explanation of the use of the building; however, the Planning Commission cannot say to the applicant that a buffer is required because there is no buffer requirement in General Commercial. Ms. Olness explained that a buffer is required between commercial uses and residential uses, therefore the applicant would have to put in a buffer of some sort along the property line.

Attorney Carroll Palmatary, representing NationsBank, explained that the property has been utilized as a bank and for commercial purposes for over 30 years. The only thing the applicant is seeking is to have the zoning conform to what the property is actually being used for. He then gave a brief history of the property and its past uses. Mr. Palmatary stated that they are not asking to change the character or the use of the neighborhood. He stated that there is no construction planned and no other use contemplated other than using it as an office building in its present form.

In addressing the buffer question, Mr. Palmatary pointed out the property line, two oak trees and bamboo hedges, which he feels is a better buffer than a wooden fence. He then presented photographs of the area for review and stated that the bamboo hedges and the oak trees are already serving as a natural buffer. Also, the design and layout of the parking lot and parking spaces already take advantage of the natural vegetative landscape in place.

Regarding the number of parking spaces, Mr. Palmatary stated there is more than sufficient land to put in however many spaces needed. Due to the property not being utilized as a bank any more, the existing driveway can be used for additional parking spaces.

In conclusion, Mr. Palmatary stated that they see no major problem with the buffer or the parking compliance.

A gentleman from the audience asked how wide is the buffer. Mr. Palmatary replied that Section 713 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a 3 ft. buffer, either naturally vegetated, solid masonry or board fence. He stated that the existing vegetation in place is approximately 10 ft. on the survey and is clearly wider than required. The gentleman then asked if the applicant plans to utilize any portion of the unopened street. Mr. Palmatary replied no.

Mr. Clark Adickes, adjacent property owner, wanted to know the type uses allowed in General Commercial zoning. He expressed concerns about what could go on the property in the future. Mr. Hal Hart read all of the permitted uses allowed in this

district. Mr. Chuck Taylor pointed out that some of the uses would be limited due to the size of the property.

Mrs. Touw stated that the vision for the site is excellent; however, she would suggest that this item be deferred in order to allow the applicant to come back with a type of request for rezoning that would fit the pattern and perhaps leave a little more leeway. Chairman Altman agreed. He stated there are other zoning avenues, i.e., Local Commercial, that would be better than General Commercial.

Mr. Palmatary stated that when he initially inquired about the uses, staff recommended General Commercial. He stated that he was open to whatever it took to be in conformance and at that time, staff recommended General Commercial because it clearly matched the existing and current uses. Chairman Altman stated that Section 711.2 Local Commercial, lists many of the same permitted uses. Mr. Palmatary stated that one of the problems they ran into was that the existing building did not meet some of the setback requirements under Local Commercial.

Mr. Hart stated that the applicant may want to consider Planned Commercial, which specifically addresses inadequate parking, buffers, encroachments, etc. Planned Commercial allows the applicant to write out a text as to what he would like to do.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to defer this request. She also recommended that staff assist the applicant in a Planned Commercial Text that would meet the needs of the developer and meet the concerns of the Planning Commission. Mrs. Touw made it clear that the stipulation (recommendation) is just her suggestion. The motion on the floor is to defer this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

GC-4-99

Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial, 1 acre tract fronting 190.77 ft on the north side of U.S. Highway 17 North, beginning 344.91 ft. west of Mackay Drive known as a portion of the C. H. Turton Tract.

Property owned by Driggers Construction Company

Attorney Robert Cunningham, agent, was present for discussion.

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

This request is to rezone a 1 acre parcel of land located on U.S. Highway 17 North approximately 400 ft. west of the entrance to Marshes of Mackay Subdivision.

The property located immediately to the west and north, also owned by the applicant, is vacant and zoned Forest Agricultural. The property located immediately to the east, 1.99 acres between the subject property and the entrance to Marshes of Mackay Subdivision, was rezoned from Forest Agricultural to Highway Commercial in 1979. A portion of the property was developed as a convenience store with the remainder of the property still undeveloped.

The applicant proposes to rezone the 1 acre parcel and incorporate it with the adjacent vacant property to develop mini-warehouses. A concept plan has been submitted showing the subject property and the adjacent property to meet the requirements as outlined in Highway Commercial zoning for mini-warehouses, as follows:

Conditional Use

- 8) Mini-warehouses, meeting the following requirements:
 - a) Lot size of three (3) acres or less

- b) Consisting of ten (10) units or more
- c) Adequate buffers
- d) Direct access to a major street or controlled access highway

The concept plan shows a combination 7 ft. setback line and natural buffer on the north and west sides of the property. In order to meet c) above, a buffer in addition to the required 7 ft. setback would need to be met. Staff recommends that the buffer be natural, undisturbed and a minimum width of 15 ft.

The Georgia Department of Transportation has stated that an access drive could be approved for the proposed development. If the rezoning is approved, the applicant will present detailed plans to DOT for a permit and will put the access drive in to meet the state and county regulations.

Ms. Olness 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;**

Yes, this would be an extension of the existing Highway Commercial District. With the applicant also owning the property to the north and east, adequate buffers can be provided to ensure the proposed development will not have an impact on the Forest Agricultural property.

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

No, not with adequate buffers being provided.

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

Yes, there are other residential lots that have been created along this section of U. S. Highway 17. With the adjacent property to the east (also zoned Highway Commercial) it makes this property less desirable for residential development.

- **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, will have an impact on the transportation facilities. The proposed use would generate approximately 2.5 trips per each 1000 sq. ft. of gross floor area, based on weekdays.

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

No, shown as low-density residential.

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

Not that staff is aware of.

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

During a brief presentation, Attorney Robert Cunningham stated that the applicant feels that this is an appropriate use of the property. As pointed out, it is very unlikely that

there will be any development on the north and west of this property due to the wetlands. He stated that this development would facilitate many other uses along U.S. Highway 17.

Mr. Dallas Kirby of 94 Mackay Drive expressed concerns about the drainage problems at Marshes of Mackay and whether or not the problems would be addressed. He also expressed concerns about the buffer zone and traffic. Mr. Kirby stated that the airport property would be a better location for this type of development.

Mr. Cunningham stated that it is anticipated that drainage would take advantage of the existing wetlands and would not create any new problems. The Department of Transportation must approve the access for the property. He stated that he is confident that DOT will take into consideration the traffic in that area and will place the appropriate requirements on the developer.

Mr. Bill Maskell, adjoining property owner, expressed concerns about drainage and traffic. He stated that there have always been water problems along U.S. Highway 17. The drainage ditch along Highway 17 in front of his property floods at least three or four times a year. His lawn has also flooded several times due to the re-paving of the Lil' Champ store. Not only is water a major concern, but traffic is as well. Mr. Maskell stated that there have been several accidents in the area and this development would compound the problem. He agrees with Mr. Kirby that the airport area would be a better place for this development.

Mr. Ken Rawls, 96 Mackay Drive, expressed the same concerns about drainage and traffic. He stated that lighting could be a potential problem, and he is also concerned about the value of his property decreasing if this development is approved. Mr. Rawls stated that he is opposed this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to deny this request. The motion died due to lack of a second. Discussion continued.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if staff had any information from the County Engineer's office regarding the flooding problems at Marshes of Mackay and how to curtail the problem. Mr. Chuck Taylor stated that Glynn County has strict guidelines as to releasing water off-site. He pointed out that drainage would be reviewed by the County Engineer's office during site plan review of this development. From a technical standpoint, the county does require for storm water to be stored on-site and released at a rate that would not cause downstream flooding.

Mrs. Jones asked Mr. Cunningham to address the lighting and how it would affect Mr. Rawls' property. Mr. Cunningham stated that they do not have a specific lighting plan at this time, but it would be the minimal lighting required to service this type of area.

Mrs. Touw pointed out that the Planning Commission is being asked to rezone the property. Whether or not mini-warehouses go on the property is up to the developer, after he receives the rezoning. Mrs. Jones agreed; however, she stated that since it has already been established that the developer is proposing to put mini-warehouses on the property and residents have addressed concerns about drainage, lighting, etc. associated with the mini-warehouses, she feels that the Planning Commission should afford the residents the courtesy of answering their questions. Mrs. Touw agreed, but stated that the residents should also be aware that this is strictly a rezoning request.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the U.S. 17 Corridor is of a much different nature than other areas of the county in that it is accepted for many uses that facilitate life in that section of the county.

Mr. Maskell asked if their concerns about drainage taken into consideration before a decision is made on this request or, is the decision based on the residents consideration about drainage. Chairman Altman stated that the Planning Commission has to evaluate all possible uses for the requested zoning, not necessarily warehouses, but all permitted uses.

Mrs. Jones explained that if this was strictly a rezoning request and mini-warehouses were not brought up, then perhaps they would have asked what is proposed for the property.

Mrs. Touw stated that the Planning Commission listened to the concerns very carefully. In this particular case, she did not see any specific problem in the area; however, after she heard the concerns from the residents she made the motion to deny the request based on those concerns. She pointed out that the residents who live there know more about how the area would be affected by this development. For clarification, Mrs. Touw stated that if this request is approved, she has no doubt that the mini-warehouses will be put on the property. However, at the same time the residents need to know that the Planning Commission is approving a zoning change, not mini-warehouses.

Mr. Hart stated that it seems like the Planning Commission cannot address the drainage until the property is rezoned, and drainage seems to be the problem with rezoning the property. He stated that if there is a drainage problem in the area, then there needs to be some way to address the problem. If the Planning Commission were to defer this request and get an opinion from the County Engineer, is there a solution to the drainage problem.

Mr. Reese, Assistant County Engineer, stated that he is not sure if drainage influences zoning or not. However, in situations where someone develops a piece of land in an area with poor drainage, the County Engineer's office would limit the developer to pre-development run-off and require that they do onsite retention.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this rezoning. She also requested that the County Commissioners address the drainage problems in the area and come up with a solution for the property owners. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Lamar Cole.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:10 a.m.

GC-5-99

Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural & 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.

Property owned by J. D. Moore

Attorney Jameson Gregg, agent, was 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; however, the application was denied due to existing industrial uses within the area that would not be compatible.

This request is to rezone 79.688 acres, of which 48.171 acres is currently zoned Forest Agricultural and 31.517 acres is zoned Basic Industrial. The request is to rezone the property to Planned Development-Industrial to allow the development of industrial

uses. The Planned Development 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 1. 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 incidental to the operation described, and other requirements are those outlined in Section 719.4 General Industrial.

As stated previously, 31 acres along Perry Lane Road is already zoned Basic Industrial to allow industrial uses. An industrial use could be located on the existing 31 acres without rezoning any additional land to industrial, as outlined in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance:

Any industrial use that 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.

Staff has evaluated the industrial land available and advises against additional industrial zoning along this section of Perry Lane Road. The existing vacant industrially zoned land can be utilized without incorporating additional land into the industrial classification.

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 request, which is currently zoned Forest Agricultural, would be incorporated with the 12 acres.

The Planned Development Zoning Text and Master Plan (included in the packages for review) 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 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;**

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 subject 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 involve widening the existing 60 ft. right-of-way. The road improvements would consist of intersection modification at Spur 25 and Perry Lane Road (long-range) and along Perry lane Road 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. A recent development trend in this area leans toward residential development. A rezoning request that was previously submitted by the owner for the industrial land to become residential failed because located across Perry Lane Road is a polluted site being cleared up with super fund 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 gave a brief presentation. He explained that Mr. R. D. Moore has owned the property for 35 years and he is a long-time resident of Glynn County. He stated that Mr. Moore is under contract with Martin Marietta Aggregate to sell Tract 2 of this property. His ability to sell Tract 2 is contingent on this rezoning. Mr. Gregg stated that there is one main theme that he needs to make abundantly clear which in his opinion, gives the Planning Commission reasonable grounds to recommend approval of this rezoning request. The issue is that a portion of this particular property is already zoned Basic Industrial, which would allow for the proposed project. He stated that they are not introducing the concept of industrial zoning to the area. He feels that this zoning makes sense, it is logical and it is good planning.

Mr. Gregg then presented the site plan and pointed out the current zoning line, and the surrounding areas of zoning. He reiterated that the front portion of this property is currently zoned Basic Industrial and would allow an asphalt plant. Mr. Gregg stated that the issue before the Planning Commission is would it be better for this project to go on the front part of this property or the rear part of this property as they are proposing.

Mr. Gregg explained that Tract 2 would be developed under a Planned Development Text and Tract 1 would be down sized to a Limited Industrial zoning. The property owner is making two sacrifices with the proposed Planned Development: 1) the property owner is willing to submit Tract 2 to a Planned Development Text, which would limit the uses to those shown on the site plan; and 2) Tract 1 would be down zoned from a Basic Industrial category to a Limited Industrial category. Mr. Gregg pointed out the surrounding property and the industrial characteristics in the area.

Mr. Gregg explained that it would be better to have this project in the rear portion of the property for the following reasons: there would be more acreage, which would allow the owner to move the uses more to the interior of the project; the project would be less intrusive to the surrounding property owners; it would allow for better buffers; and it would be safer. Another reason is that the asphalt plant would abut the Cate Road Landfill. If it were placed in the front, it would abut the Ridgewood Plantation property. He then presented aerial photographs to illustrate this point.

Mr. Gregg stated that in 1992, Mr. Moore sought to rezone the front part of this property to residential, but the request was denied because of the industrial uses in the area. Seven years later he has found an industrial use for the property and the staff's report stated that perhaps if he waits until Escambia is cleared by EPA maybe he then can go to residential. "How long does he have to wait to use his property."

Mr. Gregg stated that if this rezoning is denied, the county would have done a great disservice to Mr. Moore. He reiterated that it is good planning to put the project in the back of the property, and not the front. Again, he stated that they are not introducing industrial zoning to the area. They are just trying to better plan for it.

Mr. Malcolm Swanson, Design Engineer for Aztec, which is the manufacturer of the asphalt plant, expounded on the pollution control devices now used for asphalt plants. He also explained that the central component of any asphalt plant is a burner, which provides heat for the drying operation. Burners exceed 99.9% combustion efficiency and the dryer technology is a higher level of efficiency.

Mr. Swanson stated this is a plant that is mixing raw materials to produce asphaltic concrete. He stated that there is no waste produced by an asphalt plant and the product is 100% recyclable. He pointed out that this plant exceeds all federal and state established environmental requirements for pollution controls.

Mr. Swanson then addressed the noise concerns. He explained that the normal background areas outside level of noise from this plant would be at 55 decibels. In addressing the odor, he stated that in the past the primary source of odor came from burning sulfur; however, sulfur will not be used in this operation. He stated that natural gas would fuel this plant with diesel fuel as a backup.

Attorney Jim Bishop, representing Martin Marietta materials, stated that this company would like to become a good corporate citizen of Glynn County. The company has about 1 billion dollars in assets and sales and would like to be responsible for a facility of which expenditures would cost between 7 or 8 million dollars. They would also employ about 30 people.

Mr. Bishop stated that Martin Marietta has entered into a contract to buy the property from Mr. Moore. He stated that if he were sitting in the Planning Commission's shoes he would ask, could this facility be located on the property that is already zoned. His answer would be yes. Another question would be, is it better to locate this plant elsewhere. His answer would be, perhaps so. The Moore's think that it is. It is their property and they believe that it is better to do it this way.

Mr. Bishop explained that in 1963 the county rezoned the property to industrial. The Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 1966, which in affect rezoned the property back to the way it is today. Subsequently in 1992 the Moore's approached the planning staff to rezone the property, and the county said that the property would be used as residential. However, now they say industrial. Mr. Bishop stated that this appears to be unfair. He stressed that Martin Marietta will make a deal, whether it is in the front or in the back. The Moore's believe that the back portion is the best. He stated that experts are present to say that environmentally and from a use standpoint, it would be totally appropriate to locate the plant in the back.

Mr. Chris Moore, speaking on behalf of his father, stated that it would be unfair to deny this request. His personal interest is for his father's future.

Mr. Jennings Overstreet of Highhill Lake Drive stated that he has lived in the area for 39 years and he remembers when the Escambia Company moved in. He also remembers all of the traffic, noise and outfall associated with it and he has the same concerns about this proposed plant. He stated that they have just spent 27 million dollars cleaning up behind the Escambia Company and they don't need any more industrial uses in that particular area. Mr. Overstreet stated that he is opposed to this request.

Mr. Don Kirkland stated that his property abuts this project. He has just started clearing the land to develop a subdivision; however, they had to stop because of the action that is being considered now. He pointed out that there is no way that he could develop a subdivision and sell homes in a residential area abutting a plant that would be operating 24 hours a day. Mr. Kirkland stated that he is opposed to this request due to the truck traffic, noise, dust and odor. He also pointed out that there is no way to build a buffer because all of the trees have been removed from this land. He stated that it would take 10 to 15 years to build a natural vegetational buffer. Mr. Kirkland stated that there are approximately 500 people in the area who are willing to sign a petition against this request.

Mr. Don Novak of Pyles Marsh Road stated that he sympathizes with the Moore family and he understands what Martin Marietta wishes; however, the issue is "what is the most important thing." He stated that he is concerned about safety, water and noise.

Mr. Loy Mallard expressed the same concerns about traffic and odor. He stated that an asphalt plant would be a hindrance to their neighborhood, and therefore he is opposed to the request.

Ms. Miranda Smith stated that her family has owned property that abuts the proposed plant for 30 years. She pointed out that there are no trees left for a buffer and she's concerned about the noise. Ms. Smith stated that if the front portion is already zoned for this use then why not put the plant in front. Mr. J. D. Moore stated that it would not be productive to put the plant up front.

Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that industry has changed in the last 15 to 20 years. He then asked Mr. Swanson to elaborate on some of the changes, i.e., noise and dust.

Mr. Swanson stated that several years ago plants had no pollution control devices, but they do now. Part of the process is the aggregate drying operation. The major source of potential pollution from the process is the airborne dust. Mr. Swanson stated that the biggest change that has come along in the equipment is a primary collector that collects most of the dust in the air stream. There is also a secondary collector used to collect smaller particles. The most you would see from an asphalt plant today (on a cool morning) is a condensed moisture cloud.

For clarification, Mr. Williams then asked that when Mr. Novak wakes up in the morning hours would his car be covered with dust. Mr. Swanson replied no, "certainly not from the asphalt plant stack."

Mr. Novak asked if water would be used in the chemical process. Mr. Swanson replied no, water is not part of the process in an asphalt plant. He explained that the water that is in the process is there naturally just from rainfall and is introduced into the process along with the aggregate.

Mrs. Jones stated that in researching asphalt plants, she found out that the only noise generated by asphalt plants today is removing the moisture from the rocks. Mr. Swanson stated that Mrs. Jones is referring to the drying process. The primary noise is burner noise and it is the largest source of noise in an asphalt plant. He stated that they do not shake the rocks in association with the drying process. He explained that noise is energy that dissipates rapidly as you move away from the source.

Mr. David Brisley, Operational Service Manager for Martin Marietta, addressed the hours of operation. He explained that there will be times when the plant will operate at night especially if there is a major resurfacing job or an upgrade to I-95. Typically on

interstates, DOT requires for safety purposes that paving and major road construction be done at night. Therefore, there will be times when the plant will operate 24 hours a day.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if an estimate had been done as to how much traffic would be generated by this plant. She also wanted to know if this asphalt plant is similar to the plant that was proposed on Colonel's Island. Mr. Brisley replied yes. He pointed out that the property on Colonel's Island is owned by the state and the state elected not to sell the property to Martin Marietta.

In addressing the traffic, Mr. Brisley stated that they anticipate moving 100,000 tons of stones through the yard. Within three to five years that number will increase to 200,000 tons, which will all be brought in by rail. Calculating on an average of 17 tons per truck, that would equal approximately 12,000 trucks per year. If averaged at 250 working days, that would equal approximately 50 trucks per day or 100 trips per day (in and out). There could be times when traffic will increase to 220 or 230 trucks per day.

Mr. Hal Hart wanted to know how the raw materials would be moved from the train onto the stockpiles. Mr. Brisley explained that they would bring in a rail siding to store 30 cars. They would install a pit under the railroad track, open up the doors and let the aggregate fall out on a series of conveyors to the stockpiles.

Chairman Altman wanted to know if it is the applicant's intention to put the asphalt plant on the front or the back of the property. Mr. Brisley stated that initially they wanted to put the plant on the front of the property, but during the negotiations with the Moore's, the Moore's saw a bigger use for the property and said if the plant is put on the front of the property, it would restrict them from going to the back. Mr. Brisley stated that would be between Martin Marietta and the Moore's. He stated that they don't have an option on the front. They only have an option on the back and part of the back portion of the front. However, if they are denied the zoning on the back, Martin Marietta would have to sit down with the Moore's and discuss whether the Moore's would be willing to sell them the front portion of the property.

Attorney Jameson Gregg explained that regarding the buffers, the parties are willing to work to put an acceptable buffer in along the edge of the property and between the spur and the railroad track. Also, traffic is certainly an issue anytime property is rezoned, but is it better planning to put the asphalt plant up front or in the back.

Mr. Don Kirkland pointed out that he is not objecting to Martin Marietta coming into the community. He just feels that the proposed plant would be better suited in another area of the county.

Mr. Hart wanted to know if the front property is suitable for this operation. Mr. Chuck Taylor explained that the front part of the property is zoned Basic Industrial. Section 719.2 #1 allows industrial uses but it does have a caveat that states those uses cannot cause injuries or obnoxious vibration, smoke, gas, fume, odor, dust, etc. He stated that before this is actually allowed, staff would have to make a finding of fact that this use would not cause any of these things. Mr. Taylor stated that staff has not made that finding of fact yet and this would be a huge hurdle to allowing the use to go on the front part of the property.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to defer this request for further information on traffic, environmental impact and for further information as to whether or not the proposed operation can be put on the front part of the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw.

GC-2-98 N

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance

Create new section: Section 405. Glynn County Planning Districts, which will include the adoption of a Glynn County Planning District Map and description. Subject map will consist of 13 districts.

Initiated by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners

Mr. Lee Gilmour gave a brief background and an overview of the proposed amendment. He stated that during a series of meetings and discussions, the Board of Commissioners felt that it would be very advantageous to go in and give serious consideration about having existing defined districts. In this particular example we have 13 districts; however, the number is not what the issue is, but that you do break out the different areas of the county into definite legally defined zoning districts.

Mr. Gilmour explained that from an administrative standpoint, identification is relative to neighborhoods. As noted, they did not want the areas on the map referenced as political districts.

Mr. Gilmour pointed out that the public perception may be that a lot of the issues that have to be addressed on St. Simons are St. Simons issues only; however, from his prospective that is not correct. He stated that a number of the issues that may initially surface on St. Simons apply to areas on the mainland as well. He stated that it is not the Board's recommendation that all of St. Simons be considered one district because they believe that there is a large difference on the issues and developmental factors from the southern part of St. Simons and the northern part of St. Simons.

Mr. Gilmour stated that when the Board of Commissioners met in December, they stated that they would strongly request a recommendation from the Planning Commission on this amendment back to the Board so that they can proceed.

For clarification, Mrs. Glenda Jones explained that the reason the Planning Commission did not approve this map before is because the first map presented to them in November was very old and very small, which she referred to at that time as a "black blob" outline of Glynn County. She stated that it was not legible and the Planning Commission requested an updated copy of the map. As a result, the Planning Commission was given another draft dated 12-9-98.

Mrs. Jones stated that at the last Planning Commission meeting, the map was presented as a commissioner item (as it is today) and they requested additional time to study the map. She pointed out that they were aware that there were some pending ordinances using Planning Districts 11, 12 and 13, but the Planning Commission did not feel comfortable with it being presented for the first time and not being able to study the map and was therefore not prepared to take action.

At this time, the Planning Commission discussed several different options; however, most of the discussion was centered on how the proposed map would be used in the Ordinance. There was also concern expressed about using major roads/highways as boundary points.

The floor was open for public comment. Mr. Dan Coty stated that he "sees this as a cancer." He stated that this is a "divide and conquer mentality." Mr. Coty stated that he is an opponent of less government and he is totally opposed to this map. He advised the Planning Commission to think long and hard before passing this amendment.

Following a lengthy discussion regarding land use issues, future uses and the concerns about how the proposed map would be used, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to defer recommendation on the proposed Planning District Map and hold an evening public hearing for further discussion and to obtain public input. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Glenda Jones, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman.

The public hearing/work session was scheduled for Tuesday, January 26th at 7:00 p.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building.

The Planning Commission took a 5 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 2:30 p.m.

GC-2-99A

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance

Article X, Appeals How Taken:

Section 1001 Appointment of Board of Appeals

Section 1008 Public Hearings on Appeals

Section 1009 Appeals from Decisions of Board of Appeals

Initiated by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Gilmour.

Concern was expressed regarding removal of members, which states in Section 1001 that "members shall be removable **without cause** by the appointing authority."

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend approval of this amendment with a recommendation that removal of members be **with cause** (rather than without cause). The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

GC-2-99B

Consider Amending the Glynn County Code of Ordinances

Chapter 2-19 Planning Commission

Section 2-19-4 Members of Commission and Terms of Office

Section 2-19-8 Removal of Members

Initiated by the Glynn County Board of Commissioners.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Gilmour.

There was a brief discussion regarding the proposed amendment in conjunction with the Planning Commission By-laws. Mr. Taylor stated that he would compare the amendment with the by-laws to determine whether or not the by-laws would have to be updated to coincide with the amendment, and report back to the Planning Commission.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Glenda Jones to recommend approval of this amendment with a recommendation that the Planning Commission By-laws be updated so as not to conflict; and with a recommendation that the membership term be increased to four years. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

At this time, the Planning Commission recessed for lunch. The meeting resumed at 3:30 p.m.

**Discuss status of SR-8-98
Amendment to the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations
Process for Subdivision Plat Approval—Article VII
Request authorization to advertise for the Glynn
County Planning Commission's February meeting**

The amendment was included in the packages with the proposed changes. Mr. Taylor presented a draft flow chart of the site development approval process and requested permission to advertise this amendment for the February 2nd meeting.

During the course of discussion, Mrs. Touw stated that a Soil Erosion Permit should be included perhaps under Construction Plans, Section 705 (3). Referring to Section 707, Mrs. Touw stated that it should not be mandatory for the Director to approve plans if there is some problem. Perhaps this should be examined closely.

Following discussion, permission was granted for Mr. Taylor to advertise this amendment for the February 2nd Planning Commission meeting.

MINUTES

Upon a motion made by Mr. Hal Hart and seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones, the minutes of the November 3, 1998 Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission called for corrections to the December 1, 1998 minutes (more specifically, page 59, paragraph 3 regarding Mr. Taylor's comments on the Landscape & Lighting Ordinance). The members also requested a status report of this Ordinance. Referring to page 23, paragraph 5 of the December 1st minutes, the members inquired as to whether this development would be a 150 room hotel or a 150 unit. Staff was advised to verify and report back to the members. The minutes will be corrected and brought back for approval at the February 2nd meeting.

Under Staff Items, the following amendments were briefly discussed and will be presented for further discussion at the February 2nd Planning Commission meeting:

- a) GC-2-98M Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance
Process for Site Plan/Development Approval
Section 302 Definitions; Section 619 Site Plan Approval;
Section 709.9 St. Simons Village Preservation District
- b) Proposed Amendment to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance
Section 705.3 to restrict limitations on the use of commercial
services in the Resort Residential District

Also under Staff Items, permission was granted for Mr. Taylor to draft language for the proposed amendment pertaining to easements in the Subdivision Regulations and advertise the amendment for the February 2nd Planning Commission meeting.

Under Commission Items, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend that the Glynn County Planning Commission initiate the following proposed amendments to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance and advertise for the February 2nd meeting:

Inasmuch as St. Simons Island and Sea Island are designated as areas of scenic beauty and historic interest, all multi-family and commercial use shall comply with Section 619 Site Plan Approval.

Also, the Glynn County Planning Commission will revisit "Fluttering Ribbons."

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Glenda Jones and unanimously adopted.

Also under Commission Items, Chairman Altmian requested that staff submit a recommendation on all items presented to the Planning Commission for review.

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