

**MINUTES  
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORKSESSION  
SEPTEMBER 14, 2000 8:00 A.M.**

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lamar Cole, Chairman  
Wayne Stewart, Vice Chairman  
Perry Fields  
Hal Hart  
Ann McCormick  
Iris Touw

**ABSENT:** Jonathan Williams

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Peterson, Director  
Lee Sutton, Planner II  
Ed Halbig, Transportation Coordinator  
Janet Loving, Recording/Admin Secretary

-----

Chairman Lamar Cole called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. He then turned the meeting over to Mrs. Iris Touw, Subcommittee Chairperson.

Mrs. Touw explained that the purpose of this worksession is to gain input from the members and the general public on the items addressed by the subcommittee. It was noted that these items are being presented for discussion purposes only. No action is required at this time.

-----

**1) Telecommunications Towers**

Mr. Perry Fields stated that in his opinion, there is not enough technical data to make a recommendation on Telecommunications Towers. At this point they need to rely upon the experts. Mr. Hal Hart stated he feels that the biggest problem is safety and lighting due to the towers being located in Residential Zoning Districts. Mr. Wayne Stewart suggested that a tower zone be created and perhaps include deed restrictions in the buffer zone. He stated that there doesn't seem to be a big problem with the towers being located in commercial areas. Mr. Fields stated that another problem is the fact that everybody wants his own tower because that is where the money is. Mr. Stewart stated that perhaps it is now time to start sharing towers to help eliminate some of these problems. (The floor was then open for public comment.)

Mr. Ronnie Perry complained that the tower at Exit 6 was not advertised and the adjacent property owners were not notified. He stated that this should be a requirement. Mr. Harry Driggers asked if there is a requirement in place for site plan submittal on telecommunications towers. Mrs. Touw replied yes. She also agreed that as with rezoning applications, adjacent property owners (within 200 ft. of a proposed tower) should be notified. Mr. Cap Fendig suggested that there be a sign-off from adjacent property owners and that this be made part of the application.

Mr. Jay Shehand, Value Concept Telecommunications, stated that Glynn County has very limited areas to locate towers. He stated that his company tries very hard to co-locate, but when they can't, they have to resort to finding another site that would provide coverage. He pointed out that the FA Zoning District has a broader spectrum for towers. Mr. Fields stated this is the reason he feels that more technical data is needed.

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of requiring "fall zones" for towers. Mr. Dan Coty stated that if a fall zone is required for telecommunications towers, it should be required for all public service utilities as well.

-----

## **2) Overlay for St. Simons and Sea Island**

Mr. Stewart stated that two problems exist in this area; developers have a hard time figuring out what applies to St. Simons; and residents have a hard time knowing what applies. He stated that an overlay would make it easier for everyone.

There was a consensus from the floor that the county should move ahead with an overlay for St. Simons and Sea Island. Mr. Cap Fendig stated that the county needs to also step up the pace on the infrastructure. He further stated that developers need the freedom to work within the confines of the ordinance.

-----

## **3) Subdivision Regulation Regarding Minor Plats**

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the minor plat application process. Mr. Perry Fields asked for clarification on the proposed revision to Article VIII of the Subdivision Regulations, which was submitted to Mr. Peterson for review by the County Attorney. Mr. Peterson replied that the language provided by the County Attorney was not what he had in mind since it was not comprehensive enough in scope to address all of the problems and confusion associated with Sections 801 and 802. He further stated that he felt that the Planning Commission did not need to consider this as a proposed amendment, but rather the changes should be reviewed at staff level and resubmitted to the Planning Commission at a future date (as time permits).

During the course of discussion, it was determined that the ordinance is lacking continuity and consistency. The language in this section of the Subdivision Regulations needed to be rewritten for clarity and definitions should be simplified. One member of the audience, Mrs. Nancy Armstrong, complained that it took 12 months to get her minor plat application processed. Each time she completed a task, staff added more, none of which seem to be in the ordinance. The Planning Commission was in agreement that this should never have happened. It was determined that a tracking policy and time limit needed to be established.

Mrs. Touw stated that staff would continue to work on suggestions and ideas in an effort to clarify Article VIII of the Subdivision Regulations.

There being no further business to discuss, Mrs. Touw thanked everyone for their input, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m.