

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 5, 2001 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lamar Cole, Chairman
Hal Hart
Ann McCormick
Iris Touw
Jonathan Williams

ABSENT: Perry Fields
Wayne Stewart

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
Lee Sutton, Planning Official
Millard Johnson, Transportation Coordinator
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement
Gary Spikes, Code Enforcement
Mickey Milton, Code Enforcement
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording 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.

GC-2001-14

Request to rezone from Highway Commercial to General Commercial, 5.52 acres described as 3210 Highway 82. Property having 632.75 ft. of frontage on Georgia Highway 303 and U.S. Highway 82. Property owned by Bay Harbor Church of God.

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

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

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.

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

No.

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

Yes, however the church wishes to expand and include a childcare center of the character described in Article VII, Section 712.3.9 of the Zoning Ordinance. This use is not permitted in the HC zoning classification.

- 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, however care must be given during construction plan approval to address traffic safety issues. Specifically, curb cut locations in relation to the intersection.

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

The future land use plan identifies this area as commercial.

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

None.

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

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if the applicant would have to come back for site plan approval. Mr. Sutton stated that he doesn't believe so, but the Planning Commission could make that part of the condition for approval. Staff would review any building permit application.

Mr. Larry Bryson gave a brief presentation. He explained that the Bay Harbor Church of God is a new facility that was completed approximately two years ago, and there was a site plan approved at that time. Their goal is to open a daycare facility to meet the needs of the church and the community and potentially in the future they plan to open a school.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw with an amendment stipulating that the setbacks are done in accordance with the Highway Commercial zoning classification; and that the applicant comes back for site plan approval due to safety concerns. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-15

Request to rezone from Medium Residential to Planned Development-Residential, 1.954 acres described as Lots 1 & 2, Picric Park Subdivision. Property having 407.06 ft. of frontage on Old Mill Trace. Property owned by Coastal Realty Investments, Inc.

Mr. Dan Coty was present for discussion.

Mr. Sutton explained that according to the PD section of the Zoning Ordinance, there is a prerequisite that any rezoning to Planned Development has to at least have three acres. This request does not contain three acres. This was not discovered in time to discuss it with the applicant. Mr. Sutton apologized for this oversight. He stated that staff originally recommended approval with the understanding that when the building permit is made consideration is given to the necessity of buffers between the residential and commercial uses. However, in light of this discovery staff is now recommending

denial in that this request does not meet the minimum requirement of a Planned Development in accordance with Section 723.2. 1).

Following a brief discussion regarding the alternative to defer or withdraw the application, Mr. Dan Coty requested that this application be withdrawn at this time. The withdrawal was granted.

At this time, Mrs. Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement Supervisor, introduced Mr. Gary Spikes and Mr. Mickey Milton as the two new Code Enforcement Officers in the Community Development Department. She informed the Planning Commission that on last month, the Code Enforcement Division investigated two violations of the Soil Erosion Sedimentation Control Act. Both cases were successfully prosecuted and the violators were fined \$1000 dollars each. Mrs. Pittman stated that her Division is constantly working to answer all complaints.

GC-2001-16

Request to rezone from Resort Residential to Planned Development, 2.754 acres, described as a portion of the Glynn County Waste Treatment Facility, located in the northwest quadrant of the Sea Island Company North Support Campus. Property owned by Sea Island Company.

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

Mr. Sutton explained that this request is 2.7 acres, which is also less than three acres. However, this is to be absorbed into a larger parcel that does exceed the three-acre minimum requirement. He then proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

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, these parcels are proposed to be absorbed into already existing (PD) text adopted in 1999.

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

No.

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

Yes.

- 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.

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

The future land use plan identifies this area as commercial and the proposed use is in support of a commercial activity.

- 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.

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

Mr. Jim Gilbert gave a brief presentation. As pointed out by Mr. Sutton, he explained that the property is going to be absorbed in the Planned Development. Glynn County needed property by the fire station on Lawrence Road for a water tower and other uses. Over a period of months, Glynn County worked with Sea Island Company to successfully swap some property for that particular piece of property.

Mrs. Touw stated that there is a copy of the Planned Development in their package with application number GC-31-99. Mr. Edenfield stated that the copy of the Planned Development contained in the packages was already on file. Mrs. Touw stated that this is the original plan that the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended to the County Commission. At that meeting, Commissioner Robertson made a motion that Parcels A and B would have a building height limited to 35 ft. and Parcel C would remain at 45 ft. Therefore, the PD needs to be corrected.

Mr. Ernie Craft stated that he is not opposed to this request but he does have some concerns. He wanted to know if the addition would have any impact on the water and sewer programs that are in place for the adjacent properties. Mr. Edenfield replied no; they have their own current water and sewer system.

Mrs. Carolyn Young, adjacent property owner, wanted to know if this is going to be consistent and just augmenting the 1999 action. She also wanted to know if this project is going to be part of a broader agenda. She would not want to see the entire west end of St. Simons acquisition of property being dedicated back to the county for increased sewage disposal use in the area of Dunbar Creek water shed. She believes that Mr. Gilbert has already addressed these questions to her satisfaction, but she wanted to go on record with her concerns. She stated she assumes that Sea Island Company, as usual, will provide sufficient buffers.

Mrs. Mary Flowers wanted to know what the developers are planning to build, and if there would be a narrow strip of public access. Mr. Gilbert explained that this will be a continuation of the 1999 plan and will not be dedicated back to the county for part of the sewage treatment plant.

Mrs. Touw stated that on the drawing there was a 25 ft. buffer between these parcels and Glynn Haven but it does not show it being extended to incorporate the new addition. Mr. Gilbert stated that it needs to be and it will be continued on out.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend approval of this request with the condition that the 25 ft. buffer be extended through the new addition; and that the Planned Development Amendment be corrected on height for Parcels A & B. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

Ocean Suites, Phase II (SP01-15)

14,954 Square Feet, Located at the corner of
Ocean Boulevard and 13th Street, St. Simons
Zoned General Commercial/VP
ABNA, Inc., Owner/Developer

Ocean Suites, Phase II (VP01-12)

14,954 Square Feet, Located on the west side of Oak
Street, between Ocean Blvd. & Oglethorpe Avenue
St. Simons Island, Zoned General Commercial/VP
ABNA, Inc., Owner/Developer

Messrs. Abbis Vakili, Larry Taylor, Don Hutchinson, Larry Bryson, Walt Bazemore, Bill Edenfield and Attorney Jim Gilbert were present for discussion.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to hear these two applications together but to make separate motions.

Mr. Sutton proceeded with the staff's report for the **Site Plan Application** as follows:

This plan calls for the demolition of single-family residential structures on lots 253 and 254 of St. Simons Beach Subdivision. A thirty room three-story hotel is being proposed. Parking will be provided beneath the proposed structure. Thirty-three spaces are required and thirty-three are provided. The maximum building height in the GC district is 60 ft. with Fire Department approval. No detail on the submittal suggests the need for Fire Department approval.

The Building Inspections Division, Planning & Zoning, Engineering, as well as Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department have all reviewed this project. The following denied the site plan:

Building Inspections:

Handicapped-parking van accessible understructure. Three curb cuts indicated on plan. Only two are allowed. This proposal allows for maneuvering in the right-of-way. Specifically, backing into an intersection.

Traffic Safety:

Requires deceleration lane for entrance and 40 ft. taper for exit on Ocean Boulevard.

Mr. Sutton stated that staff is recommending denial of this request. He then proceeded with the staff's report for the **Village Preservation Application** as follows:

This plan calls for the demolition of two existing structures to be replaced by a single thirty-room four-story hotel (3-stories of rooms over ground level parking). The structure shall be concrete floor slabs with the metal stud walls with stucco wall finish. Building style shall be Mediterranean in flavor and color palette.

Building Inspections state that the project exceeds the height restrictions, needs to provide handicapped parking under the structure, has too many curb cuts, and no LDA is on file. Traffic Safety requires a deceleration lane for entrance and a 40 ft. taper for exit on Ocean Blvd.

Planning & Zoning staff would request the Planning Commission to consider the height limit issue addressed in Article VII, Section 709.5 of the Zoning Ordinance. Also, curb cut requirements indicate only two are allowed and that the maximum width for commercial is 40 ft. This plan proposes three with one being the entire width of the lot to allow parked vehicles to back into the street. While the street currently is considered a minor street, this proposal may change that character as a result of the increase in the average daily traffic count. Finally, should we plan to allow visitors to back into an intersection?

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

Attorney Jim Gilbert gave a brief presentation. He stated that although this department is understaffed, they have done a good job with these applications. However, there are some issues that had he known about sooner they could have been taken care of. For instance, the accel/decel lane on Ocean Boulevard has already been done and resubmitted. He stated that there won't be a problem with setting aside the handicapped parking. Also, there are only going to be two curb cuts. Staff may be considering the dirt road as a third curb cut, but there won't be a curb cut at that location. He stated that he is not sure why a land disturbance permit would be needed because the developer is not even close to disturbing the land yet.

Attorney Gilbert stated that having agreed to everything else, the only other two issues that perhaps needed to be cleared up would be the height and backing into the street. In addressing backing into the street, he pointed out that according to the GPS pictures, everything in this particular area backs out into the street. The county helped to design Redfern Village and every place in that area backs out into the street. He stated that no one could do business in the Village Preservation area without having to back out into the street. He stated there would be a few parking places on the dirt road. There is 15 ft. of space in the right-of-way between the location of the existing dirt road and the outer edge of the parking places. However, there is plenty of maneuvering room between the street and the parking places. Attorney Gilbert stated that it is hard for him to see how backing into the street could become part of staff's objection.

Regarding the height, Attorney Gilbert explained that the way the overlay ordinance was originally written, height and coverage were to be determined based on the buildings that existed in 1992. There is no way to tell what buildings existed in 1992 or their height because many of them have been torn down. The GPS maps do not have a building that is critical to determine what the height is on this particular project. Attorney Gilbert explained that they did a reasonable job of figuring height. He then presented a handout showing their method of calculating the building height and stated that this is a two-phase project. The first phase of this project is one of the properties used to figure the height. There is a street separating the project but it is the same hotel that will share a check-in area, laundry, etc. He stated that this is not two different hotels and the height is not in violation of the ordinance.

At this time, Mr. Larry Taylor elaborated on the height issue. He explained that there are two ways to determine height under the Village Preservation Ordinance; 1) by using the existing buildings on the property; or 2) by using the adjacent lots to the property. He pointed out the adjacent lots and the vacant lot. Under the Village Preservation Ordinance when using a vacant lot in considering height or density, the nearest building to the proposed project is used. In this case, the Village Plaza becomes the nearest building to the project. Therefore, there are two at 45 ft. and one at 17 ft. Averaging the three together gives an average of 35.6 ft. When the Village Preservation Ordinance was established it was known that height could not be controlled exactly the same as a neighbor, which is why the 10 ft. allowance to go higher than the neighbor was included in the ordinance. In this case, they can go 10 ft. higher than the average of the adjoining property.

Mrs. Iris Touw stressed that there is no reason why the Planning Commission could not have had this information on Friday before the packages were delivered. They need time to study this information before making a recommendation. She stated that Mr. Taylor used the Village Plaza as part of his height calculation, but she would like to know why did he not use the house across Oak or 13th Street instead, which is adjacent to his property and just as close as the Village Plaza. Mr. Taylor explained that the way the Village Ordinance is written, had he crossed the street to use the house that Mrs. Touw is referring to he would have had to cross all of the streets and use all of the buildings in his calculation, which would be very involved. Mrs. Touw stated that the reason Mr. Taylor used the Village Plaza in his calculation is because it is taller. She stated that she is just trying to be equitable.

Attorney Jim Gilbert apologized for not getting the information to the members sooner. He stated that when he met with the applicant, he was of the impression that everything was in order and staff would not have a problem recommending approval. However, on yesterday (6-4-01) he received several denials from many departments. He therefore put the new information together last night in response to what he found out for the first time on Monday. Mrs. Touw stated that it is very difficult to make a recommendation at this point because she does not know the projections, etc. Attorney Gilbert presented a picture of what the building will look like. He pointed out that the building was designed around an existing large oak tree in an effort to save the tree.

Mrs. Touw explained that some time ago lot coverage/site coverage was discussed at length. She referenced previous Minutes where Attorney Gary Moore stated that the terminology for lot coverage/site coverage was interchangeable. She then asked questions about this particular site coverage and the building footprint. Mr. Taylor stated that under the definition of lot coverage this project is 41%. He stated that there is no site coverage requirement in General Commercial under the Village Preservation District. Mrs. Touw stated that her understanding of the Village Preservation was to keep development from coming in that would affect existing houses. The footprint and height of buildings were included to avoid overpowering. She emphasized that she personally could not vote on a site plan that is not totally reflective of what the applicant is planning to do with regard to the building height. She would much rather have the applicant figure in the height from across the street on both sides. She would also like to have clarification regarding the definition of lot and site coverage as to whether they are interchangeable or not.

Mr. Hal Hart stated that this is an incomplete application in that the Planning Commission has not been furnished all of the pertinent information. He stated that he has several questions involving Section 502 Building Height and Section 611.5 Use of Public Rights-of-Way. He then asked the applicants if they received a letter from the Building Inspections Office saying that it is okay to use the right-of-way. Attorney Jim Gilbert replied no because he was not notified in time. Mr. Hart stated that he understands and he is not trying to be critical, but this is why he is saying that the application is not complete. Agreeing with Mrs. Touw, Mr. Hart stated that he could not vote on this request without having complete information.

Mr. Walt Bazemore, the architect for the project, stated that Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Taylor covered most everything, but he understands the confusion. On May 22nd he submitted a set of drawings to the planning staff with all of the pertinent information including site coverage, building heights, paving, drainage, floor plan, elevation, size of the building footprint, etc. however, the Planning Commission has not seen these drawings. Mr. Bazemore stated that it is very difficult to make a ruling if you don't have all of the facts. Again, he stated that all of this information was turned into the planning staff on May 22nd.

Mrs. Touw stated that once again, consideration needs to be given to changing the submittal dates, which was tried and failed. Mr. Sutton apologized for not being able to get the information out sooner; however, he agreed with Mrs. Touw. He stated that there needs to be more time to review an application. It is impossible to be given an application on May 22nd, give the Planning Commission the details needed to make a decision in 7 to 9 days, distribute the packages and allow the Planning Commission enough time to absorb the information and be prepared for discussion on the day of the meeting. Mr. Sutton stressed that "in his opinion, there is no group of people in Glynn County better qualified at submitting a complete application than Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Bryson and Mr. Hutchinson." Mr. Sutton elaborated on the definitions of adjacent and adjoining as they relate to this application. Also, he stated that he did not suggest that the applicant needed a letter from the Building Inspections Office.

Mr. Sutton pointed out that the handicap issue could be addressed once they get pass the site plan approval process and the Village Preservation. He explained that a vehicle enters a street via curb cut. Article VI of the ordinance allows two curb cuts with a maximum width of 40 ft. There are two curb cuts in this particular project and one that is not considered a curb cut, but vehicles are accessing the street. In one parking space the vehicle backs into the intersection. Section 614.2 restricts a vehicle from entering via

curb cut near an intersection. Mr. Sutton stated that no LDA application needs to be considered at this time. He stressed that he did not censor staff's comments, or the submitted application. He did however question Mr. Hutchinson as to the amount of information needed to be presented. Mr. Sutton emphasized that staffing is a problem.

Attorney Gilbert stated that if the Planning Commission thinks that this application needs to be deferred then he is willing to defer. He stressed however that "staff is extremely confident, but there is not enough staff."

Mr. Hart asked that the applicants address the following items in their site plan: Sections 611.5; 614.1; 614.2; 613; 709.4, which states that "*there shall be no removal of healthy trees without the approval of the Glynn County Planning Commission which are 12 inches in diameter or 38 inches in circumference.*" They also need to address Section 709.5 and the point of no elevation under the Village Preservation.

At this time Attorney Gilbert requested that the Site Plan Application and the Village Preservation Application for Ocean Suites Phase II be deferred until the July 10th Planning Commission meeting. In the mean time, he stated that he is willing to work with staff on getting the submittal time extended. Also, this being the end of Mrs. Iris Touw's term on the Planning Commission, Attorney Gilbert took this opportunity to thank Mrs. Touw for her services and dedication to Glynn County over the years.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:40 a.m.

Paradise Bay (VP01-10)

2200 Square Feet, Located on the south side of Mallory Street, St. Simons Island
Zoned General Commercial/VP
Mike and Lee Waanounou, Owner/Developer

Mr. Walid Mohd was 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 installation of a fascia sign on the business. The sign will be non-illuminated with overall outside dimensions of 36" H x 138"W. The total sign area however totals 28 sq. ft. The building front wall area equals 300 sq. ft. This allows for 30 sq. ft. or 10% of the front wall area. The sign lettering does not exceed the maximum height allowed in the Village. Finally, this proposal far exceeds that of the neighboring business and definitely improves the harmony within the Village Preservation Overlay District.

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

Following a brief presentation by Mr. Mohd, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

544 Poplar Avenue (VP01-11)

6600 Square Feet, Located on the south side of
Poplar Street, between Neptune Way and
Oak Street, St. Simons Island, Zoned R-6
Alan and Diane Strihafka, Owner/Developer

Mr. Alan Strihafka was 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 addition of a master bedroom, bath, home office, craft room and the conversion of an existing bedroom into a den. Lot coverage with the proposal does not exceed 50%. Details as to total height of proposal were not available at the time the packages were distributed, nor were heights of adjoining buildings considered in their application by the applicant. Conversation with the architect late Friday (6-1-01) indicated that the 10 ft. limit addressed in Article VII, Section 709.5 of the Zoning Ordinance would not be exceeded. No building permit would be issued if it did. Structures on both sides of 544 Poplar Avenue are two stories. This can be seen in the photos submitted for the Planning Commission's consideration. Finally, no information was submitted for review in regards to color and material types that would satisfy those criteria identified in Article VII, Section 709.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sutton stated that this is an incomplete application. However, as a result of staff's inability to provide feedback to the applicant in a timely manner in order for corrections to be made, Mr. Sutton stated that he is not blaming the applicant for the incomplete application. Staff is recommending denial of this request until all aspects of the Village Preservation District are complied with.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Alan Strihafka stated that he has answered all of the questions raised in the staff's report. He then presented a handout with additional information on the height calculations, colors and materials to be used. He also presented elevation plans of the existing structure and the new addition.

Regarding the right elevation plan, Mrs. Touw had questions about the size of the cupola in reference to the drawing. Mr. Strihafka stated that the cupola is long and narrow and will be the length of the building. He also stated that the new construction will all be within the 7 ft. setback.

Mr. Sutton stated that as a result of the additional information submitted today, staff would like to change its recommendation from denial to approval. He confirmed that in his opinion, this application conforms to the standards established in Section 709.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Touw asked if Mr. Sutton had seen the applicant's site plan. Mr. Sutton replied yes and he apologized for not having the site plan available for the Planning Commission's review; however he would get copies for the members to have on file.

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

MINUTES

May 1, 2001

May 22, 2001

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the **May 1, 2001** 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 and Mrs. Iris Touw. Mr. Jonathan Williams was absent for the May 1st meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

A motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve the Minutes of the **May 22, 2001** Planning Commission work session with any necessary corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Hal Hart was absent for the May 22nd work session and therefore abstained from voting.

Planning Commission Items

Ordinance Review Sub-Committee Report

Mrs. Touw thanked everyone for participating in the May 22nd work session. She also thanked Mr. Peterson for promptly getting the word search done on the items in the ordinance pertaining to St. Simons Island. Mrs. Touw stated that perhaps the Ordinance Review Subcommittee could meet again and submit a final recommendation either in the form of a draft or as a recommendation for formal action by the Planning Commission. A date was scheduled for the subcommittee members to meet on Tuesday, June 19th at 8:30 a.m. in the library of the Community Development office.

Also under Commission Items, Mr. Hart asked staff to find the letter that was submitted by the County Attorney's office regarding an interpretation of lot coverage/site coverage and report back to the Planning Commission. Staff concurred.

In reference to the staffing problem discussed earlier in the meeting, Mr. Peterson advised that someone has accepted one of the planning positions in the Community Development Department. He did not feel comfortable revealing the person's name at this time because apparently the applicant has not yet notified his/her current supervisor. Mr. Peterson elaborated on the collaborative efforts of he and Mr. Sutton on researching salaries for comparable planning positions.

Staff Items

a) Planning District Map - Lee Sutton

Mr. Sutton stated that according to Section 405 of the Zoning Ordinance, "upon adoption, said map shall be signed and dated by the County Commission Chairman and shall be kept with the Community Development Department of Glynn County. Amendments of said map shall constitute an amendment to this ordinance." Mr. Sutton stated that staff does not have a copy of the Planning District Map signed by the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners. He suggested that the Planning District Map be presented at the June 7th Board of Commissioners meeting for Chairman Woodman's signature in order to be in compliance with Section 405 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Hart stated there had been a lot of discussion about this being the official Planning District Map, and also whether or not Little St. Simons was included. Chairman Cole stated that originally Little St. Simons was included but there was an amendment from the Board to change it. Mrs. Touw stated that the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the map be forwarded to the County Commission for approval. At that time there were two maps, one for thirteen districts and one for four districts. There was a lengthy discussion from county staff and the public as to there being too many districts. The end result was a map showing four districts, which is what the Planning Commission recommended to the County Commission. Mrs. Touw stated that this took place in July 1997. Mr. Hart stated that the County Commission accepted the four districts but it is still not clear if Little St. Simons was included in the Island District or the Mainland District. Ms. McCormick stated that she remembers the Planning Commission recommending that Little St. Simons be included in District 2. Mr. Sutton stated that he would research the Minutes for further information and present the map again at the July 10th Planning Commission meeting.

b) Discuss Section 729 Adult Commercial District

Mr. Sutton presented the amendment of this section of the ordinance, which was approved by the Board of Commissioners on July 17, 1997 and containing the signature of Commissioner Fred Tullos who was chairman at that time. He explained that this information is reflective of the changes that he included in each member's copy of the ordinance. Mrs. Touw stated she only wanted to know when all of this took place because she does not remember the signage section coming to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Hart agreed and added that he had never seen it. Chairman Cole stated that when the amendment was presented to the Planning Commission it was not discussed in depth, but it was done very briefly.

Mrs. Touw had questions about the signage and definitions; specifically, the word "Achromatic." She stated that she remembers passing the ordinance but she does not remember this Planning Commission ever discussing signage, language, etc. She then asked staff to try to obtain the Minutes from the Board of Commissioners meeting where this amendment was approved. Mr. Sutton concurred. He stated that he would also get the Minutes from Planning Commission meeting showing their recommendation.

Mr. Sutton explained that Planning & Zoning staff is responsible for keeping a copy of the most current Zoning Ordinance. However, several people have been keeping amendments in different county offices, which has created problems. He suggested confirming that the Zoning Ordinance that the members possess at this time is the most accurate ordinance. He also suggested that perhaps the Planning Commission should consider re-adopting the Zoning Ordinance due to the number of recent amendments, along with anticipated changes to the ordinance.

Mr. Buster Reese advised that at a recent staff meeting, it was decided that all ordinances would be kept and updated by the County Clerk and would be available for review on-line. This is an attempt to have all ordinances updated by one person.

Mrs. Touw thanked Mr. Sutton for the information and again asked that he check the Minutes regarding Section 729 and report back to the Planning Commission.

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