

MINUTES

**GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 6, 1999 9:00 A.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Altman, Chairman
Pat Browning
Lamar Cole
Perry Fields
Hal Hart
Iris Touw

ABSENT: Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: Chuck Taylor, Community Development Director
Cindy Olness, Planning Official
Lee Thomasson, Planner
Deborah Taylor, Zoning Administrator
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Buster Reese, Assistant 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 introduced and welcomed Mr. Pat Browning as the new member appointed to the Glynn County Planning Commission.

GC-17-99
**Request to amend the Planned Development
Master Plan for Retreat Village Shopping
Center and adjacent properties.**

**Amerishop Retreat, LLC, Property Owner
Attorney Tom Whelchel, Agent**

Attorney Tom Whelchel requested a deferral in order to resolve some of the issues of this application. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to defer this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted. (It was noted that Mr. Bluestein was present to oppose this request and stated that he had no problem with the deferral.)

GC-18-99

Request to rezone from Limited Industrial to Highway Commercial three tracts of land having a total of 10.8318 acres as follows:

Tract A: 3.3228 acres, northeast corner of Habersham Street and Shell Drive
Tract B-1: 5.5843 acres, southeast corner of Habersham Street and Shell Drive
Tract B-2: 1.9247 acres, southwest corner of Shell Drive and New Community Road

Victory Storage Company, Property Owner
Bill Kirby, Agent

Mr. Jim Watson 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 several tracts from Limited Industrial to Highway Commercial. The properties are located within an area that has mixed zoning of Limited Industrial and Highway Commercial. There have been several rezonings from Limited Industrial to Highway Commercial over the years. For example, the property located immediately south of Tract B-1 was rezoned from Limited Industrial to Highway Commercial in 1989. The Limited Industrial zoning classification allows a minimum lot size of 1 acre and a minimum lot width of 100 ft. The Highway Commercial zoning classification allows a minimum lot size of 6,000 sq. ft. and minimum lot width of 60 ft.

As zoned, Limited Industrial, the tracts could possibly be subdivided to allow approximately three (3) lots for Tract A, approximately five (5) lots for Tract B-1, and Tract B-2 could not be subdivided. The concept plan that was submitted for rezoning purposes shows these tracts are proposed to be subdivided with each lot having approximately 100 ft. of frontage, as follows: Tract A to consist of six (6) lots; Tract B-1 to consist of ten (10) lots; and Tract B-2 to consist of three (3) lots. (The concept plan was included in the packages for review.)

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the 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, although the area is a mixed zoning of Limited Industrial and Highway Commercial, the intent of the Highway Commercial district is for commercial uses which primarily render a service or cater to tourists, vacationers, truckers and the traveling public in general. It is staff's opinion that rezoning properties adjacent to Shell Drive would not meet this intent.

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

The area is mixed with Limited Industrial and Highway Commercial zoning. Depending on the type development (land uses) would determine the affect it will have on the surrounding properties. However, the zoning being requested could allow for less lot widths, which would create additional development lots, increasing curb cuts along the existing roads.

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

Yes, could be developed as Limited Industrial as stated previously.

- 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 traffic and existing streets. The land use for each lot would make the determination as to what the impact may have. (Please reference the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance for the permitted uses within the Limited Industrial and Highway Commercial Zoning Districts.)

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

No, shown as low-density residential on the Future Land Use Map.

- 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 Tract A, Tract B-1 and Tract B-2.

Mr. Jim Watson gave a brief presentation. He stated that it is not his intent to maximize the density or radically change the zoning of this property. He stated that the neighborhood has a lot of mixed uses. His plan would allow him to go from 11 lots as Limited Industrial to 20 lots. Mr. Watson explained that under the definition of Highway Commercial he could go up to 36 lots if he were to use a 60 ft. frontage, and if he were to include roads, he would be allowed to go up to 70 lots and still be within the 6000 sq. ft. density requirement. However, he is not asking to do any of that. He just wants to make the lots half-acre or better. He then listed the businesses located in the area.

Mr. Watson stated that sewer lines are not available, but he would install water lines. The sewer lines are several blocks away, and according to Bill Powell, it would not be feasible to get the sewer lines anywhere near this particular piece of property.

In addressing staff's comment regarding the Comprehensive Land Use, which lists the area as low-density residential, Mr. Watson stated that there is no residential anywhere near the property. He reiterated that he is not radically changing the zoning and he is willing to add any restrictions deemed necessary.

Mrs. Iris Touw wanted to know how the sewage would be handled if there is no service available. Mr. Watson stated that he would install septic tanks. Mrs. Touw then asked how large would the lots have to be if the applicant were to install septic tanks. Ms. Olness replied that Environmental Health would have to address that question. She stated that the standard would probably be a minimum of 20,000 sq. ft., but it would depend on soil type, etc. Mrs. Touw explained that she does not doubt the applicant and she has no problem with the number of lots being proposed. However, the Planning Commission would be rezoning to Highway Commercial, which means that the applicant would be allowed to do whatever is permitted under that zoning district.

Mr. Pat Browning wanted to know the number of lots proposed for the area. Mr. Watson stated that he is proposing 20 lots including the existing tract of which the zoning would not change.

Chairman Altman wanted to know staff's reason for recommending denial. Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending denial because the majority of the findings of fact were against the proposal. She pointed out that staff also looked at the proposal as individual tracts because it may be possible to consider Tract B-2 for Highway Commercial in that it also fronts on Community Road.

Mr. Hal Hart stated that he would like to vote on the three tracts separately. The members concurred. Thereupon a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of Tract B-2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pat Browning. Mr. Perry Fields asked that the motion be amended to include a stipulation that Lot 3 would not be accessed from Community Road. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of Tract A and Tract B-1. However, the motion failed for lack of a second. Mr. Hart then made a motion to recommend denial of Tract A and Tract B-1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Voting Aye: Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields and Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman and Mr. Hal Hart.

GC-20-99

Request to rezone from M-20 One-Family Residential Manufactured Home to Highway Commercial, 24,363 sq. ft. of land beginning 91.02 ft. south of GA Highway 303 approximately 200 ft. east of U.S. Highway 17 and located on the north side of the Old Fancy Bluff Road (abandoned right-of-way), which lies immediately north of property owned by Flying J Truck Stop.

**Windell Boatright, Property Owner
Neal Boatright, Agent**

Mr. Neal Boatright was present for discussion.

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

In 1984, the subject property was a portion of a tract of land consisting of 37,216 square feet. On February 2, 1984, the property was rezoned from Freeway Commercial to the M-20 One-Family Residential to allow the location of a manufactured home. The rest of the property, fronting along the highway, remained Freeway Commercial until May 3, 1984 when the owner sought a rezoning from Freeway Commercial to Highway Commercial.

The applicant proposes to incorporate the subject properties back to one parcel for the development of a car wash. Therefore, at this time the applicant is seeking a rezoning for the 24,363 sq. ft. to Highway Commercial. The property is surrounded on all sides by commercial zoning (Highway Commercial and Freeway Commercial).

Access to the property is by an existing access drive off Blythe Island Highway (formerly Highway 303). This will be a shared drive for the existing commercial establishment (convenience store) and the subject property. The expanded use of the existing access drive has received approval from the Department of Transportation.

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the 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 subject property is surrounded on all sides by commercially zoned property.

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

No, the adjacent properties are already zoned to allow commercial uses.

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

No, subject property is surrounded by commercial properties and the parcel has no access except via the commercial property along the highway. Old Fancy Bluff Road has been abandoned.

- 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;

Will have an impact on the traffic, but a portion of the parcel is already zoned to allow commercial development. With the shared access, there should be less impact on the highway traffic as it relates to turn movements. If any additional improvements are needed for the access drive, this will be required by the Department of Transportation.

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

Yes, the future land use is shown 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;

The subject property is located within the area of three intersecting highways. This area is developing commercial to serve the needs of the traveling public as well as the residential subdivisions within the area.

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

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

GC-21-99

Request to rezone from Forest Agricultural to General Residential 1,423 sq. ft. being a portion of the Brunswick Altamaha Canal and further described as being located north of Emanuel Missionary Baptist Church. Subject property to be incorporated into the adjacent multi-family development located between the church and Canal Landing Subdivision.

Mr. Tharion Pittman, property owner, 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 11,423 sq. ft. of property, being a portion of the Brunswick-Altamaha Canal, which the applicant purchased from Glynn County.

The subject parcel is located immediately west of a 1.104 acre tract that was also a portion of the Canal, purchased from Glynn County and was rezoned from Forest Agricultural to General Residential in 1997 to allow the development of triplexes. This development was a continuation of a multi-family residential development located to the south (Pittman Circle) that was also owned by the applicant, rezoned and developed in 1971 for duplexes.

The applicant is seeking the rezoning of the 11,423 sq. ft. parcel to General Residential to allow for the development of a recreation area and/or maintenance building to store equipment to maintain the existing multi-family residential development.

The subject parcel is also located immediately north and east of Emanuel Missionary Baptist Church, which is zoned Forest Agricultural.

Ms. Olness stated that in conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the 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 proposed structure meets all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and Building Code.

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

No, with adequate buffer and setbacks.

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

No, the only access to the subject property is via the applicant's other properties zoned General 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, should not have any impact.

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

Yes, would be consistent with the land use plan.

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

The applicant constructed a multi-family development in 1997, which this subject property will be combined with to allow for accessory uses. In 1998, the Board of Commissioners voted to protect and preserve the Brunswick-Altamaha Canal.

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending approval of this request subject to the following:

1. A buffer 10 ft. in width and a fence being provided along the south and west sides of the subject property where it abuts the church property (Emanuel Missionary Baptist Church).
2. A buffer 25 ft. in width along the northwest side of property where it abuts the Altamaha Canal.

Mr. Hart asked staff to define the types of buffers listed in the recommendation. Ms. Olness stated that she would come up with suggested language. In addition to the language for buffers, Mrs. Touw asked staff to determine the amount of remaining square footage. (It was noted that Ms. Olness would come back to these questions after ascertaining the information.) Mr. Hart asked if the property was being requested for

General Residential as an accessory use, or would the applicant be able to develop the property later for another residence or a duplex. Ms. Olness explained that the applicant would be able to do this if the Board of Commissioners were to approve the rezoning to General Residential; however, the applicant is proposing accessory uses. The only access would be through the existing development and it would likely be difficult due to the way the buildings are placed in the existing development.

Mr. Fields stated that if the applicant just wants to put a maintenance shed on the property, why does it have to be rezoned. Ms. Olness stated that currently, the property is not zoned to allow a maintenance building. Technically, the lot does not have any access, so the applicant would have to combine it with the other property in order to do anything with it. For clarification, Mrs. Deborah Taylor explained that in order to have an accessory use, a principle use is required under the zoning classification under the same lot. In that the 1.1 acre was added to the other property, the applicant would also add that property to the other tract, which would enable him to have the accessory use for the entire property. Under the FA zoning, the applicant would have to have a principle use in order to have an accessory use. Mr. Pittman stated that he has no objection to staff's recommendation.

In response to Mrs. Touw's question about the amount of remaining square footage, Ms. Olness stated that the remaining amount would be approximately 7800 sq. ft., which means it would be a large usable portion of the property after the recommended buffers. In defining the buffers, Ms. Olness stated that staff would suggest that the 10 ft. buffer with the fence along the south and west sides be a landscaped buffer to be approved by staff during site plan approval, and that the 25 ft. buffer be a natural undisturbed buffer.

Mrs. Touw stated that the Altamaha Canal is a sensitive area, and if that strip was approved at 30 ft. she feels that in order to be consistent, it should remain at 30 ft. all the way across. Mr. Hart stated that the 30 ft. easement is not a buffer. He stated that there is a buffer on one side and an easement on the other side. Mr. Hart asked Mr. Pittman if he had a problem with the two buffers recommended by staff. Mr. Pittman stated that he has no objection to the buffers; however, the 25 ft. buffer has already been disturbed. The other side, which was cleaned up by the church, has also been disturbed. He stated that he has no problem with the buffers because he's not planning to build near the fence anyway. Ms. Olness stated that the language could be changed to a 25 ft. undeveloped buffer.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request without any buffers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pat Browning. Voting Aye: Mr. Pat Browning and Mr. Perry Fields. Voting Nay: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart and Mrs. Iris Touw. The motion was defeated. Discussion continued.

Mr. Fields stated that the Planning Commission is telling the applicant that he can't put a building on his land, he's got to let the land grow back up into its natural state, so he can't travel across it. He stressed that the 25 ft. has no purpose. The easement that goes down the right side of the property is a drainage easement. Mr. Hart pointed out that he is only trying to get the buffers defined so that there are no misunderstandings.

Mrs. Taylor explained that when the property was sold to Mr. Pittman, the 30 ft. easement was already on there along with the drainage easement. When the Planning Commission recommended approval at that time, the approval was subject to the 14,000 sq. ft. not being rezoned. When it went to the County Commission, they in turn rezoned the entire 1.1 acre with the understanding that the 30 ft. would be an open area with access across it, but no buildings could be placed on it. The area down the side was considered a drainage easement according to the County Attorney at that time and the 30 ft. was just an area not to be built on. For further clarification, Mrs. Taylor stated that when the property was sold to Mr. Pittman, language was included that it would not be developed. This language was also included in the deed. The County Attorney put restrictions on that 1.1 acre.

Mr. Hart asked Mr. Pittman how he would like to see the back portion handled. Mr. Pittman stated that he would prefer that they leave the 25 ft. buffer. He is satisfied as long as he can travel on it, and he also doesn't mind if the county goes across it.

Mrs. Touw stated that if there is a fence around the property on the church side, what is the purpose of having the applicant landscape his side. She stated that the fence would be the buffer between the church property and the applicant's property. Landscaping the property on the applicant's side serves no purpose as far as protecting the church. She stated that she would like for the Planning Commission to consider just having Mr. Pittman fence the church side, not worry about the 10 ft. and take the 30 ft. so that the line stays straight.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of this request subject to the following:

1. A buffer 10 ft. in width and a fence being provided along the south and west sides of the subject property where it abuts the church property.
2. A 25 ft. unbuildable buffer being provided along the northwest side of property where it abuts the Altamaha Canal.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole and Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields and Mrs. Iris Touw.

**408 Butler Avenue
Construction of single-family residence
Zoned R-6, One-Family Residential**

Mr. John Reimler, property 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:

The applicant proposes to build a new residential structure on the above referenced lot. Staff has determined that the site coverage of the proposed development is 3,494 sq. ft., while the lot size is 7,000 sq. ft. for coverage of slightly under 50% (49.9%).

The average footprint of the adjacent side lots is 2,912 sq. ft., while the footprint of this project is 2,801 sq. ft., thus meeting the footprint requirement. The height requirement calls for no more than 10 ft. over the average height of the structures of the adjoining side lots. This project is within the height standard of 34 ft. The average height of the side structures is approximately 26 ft.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pat Browning and unanimously adopted.

**Georgia Sea Grill - Signage
Zoned General Commercial-Core**

Mr. Alan Worthley, business owner, was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting approval of a sign to be mounted on the storefront of the above referenced business. The new message will be professionally painted on a 2 ft. by 8 ft. encompassing 16 sq. ft. The dimensions of this sign require approval of the Planning Commission and will be done in the colors shown in the packages.

The applicant is requesting the signage to provide visibility through the open court area of the Pier Village development to enhance the presence of his restaurant.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Mrs. Touw asked if the requested sign would be in the same location as the current sign. Mr. Thomasson replied no, the proposed sign would be mounted flat on the building. He stated that the applicant currently has a 6 sq. ft. permitted sign that is mounted perpendicular, which gives visibility through the alleyway to Beachview and Oglethorpe. Mrs. Touw asked where on the building would the sign be placed. Mr. Worthley stated that the sign would be placed above the front door. Mrs. Touw then asked if the proposed sign would be in addition to the existing signs. Mr. Thomasson stated that the proposed sign would be in addition to the 6 sq. ft. perpendicular sign and the entrance sign which is mounted by the doorway. Mrs. Touw pointed out that with the additional sign, the applicant would have three signs. Mr. Thomasson stated that the total square footage of all three signs is 23 sq. ft.

Mr. Hart pointed out that according to Section 816.5 (second paragraph), "there shall be no more than two (2) signs attached to the exterior of any one business establishment...shall not exceed the 10% area requirements." Mrs. Touw stated that their outside exceeds 30 sq. ft. Mr. Thomasson stated that it does, it includes two storefronts. Mr. Worthley stated in that he does have two storefronts, the sign that sits perpendicular to the building, which was moved up to the new storefront to provide visibility from Beachview, could be moved back to the old storefront so that there would only be two on the new storefront and one on the old storefront.

For clarification, Chairman Altman stated that according to the ordinance, a maximum of two signs is allowed for a business. For example, one business with 100 ft. of frontage is allowed to have two signs; ten businesses would be allowed 20 signs (2 per business).

Mr. Hart stated that according to Section 816.3 "freestanding signs shall be erected on post, pole or base..." He stated that perhaps the applicant could remove the sign from the wall and place it on a pole, although he would have to come back for approval. Mr. Worthley stated that he would remove the small sign from the door and come back and request a variance.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request subject to verification that the small sign is removed before the proposed sign goes up. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:30 a.m.

**548 Magnolia Avenue
Change previously approved color scheme
for new single-family residence
Zoned R-6 One-Family Residential**

Rick and Mary Ellison, Property Owners

Mr. Jim Sutton, representing the property owners, was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting approval to change the previously approved exterior colors of white with rust-red roof shingles and rust-red metal porch roof. The applicants would prefer slate green roof shingles with the porch roof being evergreen in color. The building will remain white as previously approved.

Mr. Thomasson provided samples of the new colors for review. He stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

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

**SitePlan
Golden Isles Bridge Club
Meeting and Playing Structure
Zoned Planned Development-General
Malcolm McKinnon Airport**

**Golden Isles Bridge Club, Applicant
Glynn County, Property Owner**

Mr. Robert Fahs, representing the Golden Isles Bridge Club, 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 one lot comprising .485 acres to be a meeting hall for the Golden Isles Bridge Club. The proposed building size will be 4,000 sq. ft. of space with a net patron space of 3,560 sq. ft. There will be two access driveways (one-way roadway for each) of 13 ft. to Skylane Court. The parking required for this amount of square footage is 52 spaces. This project exceeds this standard with 55 spaces being provided.

Glynn County Environmental Quality Department will provide the water source and sewerage treatment. A Sedimentation & Soil Erosion Control Permit will be required prior to construction.

Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, Fire Department, GIS, Environmental Quality and Engineering have all favorably reviewed this site plan. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Mr. Fields asked if the applicants intend to use the building for anything other than for the Bridge Club. Mr. Fahs replied no. He assured the Planning Commission that the primary use is for the Bridge Club to have meetings and private parties, and they will abide by their lease. Mr. Fahs stated that most of the members are senior citizens.

Chairman Altman expressed concerns about removal of the trees in the area. Mr. Fahs stated that they did their best to save as many of the trees as possible. Unfortunately, the parking required that they clear more land than they really wanted to. He stated that there are a number of trees in the buffer area behind the building. Mr. Fahs stressed that they've tried to maintain as many trees in the buffer area, behind the building, and on the side that faces the street.

Mrs. Touw also expressed concerns about the trees, particularly in conjunction with the parking spaces along the side of the building. She had questions about possibly saving the trees in the front corner of the building. Mr. Fahs stated that the parking spaces that Mrs. Touw is referring to are for handicap parking, which is one of the requirements that they had to comply with. Mrs. Touw then asked that they try to save the trees located toward the back of the building.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve this application with a request for the applicant to try and save as many trees as possible. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted.

At this time, Mr. Fahs and other members of the Bridge Club expressed their gratitude for the assistance they received from Mr. Thomasson in moving forward with their application.

**Preliminary Plat
Valerie Subdivision
13.3 acres located off Touchstone Parkway
22 Residential Lots, Zoned Mh-12
One-Family Residential**

Driggers Construction Co., Inc., Owner

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

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

This mobile home subdivision consists of 13.302 total acres to be subdivided into 22 lots, comprising 11.53 acres. The lots will average 22,830 sq. ft. with the smallest lot being 19,990 sq. ft. in size.

Also proposed is an extension of a 60 ft. right-of-way, entitled Sarah Drive, ending in a cul-de-sac. This right-of-way extension will encompass 1.749 acres and is to be improved to county standards and then dedicated to Glynn County.

The water source is planned to a community well system with individual sanitary septic tanks. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit will be required for this development.

Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, Fire Department, GIS, Environmental Health Department and Engineering have all favorably reviewed this site plan. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval 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. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart and Mrs. Iris Touw. Mr. Perry Fields abstained from voting to avoid a conflict of interest.

**Proposed Amendments to Article VIII
Glynn County Sign Ordinance**

The changes proposed by the Planning Commission at the June 22nd Public Meeting were incorporated into a memo prepared by Mr. Keith Taylor of the County Attorney's office and was presented for review.

Mr. Chuck Taylor stated that he would like permission from the Planning Commission to advertise the draft ordinance for the next meeting. However, Mrs. Touw pointed out that some time ago, the Planning Commission adopted a motion to not advertise any ordinances for public hearing before the Planning Commission has an opportunity to review and discuss the document in its entirety. Mrs. Touw stressed that she would like to see the final draft before the ordinance is advertised for adoption.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to schedule another Public Meeting for Tuesday, July 13th at 7:00 p.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building to review and discuss the proposed amendments to Article VIII.

MINUTES

Mrs. Touw stated that at the June 1st meeting, she presented a committee report on recommendations for lot and site coverage. She stated that throughout today's meeting the terms "site coverage" and "footprint" were used. Mrs. Touw explained that the Planning Commission's understanding and staff's interpretation has always been different in this regard, which is why the committee was formed to address this issue. She then asked staff for the status of the committee's recommendation. Ms. Olness stated that staff would put the recommendation in the form of an amendment draft and bring it back for discussion at the August meeting.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve the Minutes of the June 1, 1999 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart and Mrs. Iris Touw. (Mr. Pat Browning was not a member at that time and therefore abstained from voting.)

Georgia's Open Meetings/Open Records Act

The above referenced document was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. Chairman Altman stated that the requirements of the Open Meetings Law were discussed at length at the American Institute Conference that he and others attended in June. He stated that he is particularly interested in the section that deals with penalties and fines directed toward the chairman for disobeying these laws, i.e., conducting executive sessions.

Ms. Olness explained that one of the main issues stressed in the new law is that in the past there have always been commissioner items toward the end of the agenda. However, according to the new law, commissioner items can no longer be placed on the agenda unless the item is included on the agenda to be acted upon. Ms. Olness further explained that according to the County Attorney's office, the agenda can be amended no later than the business day prior to the meeting. Mr. Taylor pointed out that items can be added to the agenda by a unanimous vote of the Planning Commission if it is deemed to be a necessary item.

Mrs. Touw and Mr. Fields were particularly concerned about not being able to ask questions for clarification or informational purposes. Mrs. Touw stated she doesn't remember the Planning Commission ever bringing up an item and voting at the end of a meeting, but they have had questions for clarification and for information. In fact, she and Mr. Fields have questions today. Mr. Taylor explained that an item not appearing on the printed agenda cannot be discussed. Mrs. Touw stated that she would like to get a written explanation from the County Attorney's office as to whether or not they can ask questions, and if so, what subjects can be covered. In the mean time, Mr. Fields asked staff for the status of the "Hole in One Bagel" application. Ms. Olness replied that the application was approved at the Board of Commissioners meeting (last Thursday).

At this time, Mrs. Touw asked the Planning Commission members for their support in asking a question that was brought up at the St. Simons Ordinance Review Committee meeting. Support was granted. Mrs. Touw stated that the Island Committee asked if they could get a copy of the recommendations made by the Ordinance Review Committee appointed by the Planning Commission. Chairman Altman stated that both committees are entitled to see each other's recommendations. Mr. Taylor gave a brief recap of the intent of both Ordinance Review Committees.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.