

**MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 5, 2000 9:00 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, Planning Official
Ed Halbig, Transportation/Zoning
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
Janet Loving, Recording/Admin Secretary

Chairman Lamar Cole 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.

Chairman Cole advised that the applicant for agenda item #2 (GC-34-00) has requested a deferral.

GC-31-00

Request to Rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential to M-12 One-Family Residential (Manufactured Homes) 1.2621 acres, described as tracts 1, 2 and 3 of Robert H. Griffin Subdivision; property having 190 feet frontage on Carteret Road. Property owned by Robert H. Griffin.

Chairman Cole stated that this item would be discussed later in the meeting pending arrival of a representative.

GC-35-00

Request to Rezone from FA - Forest Agricultural to GI-General Industrial 30.286 acres, described as beginning approximately 580 feet south of the intersection with Highways 32 and 99, to immediately north of DePratter Lane; property having 1403 feet of frontage on US Highway 341. Property owned by Constance C. Daniels.

Mr. Horace Daniels and Attorney Eugene Caldwell were present for discussion.

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

The agent for this rezoning came before the Planning Commission in August, and that meeting the agent was seeking to rezone the property to Highway Commercial. The uses currently taking place on the property (mining, open storage of scrap) would still

have violated the permitted uses of Highway Commercial. The application was not heard due to the numerous code enforcement violations existing at the time.

The agent now seeks to have the majority of the property (Tract "A" on the survey) rezoned to General Industrial. General Industrial zoning would allow for the uses that the agent currently desires (and has previously conducted) as permitted and conditional uses. The agent still has outstanding code enforcement violations, but staff seeks to separate the rezoning from the code enforcement violations.

Section 720.3 (Conditional Uses) states that open yard storage of junk material is allowed, if specific conditions are met. The applicant would need to meet these conditions to the satisfaction of the Building Inspections Department in order for such use to be allowed.

In order for the applicant's agent to continue to use the property, it will need to be rezoned. The Future Land Use Map shows the property as being Agricultural, but within a Multi-Use node at the intersection of GA 99 and US 341. According to the Comprehensive Plan, the Multi-Use Nodes are "foreseen [sic] as future locations for commercial, residential, institutional and recreational uses in a multi-use planned concept." Multi-Use nodes are areas that are anticipated to develop, and where development should be monitored. The Comprehensive Plan further states "site plan approval would be required for any new rezoning request in these areas."

In conformance with Section 1103 of the 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, with the exception of the properties west of the subject property. These properties are residential and would require special consideration with regard to setbacks and buffering.

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

Properties to the rear of the subject property could be adversely affected.

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

The property has reasonable economic use as currently zoned (FA).

- 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. Rezoning of approximately 30 acres to general industrial could allow for development that would generate an estimated 1,560 to 1,990 additional trips per weekday. 1999 Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) were estimated at 12,619.

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

The Future Land Use Map shows the property as being used for agricultural and forestry.

- 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 multiple code enforcement violations and the violation of the Georgia Surface Mining Act give supporting grounds for the denial of this application. A letter from the Department of Natural Resources and a report from Code Enforcement are included. Due to a number code enforcement violations issued on the subject property, the case was not heard. As of this writing, those violations have not been addressed.

Mr. Halbig stated that staff is recommending approval of this request subject to the following:

1. Update of the general layout plan to reconfigure "proposed street" so that it serves all of lots 1 through 6;
2. All future development subject to site plan approval.

The conditions are in keeping with the recommendations of the Future Land Use Element of the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fields stated that if the property were rezoned, the code violations would be cured. However, he is reluctant to approve something with existing violations. Mr. Halbig explained that the rezoning would not necessarily cure the code violations. He stated that they are looking to separate the use of the property from the condition of the property. The applicant would then have to meet the requirements of General Industrial zoning which involves how scrap materials are stored, how surface mining is conducted, etc. The rezoning is not going to grant the applicant amnesty from the code violations.

Mr. Fields pointed out that if the applicant brings his property into compliance with zoning, then he is no longer out of compliance. He explained that when this application was previously presented, there were multiple problems that were not being addressed. The applicant had been taken to court concerning the violations and nothing is being corrected. Mr. Fields stated that he would like to know what those violations are. At this time, Mr. Stewart requested the presence of the Code Enforcement Supervisor to answer questions and to enlighten the members on the status of the violations. In the meantime, discussion continued.

Regarding staff's comment that "the applicant would have to meet the conditions to the satisfaction of the Building Inspections Department," Mr. Fields wanted to know if there is a set of criteria in place that the Building Official must adhere to in determining whether or not the applicant is in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Halbig replied yes, as outlined in Section 720.3 of the ordinance.

At this time, the Code Enforcement Supervisor, Brenda Pittman was present to address the status of the code violations pertaining to this request. She explained that the violations still exist and are being investigated by her division. Mr. Daniels was issued a citation to appear in court. The Judge ordered Mr. Daniels to either clean up the area or pay a fine. Mr. Daniels elected to pay the fine. Mrs. Pittman stressed that Mr. Daniels is showing an effort to work with staff.

Mr. Stewart stated that he would like to eliminate the condition regarding the general layout plan, which in his opinion is a site plan. He stated that he would rather use the boundary survey at this point. When the applicant decides to develop the property, he could then bring the site plan in for review. Mr. Halbig stated that the general layout plan is not considered a site plan and it is required to be submitted in accordance with the code. Mrs. Touw stated that the code requires it, the applicant has submitted it, and there are questions about it; however, it is not a condition of rezoning. She stated that it is a requirement and must come back for preliminary plat approval as the lots are divided.

Mr. Hart wanted to know if bridge guards and concrete material fall under the definition of junk material, and if so, they would not be allowed. It was pointed out by Mrs. Pittman that these items are considered as junk material. Mr. Hart then asked the applicant if he understood this. Attorney Caldwell's reply was "yes, we do now."

Mr. Fields pointed out that staff is not satisfied with the proposed layout at this time and would like it to be reconfigured. Although what the applicant has submitted is in compliance with the code, staff wants the layout reconfigured so that the access is off of one road as opposed to multiple curb cuts. However, Mr. Fields thinks that this is an inappropriate item for the Planning Commission to address at this time. He stated that the applicant has met the basic requirements and that is what should be addressed.

Attorney Eugene Caldwell gave a brief presentation. He elaborated on the Daniels' family history and stated that the land has been in the applicant's family for four generations dating back to the 1920's.

Mr. Caldwell stated that a lot of the commercial activities that are in violation were in existence prior to adoption of the Zoning Ordinance, and those issues don't have a forum when violations are cited before the administrative body of the county. He stated that his client acknowledges that there are violations on the property and fully intends to put all violations in compliance.

Mr. Caldwell stated that his client is proposing to locate a recycling center on the property for the purpose of recycling concrete products, i.e., bridge pilings (not guard rails) that are stored, which will eventually be ground up into concrete aggregate and sold for fill. This will be a recycling effort for concrete and asphalt. A maintenance facility is also part of the plan, which is needed to support the uses. He stated that his client wants to bring the property in compliance with zoning, which is why the request is for Light Industrial. He stressed that his client is trying to work with staff and the judicial system to clear up all violations.

Mr. Caldwell stated that the neighborhood is changing to commercial and industrial activities. Some of the industrial developments in the area include the Sterling Industrial Park and a Scale Manufacturer. Also, adjacent to DePratter Lane from the proposed site is a Georgia DOT Facility where they store aggregate, fill, asphalt and gravel. This particular facility does not recycle material but they buy, haul and store the same materials proposed by his client.

Mr. Caldwell stated that his client intends to minimize the impact of the rezoning by maintaining a wooded 50 ft. buffer to eliminate noise, dust and a view of the industrial areas from the residential property. His client has complied with the state's requirements on sub-surface mining except for growing grass on top of the ground, but is expected to be fully permitted by the GA Department of Natural Resources for sub-surface mining.

Mr. Caldwell stated that the neighborhood is changing and they want to change with the neighborhood. He reiterated that his client has pledged to continue to work with staff to clear up the violations, and he is respectfully asking for the Planning Commission's support of this application.

Mr. Stewart stated that because of all of the children in the neighborhood, would the applicant consider installing a fence at least 8 ft. high all around the property. Mr. Caldwell stated that Mrs. Daniels is willing to install a fence along the rear property line where the residences adjoin and would agree to make that a condition of the rezoning. He pointed out that the 50 ft. buffer would be adjacent to the western boundary and the residential areas. Mr. Caldwell stated that they are willing to fence the area to keep the view from intruding on the residential property.

Mr. Hart wanted to know the plans for the two existing residences. Mr. Fields pointed out that there are actually three residences (one mobile home and two one-story frame buildings). Mr. Caldwell explained that the mobile home would remain on the property as the caretaker's home. Mrs. Daniels is currently living in one of the houses. The other house is not in use and will eventually be torn down.

Mr. James DePratter of 180 DePratter Lane was present to oppose this request. He stated that he lives behind the property of the proposed development. He explained that he is opposing this development because he currently has asbestosis of the lung and his wife has lung problems. He stated that grinding cement creates dust and asbestos which

is not good for his health. Also, the road was not designed to handle heavy equipment. He stressed that he does not want this behind his house, nor would the Commissioners want it behind their house. Mr. DePratter stated that he thinks the world of his neighbors but he has to protect his family and he is asking the Planning Commission to deny this request.

Mr. Jim DePratter, III of 200 DePratter Lane was present to oppose this request. He stated that his daughter plays in the area near the proposed site, and so does other children in the area. This development would pose a threat to their safety. He also expressed concerns about traffic and the damage that would be done to their road.

Mrs. Helen Farmer and Mrs. Joan DePratter were present to oppose this request due to the health, safety and welfare of the children, as well as adults in the neighborhood. They specifically expressed concerns about the dangers of the dust in the area.

Mr. Donnie Fraser asked the Planning Commission to consider the impact this development would have on the recreational facility in the area.

Mr. David Dubberly was present to speak on behalf of Glynn County's interest, health, safety and welfare regarding the proposed recycling activities.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any precautions in place for air admissions that would alleviate the concerns about dust. Mr. Caldwell explained that not all of the activities planned are anticipated to generate dust, such as grinding asphalt. He stated that there is a pond on the property that would provide a reservoir of water to supply a sprinkler system in the area to combat any generation of dust. Mr. Halbig stated that EPD would have regulations and requirements for preventing dust. He stated that the number one permitted use in this case is industrial use which involves manufacturing, processing, assembly...not including uses which may cause injurious or obnoxious noise, vibration, smoke, gas, fume, odor, dust, fire hazard, dangerous radiation or conditions objectionable to adjacent or nearby areas.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to deny this request based on the possible problems associated with the neighborhood and being located in the proximity of a county park. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

It was noted that a representative was still not present for application GC-31-00. Chairman Cole stated that this item would continue being held until a representative arrives. However, several residents were in attendance to express concerns about this item and requested to be heard at this time, in that they had to return to their places of business. It was pointed out that the applicants were notified and had full intentions of attending the meeting, and it was established that enough time had been allowed for them to arrive. Therefore, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to proceed with the application.

GC-31-00

Request to Rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential to M-12 One-Family Residential (Manufactured Homes) 1.2621 acres, described as tracts 1, 2 and 3 of Robert H. Griffin Subdivision; property having 190 feet frontage on Carteret Road. Property owned by Robert H. Griffin.

Mr. Halbig explained that this item was deferred from last month and re-advertised due to an error in the rezoning request being included in the staff's report and in the letters to the adjacent property owners. He proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

The intent of the agent is to locate a manufactured home with city water and individual septic on each of Lots 2 and 3. The lots are 12,027 sq. ft., which is in conformance with current requirements for lot size.

There is currently a residence on tract 1, owned by the applicant; this lot abuts Carteret Road. An extensive vegetative buffer shelters the back portion of the property.

The area is a mix of mobile homes and site-built homes. Zoning has been changing to and from mobile homes in the area with relative frequency. Since the area is developing as a mix of uses, staff recommends maintaining the residential quality of the tract 1 by maintaining its current zoning. Since the agent is seeking to locate manufactured housing on the site, Section 702.5 must be addressed as follows: Manufactured homes in M-12 and M-20 must comply with the following standards in order to assure visual compatibility with site-built single-family homes:

- a) Prior to occupancy each unit must be secured to an accepted foundation by tie-downs. The unit shall have a visible foundation or skirting, in conformance with Section 302. Definitions - Skirting.
- b) The minimum width of the main body of the doublewide units as assembled on the site shall not be less than twenty (20) feet wide, as measured across the narrowest point.
- c) The pitch of the main roof shall not be less than a 4 to 1 slope. Minimum distance from eaves to ridge shall be ten (10) feet. In general, any roofing material may be used that is generally acceptable for site-built housing.
- d) Any materials that are generally acceptable for housing built on the site may be used for exterior finish if applied in such a manner as to be similar in appearance.

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 use would be residential.

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

No. The addition of manufactured housing to the area should have no negative impact, given the mixed nature of the surrounding land uses and housing types.

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

Yes. Tracts 2 and 3 could each be developed as R-9 single-family 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. As stated above, since the properties can already be developed as one form of single-family residential, allowing a different category of single-family residential should have no additional impact on the area roads, schools or infrastructure.

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

Yes. The area is 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;

Since the front tract (tract 1) is currently developed, and the agent is seeking to locate homes on the rear two tracts, the front part should not be included in this request.

Mr. Halbig stated that staff is recommending approval of Tracts 2 & 3, and denial of Tract 1. He then read a letter that the applicant brought into the office yesterday (12-4-00) outlining the reasons for the rezoning.

Mr. Lonnie Johnson of 145 Carteret Road was present to oppose this request. Mr. Johnson stated that the only good that has come out of this request is that the applicant is finally cleaning up the area in question.

Ms. Julie Thorn of Emanuel Farm Road was present to oppose this request. She stated that there are already two existing mobile home parks in the area, which she feels is a sufficient number. She stated that the majority of the existing mobile homes are rental and are not properly maintained. This particular request lacks only one lot from being classified as a mobile home park. Ms. Thorn stressed that she and other residents in the area invested a lot of money in their homes and are totally against this request, as it would depreciate their property value.

Ms. Thorn stated that Mr. Griffin owns five additional parcels of property adjacent to the property that he is requesting to be rezoned. All of the six parcels of property are continuous. Five of the parcels have stick built homes on them. She stated that she is sympathetic to Mr. Griffin's health problem, but if he needs assistance from his daughters perhaps they could live in one of the existing homes. She also pointed out that two of the applicant's children already live near him. Ms. Thorn respectfully requested that the area remains for the use of stick built homes, and she asked that this application be denied.

Also present to speak in opposition of this request were Mr. Murray Miller of 100 Emanuel Farm Road, Mr. James Longshore of 118 Emanuel Farm Road, Mr. Donnie Fraser of 108 Emanuel Farm Road and Mr. Dennis Thorn of Emanuel Farm Road.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:55 a.m.

Preliminary Plat/Pickett Landing, Phase II (PP00-21)
14.16 Acres, Located on Highway 303 Approximately
1500 ft. west of Highway 341, Zoned R-9
Danny Highsmith, 303 South, LLC, Owner/Developer

Mr. Danny Highsmith and Ms. Diane Sapp were present for discussion.

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

The applicant is proposing to create a 34 lot phase II subdivision. Phase I ultimately created 22 lots. The smallest lot will be lot 15 at 12,002 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning classification is 9,000 sq. ft. The total area for lots equals 11.32 acres. In addition, there will be 2.84 acres for roads. The right-of-ways are suggested at 50 ft. public and are to be called Pickett Lane, Pickett Trail and Pickett Landing. An LDA permit will be required. The water supply will be a private system and individual septic tanks. Phase I of Pickett Landing, formerly (Doerflinger's Creek) was not reviewed as a multi-phase development. Phase I final plat was approved by the Board of Commissioners conditioned on the installation of accel/decel lanes.

Phase II was approved by the Planning Commission in September of this year with the conditions listed below. The applicant is petitioning the Commission to remove the second condition.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Halbig stated that staff recommends approval of this request conditioned on the following items:

1. Accel/decel lanes being included in Phase I.
2. Installation of water supply to county material and installation standards.
3. Limit the number of streets using the name "Pickett" to two in Phases I & II.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if the recommendations are the same as those approved by the Planning Commission in September. Mr. Sutton stated that the recommendations are the same. He further stated that he recalls Mr. Stewart at that time asking Mr. Highsmith if he were okay with those conditions and Mr. Highsmith acknowledged that he would be okay with the conditions. Mr. Highsmith has since discovered from EPD that without a system with an 8 inch line he would not be able to maintain the residual chlorine in the system without flushing a great deal, which wastes an excessive amount of water. Mr. Sutton stated that there are a number of other issues that are of concern to staff.

Yesterday afternoon (12-4-00) Mr. Sutton met with Mr. Jim Harris of EPD who provided a letter (dated 7-6-99) approving a request from Mr. Woodrow Sapp for a water system consisting of two 6 inch wells and 8 inch lines. An 8 inch line is the minimum that the county will accept for a fire hydrant. EPD will accept a fire hydrant on a 6 inch line. Mr. Sutton elaborated on the reasons staff suggested a water system be installed to county standards.

Mr. Stewart commented that most of the water systems that he's familiar with have been required to be looped. Ms. Diane Sapp stated that is correct, "if possible." Mr. Sutton read the following from the letter provided by Mr. Harris: "...Dead ends shall be minimized by making appropriate tie-ins whenever practical. Where dead end mains occur, they shall be provided with a fire hydrant or flush." Therefore, Mr. Sutton stated that it is not a requirement, but rather a preference. However, Mr. Stewart questioned why this particular system could not be looped. Ms. Diane Sapp stated that she is not sure. She explained that the engineer has not drawn the plans for the new phase. The water system is completely in place for Phase I. Mr. Stewart further commented that the system could be looped in that the easements are small. Ms. Sapp stated that it has been their practice to loop every system, but the engineer has not drawn the plans for this particular phase yet.

Mrs. Touw stated that the applicant is asking that the condition approved by the Planning Commission in September be removed. However, if the engineering has not been done yet, how then can the condition be removed? In essence, until the engineering is done, the applicant doesn't know if the system can or cannot be installed to county standards. Mr. Sutton stated that to date, no construction plans have been submitted for staff's review.

At this time, Mr. Danny Highsmith asked Ms. Sapp to explain why they are requesting to use 6 inch lines rather than 8 inch lines. Ms. Sapp stated that the water system for Phase I was approved by EPD in July 1999. Phase I is on a 6 inch line. The engineer for the project is prepared to move forward in designing the water system. She stressed that the developer will meet any condition proposed by the Planning Commission for either 6 inch lines or 8 inch lines; however, she just wants the Planning Commission to be aware that problems have come up in the past which calls for modifications from time to time. Ms. Sapp explained that had the developer installed an 8 inch line in Phase I (as required by the county) there would have been a lot of wasted water, which is what they would like to prevent in this case as well. EPD approved the 8 inch line, but did not like it. She reiterated that the developer is willing to meet any condition proposed by the Planning Commission.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this request within 60 days until the engineering is done on this phase; however, after further discussion, Mr. Stewart withdrew his motion. Discussion continued. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the applicant's request to remove condition #2. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mrs. Iris Touw. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Hal Hart.

Preliminary Plat/Harrington Oaks Subd. (PP00-30)

4.99 Acres, Located on South Harrington Road

Zoned R-6; RNI, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ron Tyson was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is proposing to create a 12 lot subdivision. The smallest lot will be lot 11 at 10,970 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning classification is 6,000 sq. ft. The total area for lots equals 3.61 acres. In addition, there will be 1.38 acres for roads. The right-of-ways are suggested at 60 and 80 ft. public and are to be called Redemption Lane and Redemption Circle. An LDA permit will be required. The water supply and sewage disposal will be Glynn County.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

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

Ms. Kay Horton, representing the St. Simons African American Heritage Coalition, was present to express concerns about the heritage of the Harrington Community, which she stated is 150 years old. Ms. Horton pointed out that the proposed development is in the heart of Harrington Community. "One by one the landowners are being forced off and this very significant community is being lost." She stated that the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan references recommendations to pursue the idea of preserving historic communities on St. Simons Island, and it was recommended that Harrington be considered as a potential historic district. Ms. Horton stressed that she just wants to raise awareness about what is happening in this historic community.

Mr. Tom Swan of RUPA wanted to know if there were any wetlands on the subject property. Mr. Sutton stated that wetlands would be addressed during the construction plan phase. Mr. Fields asked the applicant if wetlands had been delineated. Mr. Ron Tyson stated that a topographical survey was done by Alison Fletcher of

Atlantic Surveyors and there are no wetlands denoted on the property. He pointed out that they are not intending to develop lots to sell to individual builders. They would develop the lots and build the homes themselves in order to maintain the architectural value. Mr. Fields stated that a topographical survey is not a wetlands delineation, therefore the answer to his question would be "no." Mr. Tyson stated that they have found nothing to suggest wetlands being on the property.

Regarding Ms. Horton's comments about the Harrington Community, Mrs. Touw agreed that it was suggested that Harrington be considered as a potential historic district. There was an attempt to get a grant in order to run water and sewer into Harrington; however, the county determined that there was not enough residents to get the grant or to put in water and sewer. Mrs. Touw stated that she is concerned about this community. The property is zoned R-6 and tracts of land are being sold. When property is zoned R-6 and sold, then the buyer has the anticipation or the right to develop it. She stated that she wished there had been an organization to save this community six years ago. Mr. Fields concurred with Mrs. Touw. He stressed to Ms. Horton that the Planning Commission is not unsympathetic with the cause that she has put forward, but in this case it is their job to ensure that the preliminary plat is in compliance with the statutes.

Ms. Horton referenced earlier discussions in today's meeting about developments and how they affect existing neighborhoods. Mr. Hart explained to Ms. Horton that those instances were rezonings, which involved changing the use of land. In this particular case, the land has already been zoned.

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

Preliminary Plat/Live Oak Place Subdivision (PP00-31)

.9 Acres, Located on Demere Road, Zoned R-6

George Stewart, Owner/Developer

Mr. George Stewart and Mr. Ray Richard were present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to create a 5 lot subdivision. The smallest lot size will be 6,019.11sq. ft. Total area for lots is 34,203.35 sq. ft. and total area for streets is 5,000.97 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning classification is 6,000 sq. ft. Live Oak Place is suggesting a 40 ft. private street. The water supply and sewer service will be Glynn County.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

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

Mr. Ray Richard explained that the property has been delineated by an environmental consultant. The property owner is permitted to fill the area in question under the current Nation Wide Permit. There will be no other permitting required regarding wetlands.

Mrs. Touw stated that Live Oak Place could conceivably serve four lots. She wanted to know if it is anticipated that lot 5 will be exiting out onto Demere. Mr. Richard replied yes. Mrs. Touw had questions about the front yard setbacks. Mr. Richard stated that three lots (1, 4 & 5) would front on Demere Road. In accordance

with the ordinance concerning major and minor streets, Demere Road is considered the major street (20 ft. setback) and Live Oak Place would be considered the minor street (10 ft. setback).

Mr. Fields had questions about the access for tract 3 and how it would affect the owner of that tract. Mr. Richard stated that tract 3 would be accessed off of Live Oak Place. Mr. Hart expressed concerns about lots 1, 4 & 5 accessing Demere Road rather than Live Oak Place. Mr. Richard explained that these lots are fronting on Demere Road. The houses on Lots 1 & 4 could either face Demere Road or Live Oak Place. The Planning Commission could stipulate that the applicant is to provide a driveway access off of Live Oak Place and in that the developer is present, he could state whether or not he would have any objection to the stipulation.

For clarification, Mr. Sutton referenced Section 602.2(g) of the Subdivision Regulations regarding permanent dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs. He stated that he and Mr. Richard agreed that it would be safer to access Live Oak Place rather than Demere Road. Mr. Fields wanted to know who would have the authority to grant the variance from the cul-de-sac requirement. Mr. Sutton replied that the Planning Commission would. Mr. Hart asked the applicant (Mr. George Stewart) if he would have any objection to submitting a variance request. Mr. Stewart replied that he would not have a problem with that.

For further clarification, Mr. Fields stated that it appears that the consensus is to deny the preliminary plat and specify that access for lots 1, 4 & 3 be off of Live Oak Place only; and that a variance be granted from the cul-de-sac requirement for this particular application. Mr. Fields then made a motion to table this discussion for later in the meeting until a written request for a variance is submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart and unanimously adopted.

Preliminary Plat/The Landings at West Point (PP00-32)

7.373 Acres, Located on Mimosa Drive, Zoned R-12
Mary Louis Langston Dickey, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to create a 20 lot subdivision. The smallest lot will be lot 19 at 12,030 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning classification is 12,000 sq. ft. The total area for lots equals 5.993 acres and .075 acres for common areas. In addition, there will be 1.305 acres for right-of-way. The right-of-ways are suggested at 40 and 50 ft. private and are to be called Mimosa Drive and West Landings Lane. An LDA permit will be required. The water supply and sewage disposal will be Glynn County.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that according to the report, staff had recommended approval conditioned on the submission of a revision that addresses the items identified in a letter from him dated November 21, 2000. However, Mr. Shupe has submitted a revision that addresses the issues outlined in the letter. The revision was submitted after the planning packages had been delivered. He stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know who would be responsible for the cost of paving the section of Mimosa Drive. Mr. Ray Richard explained that the developer will carry the paved street all the way out to the existing paved street. Mr. Sutton stated that the roadbed will be a continuous pattern in accordance with Section 606.2 of the ordinance, but the right-of-way will not be continuous.

At Mrs. Touw's request, Mr. Sutton addressed the status of the list of items outlined in the November 21st letter to the developer as follows (NOTE: The italicized word "*Resolved*" indicates that the item has been taken care of):

1. Show the location of existing water and sewer utilities; (*Resolved*)
2. Note 3 should read R12; (*Resolved*)
3. Include state water buffer; (*Resolved: 25 ft. buffer noted on plans*)
4. Existing houses do not meet setbacks on lots 17, 18 & 20; (*Resolved*)
5. Show setbacks on lots 5, 10, 11 & 17; (*Resolved*)
6. Provide information as to how the road design will incorporate the tabby ruins; (*Resolved*)
7. Design street so that the continuance of an existing street patten is observed as described in Article VI, Section 602.2 (a) of the Subdivision Regulations; (*Resolved*)
8. All dead-end streets shall be provided at the closed end with a turnaround as described in Section 602.2 (g) of the Subdivision Regulations; (*Resolved: staff error*)

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

**Discussion resumed on Application #PP00-31
Preliminary Plat/Live Oak Place Subdivision**

At this time, Mr. Sutton presented a letter from the applicant requesting a variance from the cul-de-sac design standards as outlined in Section 602.2 (g) of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Sutton stated that this is a safer proposal and staff recommends approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the Preliminary Plat Application for Live Oak Place Subdivision with the following conditions:

- 1) Exception to the Subdivision Regulations be granted;
- 2) Vehicular access for lots 1 & 4 be from Live Oak Place private street only and placed on the final plat for approval; and
- 3) Lot 5 to be accessed via Demere Road.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued. Mr. Hart asked that the motion be amended to include lot 3 to be accessed from Live Oak Place; however, during the course of discussion, Mr. Hart withdrew the amendment. After discussion, the motion for approval with the above noted conditions were unanimously adopted.

Preliminary Plat/Lexington Place, Phase II (PP00-33)

29.83 Acres, Located on the Northeast Quadrant
of I-95 and Spur 25, Zoned Planned Development
Regency Group, Owner/Developer

Mr. Chris Amos was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to create a 51 lot phase. The smallest lot will be lot 50 at 8,008 sq. ft. All right-of-ways will measure 60 ft. and will be public. These right-of-ways are to be called Freedom Trail, Carolina Court, Virginia Way, Pennsylvania Court, Maryland Court and Continental Drive. An LDA permit is required. The water supply will be Glynn County Water System and the sewage disposal will be Glynn County Sewer.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff is recommending denial of this request. He explained that no state water delineation has been made. Lot 49 may lose its entire access to a State Water Buffer. Soils and delineation may affect the possibility of construction of a road at the proposed location identified as Continental Drive. The applicant was informed of this concern and has attempted to address it with note 13 on the drawings, which states "The GA Soil Erosion Sedimentation Act of 1975 requires a 25 ft. buffer along waters of the state." Mr. Sutton pointed out that the extent of state waters on or adjacent to the subject property has not been determined at this time. He stated that until confirmation is provided to the contrary, staff feels that the wetland areas and lake are considered state waters.

Mr. Fields stated that Freedom Trail will eventually tie back in to Altamaha Boulevard, thereby extending beyond the 1200 ft. limit, which would require a variance. Mr. Sutton stated that it was suggested that a temporary cul-de-sac be included at the end and Mr. Chris Amos has concurred with staff. However, Mr. Fields recalled a previous application where a variance was requested on each phase. He stated that is not the case with this request in that Phase I has already been approved. Mr. Fields stated that he has a problem acting on this request without the necessary delineation. In an effort to solve the problem, he suggested tabling this item until a variance request is submitted.

During his presentation, Mr. Chris Amos stated that this is the first time that the variance request on the 1200 ft. has been brought to his attention. He stated that he does have a Master Plan for this project and Freedom Trail will be extended to Altamaha Boulevard. He pointed out that there is no doubt about the state waters. He explained that a wetland area is considered to be waters of the state, but all waters of the state do not require a buffer. Typically, jurisdictional wetlands do not require a buffer. If there is water flowing in the wetland, then there is a buffer but the buffer is not measured from the wetland jurisdiction.

Mr. Amos stated that no buffer was required on Phase I, and he is dealing with the same wetland systems on Phase II. The lake that is located to the east of Waldon Shore Apartments requires a 45 ft. buffer, but it is measured from the normal water elevation of the lake where the vegetation begins. He explained that the intent of the buffer is to preserve a 25 ft. strip adjacent to a body of water so that surface pollutants can be cleaned up by the vegetative strip as the water runs into the lake. The lake is off of the developer's property. Mr. Amos stated that he did not initially show the 25 ft. buffer on the plat because he had not located the edge of the lake. He further explained that although the buffer needs to be shown on the plat, it will not be an issue with the construction of the subdivision on the usable lot area. Mr. Amos stated that perhaps the Planning Commission could approve this request contingent upon the buffer being properly shown on the plat and submitted to staff for review.

Mrs. Touw asked Mr. Amos if he understands that if any of the lots were to change in size, location, etc. that he has to come back to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Amos replied yes.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about the area located east of Lot 30 along Continental Drive between jurisdictional wetlands and the lake. He stated that if the preliminary plat is approved, this particular area becomes part of the approval process. He is concerned that it is an undesignated tract of land that has no use, function or purpose, and he is concerned about its future use. Mr. Amos stated that the original intent was to show the area as common area and the use of that common area would be determined at a future date. He stated that the area could be labeled as reserved for common development.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this preliminary plat with the following conditions:

1. The area in question (wetland jurisdiction area east of Freedom Trail) be labeled "area to be deeded as common properties."
2. Upon review of the requested jurisdictional state waters buffer, if staff finds that there are significant changes in any lot configuration, said changes are to be brought to the Planning Commission's attention prior to construction.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mrs. Iris Touw. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Wayne Stewart.

Preliminary Plat Extension/Oak Grove Island, Phase VI
Located on Oak Grove Island Road
Zoned Planned Development
Oak Grove Island Limited, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting an extension to a preliminary plat that was originally approved in 1990. There have been several extensions granted, most recently in 1998. In 1990, the Planning Commission approved a preliminary plat for 313 acres and 425 lots. Mr. Shupe has indicated in his letter dated November 27th that to-date a total of 139 lots have been developed either through phased preliminary plats or minor plat applications.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff recommends approval conditioned on the developer providing a more detailed master plan indicating completed development by phase, and providing a more detailed instrument with which to determine the exact boundary lines of the tract to be subdivided, indicated by a heavy line giving length and bearings, and total subdivision land area in acres. (This requirement is stated in Article VII, Section 703.8 of the current Glynn County Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Fields asked if the applicant agrees with staff's recommendations. Mr. Shupe replied yes.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve this request subject to staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted.

Minor Plat/Heidi Subdivision

Lots 8A, 8B1, 8B2 & 9
7.7893 Acres, Located on Doris Street
Zoned Forest Agricultural
Camilla Outland, Owner/Developer

Mr. Charles Outland was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to further subdivide lot 8. Previously, lot 8 was subdivided. Records do not indicate that the Planning Commission, in accordance with Article VIII, Section 802 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations approved the subdivision. Wetlands were filled with Army Corp approval and the applicant now seeks approval to further subdivide lot 8B.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed the application.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff recommends denial based on encroachment into wetlands, the purposes outline in Article IV of the Subdivision Regulations, and the intent of Forrest Agricultural Zoning District.

Mr. Outland gave a brief presentation. He stated that he is requesting to subdivide the property in order to put a trailer on Lot 8B2 for his stepson. Possibly in the future he would also like to put a trailer on Lot 9 for his other son. Lot 9 is not ready for any type of construction at this time. The areas that are clear and have been filled are capable of supporting a trailer or a house. Mr. Outland pointed out that he has the proper square footage for a septic tank and for wells. There will be a separate well and separate septic systems for both trailers. He stated that the property meets all county requirements and he is asking for the Planning Commission's support.

Mr. Walter Goodbread, adjacent property owner, was present to speak in favor of this request.

It was pointed out by the Planning Commission that the 801 section of the ordinance was designed to help families like Mr. Outland to be able to provide property and subsequently homes for other family members. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

Site Plan/Oak Grove Island Office (SP00-30)

15.283 Acres, Located on Oak Grove Island Road
Zoned PD-G Planned Development-General
Oak Grove Island Limited, Owner/Developer

Mr. James Kent and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

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

The majority of the site exists as an unimproved woodland area with a 1,250 square foot temporary office, gravel drive and parking. The proposed project is for the construction of a 1,856 square foot building with two asphalt entrances leading to a ten car parking area. The temporary structure is to be removed. A minimum of ten parking spaces is required. The lot size is 15.283 acres and site coverage equals approximately 3.9%. Water will be provided from a community water system and sewer will be provided by a septic system.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

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

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. (It was noted that Mrs. Iris Touw was not in the meeting room at this time.)

Site Plan/New Hanger & Office (SP00-31)

.324 Acre Tract, Located on Airport Road
Zoned PD-G Planned Development-General
Ray & Linda Pinson, Owner/Developer

Mr. Don Hutchinson and Mr. Ray Pinson were present for discussion.

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

This plan calls for the construction of an office with hangar space. 10 parking spaces have been provided and 10 are required. The lot size is 14,100 sq. ft. Total site coverage is 12,473 sq. ft. or 88%. Water and sewer will be provided by Glynn County Water and Sewer Department.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff recommends approval with the following conditions prior to issuing a building permit:

1. A minor plat application be submitted and a lot created that provides dedicated ingress/egress to public right-of-way. Currently, the Airport Commission grants access via unstated easement. This conflicts with Article VI, Section 601 Street Access which states, "Except as herein provided, **no building shall hereafter be erected, constructed, moved or relocated on a lot not abutting on a publicly dedicated, accepted and maintained street, or on a lot not having an officially**

approved permanent record easement to such a street, or on a private street which does not meet minimum design standards..."

Mr. Fields stated that he doesn't think the site plan should be approved before submission of an 801 application. Mr. Sutton stated that the site will change. The majority of the change will occur where the access is located. At this point it is indicated on the plan as a driveway. If the same boundary lines are used on the minor plat application, the square footage would be included in the lot size.

Mr. Fields asked the applicant if he will need the 10 parking spaces indicated on the site plan. Mr. Ray Pinson stated that he probably won't need 10 spaces but the site plan was drawn on the requirements for the existing office space. He pointed out that there will only be four people in the office building and maybe a visitor from time to time. Mr. Fields stated that perhaps another alternative method could be used for at least 5 of the spaces. Mr. Pinson stated that he is flexible and would be fine with landscaping some of the area. Mr. Fields stated that the site plan is in compliance with the statute, but they have been looking for ways to try to cut down on paving and having more green space or a substitute, such as "grassring" paving.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart subject to staff's recommendation and subject to staff's review of the parking. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. (It was noted that Mrs. Iris Touw was not in the meeting room at this time.)

Site Plan/Bristol Efficiencies (SPOO-32)

.8 Acre Tract, Located at the end of Cornwall Street, Zoned Medium Residential
Chris Hutchinson, Owner/Developer

Mr. Quinton Hutchinson was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes the construction of two multi-family units. Total area equals 34,848 sq. ft. Impervious surface equals 20,419 sq. ft. or 58.6%. 26 parking spacing are required and 26 have been provided. Access is being proposed from Cornwall Street. A court ruling previously has affected the possibility of accessing the Hutchinson property via Cornwall Street.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, Environmental Engineering, as well as GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff is recommending approval of this request with the following conditions:

1. The applicant provides resolution to the problem of access from Cornwall Street prior to being issued a building permit.
2. No access be granted or assumed from Bristol Lane, P.E. because it currently exceeds private access easement requirements in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations.

3. The construction of two additional units beyond the scope of this site plan will require ADA minimum standards to be achieved in not only the next phase but retrofitted into this phase as well.
4. Must meet City of Brunswick development standards for water and sewer.

Mr. Quinton Hutchinson acknowledged that he agrees with the staff's recommendations.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve this request subject to the conditions stated by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mrs. Iris Touw.

Site Plan/Used Car Sales Facility for the Liberty Group (SP00-33)

8.1 Acre Tract, Located on Golden Isles Parkway
and Walker Road, Zoned HC Highway Commercial
James Roberson, Owner/Developer

Contrary to a recent news article, Mr. Sutton stated that the owner has provided a letter indicating that there is no consideration for a restaurant at the proposed location at this time.

Due to a representative not being in attendance, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this request for a maximum of 60 days. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

537 Beachview Drive (VP00-14)

11,229 Sq. Ft. Tract, St. Simons Island, Zoned
General Commercial-Core/Village Preservation
Mr. & Mrs. Irvine, Owner; Larry L. Bryson, Developer

Mr. Sutton stated that Mr. Larry Bryson was in attendance earlier, but he had to leave. However, he did state that he would try to return before the end of the meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to table discussion of this item until Mr. Bryson returns, and if Mr. Bryson is not back before the end of the meeting, this item will be deferred for up to 60 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart and unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the Minutes of the November 7, 2000 Planning Commission meeting with any necessary corrections. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mrs. Iris Touw. Mr. Perry Fields was not present at the November 7th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

A) Ordinance Sub-Committee, Report & Discussion

Mrs. Iris Touw presented a summary of the sub-committee's meeting of November 21st. She explained that the committee's top priority is to have staff increased to a level required in order to fulfill the requirements of the Planning & Zoning Division. The Planning Commission members concurred.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields (on behalf of the Planning Commission) authorizing Chairman Lamar Cole to draft a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners requesting the Board to give priority to assisting the Community Development Department in locating additional staff for the Planning & Zoning Division. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Discussion continued.

Mr. John Peterson explained that one of the problems is that the market and the cost of living in this area are not comparable to other areas, which in turn promotes disinterest. He stated that he has discussed this problem with Ms. Rowell and Mr. Eckert and has been given the go-ahead "to do whatever it takes to fill the bill." They are therefore in the process of amending the budget in order to get additional staff. Mr. Peterson further stated that he is considering adding a permanent part-time position to assist with the regular business of the Planning Commission, Board of Appeals, etc. He stated that Mr. Eckert has also approved for him to re-hire three vacant positions in the department. The applications received to-date for the Planner III position have not been at the level of expertise needed for the department.

After discussion, the motion was amended to include that copies of the letter from Chairman Cole be distributed to Mr. Peterson, Mr. Eckert, Ms. Becky Rowell and to all County Commissioners. Also, incorporate language in the letter that it is being submitted with the full support of all Planning Commission members. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

Mrs. Touw stated that the sub-committee is ready to do a draft ordinance for consideration for the St. Simons Island Overlay in an effort to put all of the special exceptions together, to restrict any new R-6 zoning to the mainland, and to include institutional uses under uses requiring site plan approval.

Mr. Stewart suggested going through the ordinance and making notations in pencil, page by page and to proceed expeditiously on an individual level. The changes should then be compiled in a rough draft and eventually forwarded to the County Attorney for legal review.

Mr. Fields suggested setting a time limit to go through the ordinance individually. He stated that perhaps a rough draft of the changes could be ready for review by March 2001. He further stated that it might be a good idea to consider publicizing the act that this is a step that the Planning Commission is taking and invite the public to contact staff or any member of the Planning Commission with comments or concerns to be incorporated. He also suggested for consideration the possibility of having a separate zoning book for District 2 or perhaps having two sections in one book; one section to address the Island and one section to address the mainland.

Regarding the parking issue, Mrs. Touw reported that the consensus of the sub-committee is to reduce parking by approximately 10%, but to require that the area in question be reserved as green space and not be used to increase building size. She stated that this issue will be reviewed further and perhaps incorporated in the draft.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that the sub-committee is also continuing its work on the possibility of having a "tower zone." He stated that they would try to have a status report at the next meeting, which is scheduled for December 13th at 9:00 a.m. in the first floor conference room of Community Development.

B) Election of Chairman & Vice Chairman, 2001

Ms. Ann McCormick reported that the nominating committee recommended that Mr. Lamar Cole remain as Chairman and that Mr. Wayne Stewart remain as Vice Chairman of the Glynn County Planning Commission for the year 2001. The floor was then open for nominations. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to nominate Mr. Lamar Cole as Chairman for the year 2001 and Mr. Wayne Stewart as Vice Chairman for the year 2001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. There being no other nominations from the floor, nominations were closed. The motion nominating Mr. Lamar Cole as Chairman and Mr. Wayne Stewart as Vice Chairman was unanimously adopted.

It was noted that Mr. Larry Bryson, representing application VP00-14, 537 Beachview Drive, did not return to the meeting. Therefore, as stated in the motion, this application is deferred and will be placed as the first item on the agenda for the January 9, 2001 Planning Commission meeting.

In an effort to expedite uncontested items on the agenda, it was suggested that these items be presented earlier in the meeting to avoid having applicants wait unnecessarily through an entire meeting.

Mr. Fields requested that staff look into getting an update as to the progress of the Wildlife Park and report back to the Planning Commission.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.