

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 6, 2001 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lamar Cole, Chairman
Wayne Stewart, Vice Chairman
Perry Fields
Ann McCormick
Iris Touw
Jonathan Williams

ABSENT: Hal Hart

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
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.

GC-34-00

Request to Rezone from GI General Industrial to M6 One-Family Residential (Manufactured Homes) 8812.5 square feet, described as the east 125 feet of Lot 7, Harlem Subdivision; property having 77 feet of frontage on Track Street. Property owned by Willie L. Hayes.

Mr. Willie L. Hayes, property owner, was 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 seeking to rezone the subject property to M-6 so that he may locate a manufactured home on the property. The applicant would need to add a septic system to the property. A well currently exists, which serviced a home that was located on the site that was demolished approximately two years ago. The applicant has indicated a desire to install a new well. The lot is 8812.5 sq. ft. and public water and sewer are not available in the immediate area.

Prior to the December meeting, the applicant deferred the application at the request of staff. The deed for the property did not reflect the area that was currently owned; the applicant is seeking a correction deed. At issue was whether or not the lot in question was a lot of record. This is the first requirement of Environmental Health before a well and septic can be located on the property. Staff's review of records has found that the lot, defined as the eastern half of Lot 7 of Harlem Farms Subdivision, has existed at least since 1962, possibly earlier. Harlem Farms was platted in 1944.

As recently as 1995, residential rezoning of industrial property have been approved in this subdivision. In previous instances, however, the rezonings have been on thru lots. Lots on the east side of the subdivision are served by Track Street, an unimproved drive alongside the railroad. Several other houses are served by Track Street. Track Street is reached by way of the access roads around the overpass on Community Road.

The applicant is seeking to locate a residence on the property and has stated that a house existed there at one time, which is apparent on the tax map. At the time the house existed, it was a non-conforming use in the General Industrial Zoning District. The Code states that a non-conforming use cannot be re-established after a discontinuance of twelve months. The applicant has stated that the building was removed over 2 years ago.

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;

Adjacent land uses include storage of junk, vehicles and a railroad yard. Nearby uses include residential uses. While not deemed suitable, the use will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby property.

- 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;

The size of the property is substandard for General Industrial. Therefore the property has no economic use other than sale.

- 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;

The rezoning should have no impact on the aforementioned facilities.

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

Yes. The Future Land Use map shows the area to be 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;

None at this time.

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

During a brief presentation, Mr. Hayes stated that he has worked hard to get this property squared away and he is soliciting the Planning Commission's support.

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

GC-2001-02

Request to Rezone from M-12 One-Family Residential (Manufactured Homes) to MH-12 One-Family Residential (Mobile Homes) 19,398.84 square feet, described as Lot 1, Block "B" of Sterling Park Subdivision; property having 136.14 feet of frontage on Holly Circle. Property owned by Dennie and Glenda Barwick.

Mr. Dennie Barwick was present for discussion.

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

In 1973, the area known as Sterling Park was rezoned from TR-12 Temporary Residential to M12, then known as a Mobile Home District. Six properties were not rezoned because they had single family site-built homes on them. There was concern that the rezoning of these lots would make them non-conforming. They were exempted from the rezoning request and the request passed. The applicant's subject lot was one of the lots that remained R12.

In 1994, the owner of the property requested to rezone the subject lot from R12 to M12 after the home on site was destroyed by fire. The current owner is seeking to rezone to MH12 in order that he may locate a single-wide mobile home on the property. Currently, there are a number of single-wide mobile homes within the subdivision.

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. The adjacent neighborhood is a mix of single-wide, double-wide and some site-built homes. The area was rezoned in 1973 to permit the use of "mobile Homes" and while the "double-wide" had been in existence since 1968, there was no distinction between manufactured homes and mobile homes in the Zoning Ordinance until 1983. There was such a distinction at the time the subject property was rezoned to M12 in 1994, but the character of the surrounding neighborhood remains as a mix of mobile homes, manufactured homes and some site-built homes.

- 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;

The property has reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

- 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. The property will maintain a single-family residential use.

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

Yes. The Future Land Use map shows the area 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;

None at this time.

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

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

GC-2001-03

Request to Rezone from FC Freeway Commercial to Planned Development-Shopping Center 8.094 acres, described as being located on the north side of Perry Lane Road approximately 599 feet west of Spur 25; property having 160 feet of frontage on Perry Lane Road. Property owned by Stellar Investments.

Mr. Ron Sawyer of Sawyer and Associates was 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 seeking to rezone the subject property to Planned Development in order that the zoning text will more accurately suit the proposed plans for the site. Specifically, the applicant is seeking to allow for more curb cuts than are permitted in Section 614.1., which states that "no use shall be permitted more than two curb cuts." The Planned Development Text includes a provision that allows for four curb cuts. The general layout plan for the site shows three curb cuts on Stellar Drive (proposed) and one on Perry Lane Road.

The PD Text also prohibits the uses of repair garage, hotel, motel, and vehicle or boat sales. Otherwise, it is identical to the Freeway Commercial Zoning District.

The proposed plans include the development of a shopping center anchored with a grocery store, including area for shops and future expansion of both the anchor store and additional shops.

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. The rezoning will have no greater impact than if the property were developed as it is currently zoned.

- 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;

The property can be used in accordance with Freeway Commercial zoning.

- 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. The zoning proposal does not create any uses that are not already permitted within the current zoning.

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

The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan shows the area as a combination of commercial and undeveloped property.

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

There are none at this time.

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

Mrs. Touw had questions concerning the access locations and the curb cuts. She stated that there should be an easier way to do this rather than doing a Planned Development. Mr. Sawyer explained that this rezoning was the quickest route to take under the guidelines of the ordinance. He pointed out the four curb cuts and stated that the setbacks would not change. There are some existing buffers but he is proposing to make those more restrictive.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-04

Request to Rezone from Planned Development-General to Planned Development-Residential 33.37 acres, described as a portion of the Golden Isles Gateway Tract, located at the northwest corner of Altamaha Boulevard and Lexington Place; property having 550 feet of frontage on Lexington Place. Property owned by OGR Enterprises, LLC.

Mr. Halbig suggested that this item be deferred due to lack of an agent authorization form being completed. Mr. Chris Amos was present, but was not authorized to act as agent for the applicant. Mrs. Touw stated that perhaps by the next meeting, staff could have some suggestions as to how to handle patio homes. She also asked that the four items listed in the staff's report be addressed and corrected by the time this application is resubmitted for review. Mr. Halbig stated that most of those items have already been satisfied.

Per the applicant's request, Chairman Cole advised that this item would be deferred until next month.

Little Lake Farms (PP0036)

21.785 Acres, Located on Old Jesup Highway
At Anna Way, Zoned Forest Agricultural
Farrell Landon, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ernie Johns stated that the owner has requested a deferral until next month. The request for deferral was granted by Chairman Cole.

Big Buck Subdivision, Tract B (PP01-01)

5.162 Acres, Located on Buck Swamp Road
Zoned Forest Agricultural
Kathy Girtman, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ernie Johns was present for discussion.

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

This project proposes to extend the length of Big Buck Trail, a private road, so as to increase the number of lots served. A subdivision of Tract B is being suggested. The water supply and sewage disposal will be individual septic tanks and wells. Environmental Health site approval and an LDA permit are required.

Staff determined that the Subdivision Regulations require the further subdivision and extension of the road be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The application suggests adding one lot and extending the length of a private street. Article VI, Section 602.5 requires private streets to meet the procedural requirements regarding Preliminary and Final Plat approval. In addition, it indicates that private streets shall be improved according to the design standards established for public streets. In this case, the design standards are described in Article VI, Section 602.3. In order to ultimately reach Final Plat approval, staff would need to review engineering details at construction plan review to ensure those standards described in Section 602.3 are met.

Recently, the applicant submitted a Minor Plat application to subdivide the tract. This was done in an effort to accomplish their goal of subdividing the property without having to extend "the private road." This proposal is based on Tract B2 having a 60 ft. frontage on the end of Big Buck Trail "the private street" and having Big Buck Trail "the private access easement" extend through Tract B2 and serve four parcels (B1, C1, C2 and D). Forest Agriculture zoning requires a 100 ft. lot width.

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

Mr. Halbig stated that staff is recommending approval of this request conditioned on a cul-de-sac being included in the design at construction plan review in accordance with Article VI, Section 602.2g.

Mr. Ernie Johns gave a brief presentation. He explained that the property owner decided to add an additional lot to his property. In the process of discussing this with staff, it was suggested that a minor re-subdivision of the property be submitted and that a Final Plat be submitted to have the road approved as a county road in order to allow the additional lot. This was discussed at the last meeting because staff had decided that a Preliminary Plat had to be submitted before submittal of a Final Plat.

Mr. Johns stated that he revisited the property and realized that Lot B-2 fronts on an existing county road, thereby making it possible to submit this application through the minor subdivision process.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know how many lots are allowed as Minor Plats before it becomes a subdivision. Mr. Halbig explained that there is a section of the regulations that allows for minor subdivision of properties of no more than four lots on a private access easement. Mrs. Touw stated that she is not sure what they're being asked to vote on. Mr. Fields and Mr. Stewart agreed with Mrs. Touw. Mr. Halbig stated that the Preliminary Plat application is before the Planning Commission at this time.

Mr. Fields stated that the issue is, "can you do an 801 on a private access easement off of a private road." Mr. Peterson stated that what needs to be clarified is whether there are four lots or five lots fronting on the road.

Chairman Cole asked if Forest Agricultural zoning require a 100 ft. lot width. Mr. Johns replied yes. He explained that the definition of "lot width" is the distance between the side property lines measured at the minimum building setback, which would be 20 ft. off of the 500 ft. line of the property. He stated that the road in question began life as a private access easement serving four parcels. When the owner decided to put in an additional parcel he had to upgrade that particular portion to county specifications, which was done through the Final Plat process.

At this time, Mr. Peterson read the definition of front yard and building line as they relate to this request. Mr. Wayne Stewart wanted to know if Tract 2-B was originally shown as fronting on Buck Trail private road, or was the easement already there. Mr. Johns stated that Parcels A, B, C & D in the original subdivision were all on a private access easement.

Mr. Rick Lee gave a brief presentation. He explained that currently Ms. Girtman has a double-wide on the property and all she is trying to do at this time is build a house and leave the double-wide on the property for her mother-in-law. He stated that they have five acres of land and would like to put a house in the middle of the property

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve the Preliminary Plat, which would extend the Buck Swamp Trail private road to serve the five lots in question; that it be built to county standards; and that no more than 10 lots be allowed on the dirt road. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued.

Mr. Stewart stated that he understands Mrs. Touw's motion in relation to the guidelines of the ordinance as interpreted by staff, but it is possible that they are doing more harm than good by allowing 10 lots. Mrs. Touw stated that if this is approved as a Minor Plat, the applicant could come back and ask for a Preliminary Plat, split the lots into any number and pave the road. However, the applicant is not asking for that at this time. She stated that the potential is enormous, but that is the applicant's individual right.

After discussion, the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Wayne Stewart.

Village Creek Way, Phases II & III
8.993 Acres, Located on South Harrington Road
Zoned R6; W. P. Portman, Owner/Developer

Mr. William Ligon and Mr. Ernie Johns 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 39 lots on this portion of a multi-phased project. In total, to date, 64 lots are being suggested. The smallest lot size of this phase is suggested at 6,006 sq. ft. The minimum lot size for this zoning classification is 6,000 sq. ft. Village Creek Way, Village Creek Drive and Villager Court are suggested public with right-of-way widths of 40 ft. The proposed minor streets create an average daily traffic count of 640. An LDA permit is required. The proposed water supply and sewage disposal will be Glynn County

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

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

Chairman Cole stated that Phase II and Phase III goes beyond the property lines of the lot and continues on both sides. Mr. Halbig explained that this was done only to define the boundary lines.

Mrs. Touw stated that this property was originally platted in 1997. She then asked if any portion of that particular plat reached the Final Plat stage. Mr. Ligon replied yes. Phase I was platted, approved and has gone to the Final Plat stage. He stated that they are increasing the size of some of the lots.

Mrs. Touw stated that the original approved plan had 51 lots. It is now being developed in phases. Mr. Ligon stated that they have acquired additional properties. There are more lots now because there are four acres. In Phase II the lot sizes were increased. Mrs. Touw stated that by acquiring more property, the plan is not the same as the original approved plan. She then asked staff how should this be handled. Mr. Peterson explained that the applicant is submitting this as a new Preliminary Plat to show that it is different from the original approved plan. Mrs. Touw stated that in cases like this and for future reference, staff should have the original plan on hand and show that the submittal is a new Preliminary Plat that is changing the original approved plan. Mr. Peterson concurred.

Mr. Fields expressed concerns about the procedure in submitting changes to a Preliminary Plat. He wanted to know how often does this happen where the Planning Commission approves Project A but the applicant develops Project B, because in this particular case, the Planning Commission approved Village Creek Way Subdivision, not multiple phases. For clarification, Mr. Ernie Johns explained that when the original Preliminary Plat was done there were no requirements in the regulations, which is why there is no phase number on the first part. However, the requirements are now in the ordinance, therefore the applicant is showing Phases II and III, which is actually a redesign of a portion of Phase I. Mrs. Touw stated that this is a redesign and additional lots. She stressed that the Planning Commission needs to know that there is a change from the original approval. Mr. Fields agreed with Mrs. Touw.

Mr. Tom Swan of RUPA was present to express concerns about changes and adding to approved plans. Specifically, how the changes affect traffic, water and sewer, etc. He wanted to know if the county had one organization to address these changes. Mr. Fields explained that the Planning Commission is bound by the ordinances and the applicant has met the requirements of the ordinances. He suggested that Mr. Swan's organization lobby for lower density.

Mr. Fields wanted to know the current criteria in determining the requirements for an LDA. Mr. Ellis Carter stated that the Building Inspections Division is using a model ordinance as prescribed by the State of Georgia, which covers lot sizes, state waters, etc. Also, there is a 200 ft. rule within state waters which would require an LDA permit regardless of size. Mr. Carter stated that with the Chairman's permission, he would provide an updated copy of the LDA requirements to the Planning Commission members to use as reference material. Permission was granted.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the new Preliminary Plat. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Wayne Stewart.

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:00 a.m.

Minor Plat/Little Oaks, Phases I & II

Little Oaks Subdivision, Lot 1
60.9237 Acres, Located on Rodeo Lane
Lloyd Tolar, Owner/Developer

Mr. Tolar and Mr. Ernie Johns were present for discussion.

Mr. Halbig explained that Mr. Tolar requested a hearing regarding the disposition of the Minor Plats for Little Oaks, Phases I and II as outlined in a letter included in the Planning Commission packages. Also included in the packages was a letter from Mr. Lee Sutton to Mr. Tolar dated January 17, 2001 outlining two items of concern as follows:

- 1) A permanent vegetative ground cover needs to be established on all disturbed areas. Until that ground cover is established, re-inspected and approved by the County Engineer's office, all erosion and sediment control devices need to remain and be maintained as required.
- 2) In accordance with Article VI, Section 602.2r of the Subdivision Regulations, all trees within 8 ft. of the paving edge are to be removed unless approved to remain by the County Engineer.

At this time, Mr. Halbig presented a letter from Mr. Wayne Nuenke of Environmental Health dated February 5, 2001 which indicates that the property has been found suitable for on-site sewage disposal systems.

During the course of discussion, questions were raised about the two items of concern outlined in Mr. Sutton's letter in relation to the County Engineer's approval. The Chairman requested the presence of the County Engineer to address these items. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to table discussion until later in the meeting pending arrival of the County Engineer.

First Georgia Bank, SSI (SP01-01)

19,776 Square Feet, Located at 2641 Demere Road
Zoned Planned Development-General
First Georgia Bank, Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

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

This plan calls for the construction of an addition to the existing building that is to include three offices, two bathrooms, a work room and a break room. Twenty parking spaces are required for the expanded building and 26 are available.

The addition is approximately 990 sq. ft. and measures 25 ft. by 39 ft. 7 inches. The total building area is 4,090 sq. ft.

Building Inspections, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, as well as GIS, Fire Department and Environmental Engineering have reviewed this project. Environmental Engineering requests submittal of one set of architectural drawings for capital tapping fee calculations. Building Inspections requests that Flood Hazard Area Statement, Erosion/Sedimentation Control Plan and a Drainage Plan be submitted prior to receiving a Building Permit.

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

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

King & Prince 18-Room Hotel (SP01-02)

26,049 Square Feet, Located at Arnold Road and
Downing Street, Zoned Resort Residential
Inn of Lake City, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

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

This plan proposes the construction of the 18-room hotel. The building will be a three-story concrete structure with stucco walls and a tiled roof. Parking will be on site and 19.8 parking spaces required with 20 provided. Site coverage tabulations indicate 49% coverage with building and impervious surface. The building's footprint equals 4813 sq. ft.

Building Inspections, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, as well as, Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project. Engineering and Environmental Engineering have requested additional Construction Plan information that will be reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Building Inspections has indicated all construction will comply with FEMA requirements and the project requires that an LDA application be approved and issued prior to receiving a Building Permit.

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

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

It was noted that the County Engineer, Jim Bruner, was now in attendance. Discussion continued at this time on the **Minor Plat/Little Oaks, Phases I & II**.

Mr. Bruner explained that his office made an inspection of the road (Rodeo Lane) and found that it meets county standards with the exception of two items: 1) establishment of vegetative covers on the disturbed areas; and 2) trees that are closer to the edge of the pavement than allowed by the ordinance. According to Mr. Bruner, the road is not an approved road at the present time. The vegetative cover is a bonded item in order to allow for weather, seed germination, etc.

Regarding the trees, Mr. Bruner explained that throughout Glynn County there are many locations where trees are closer than allowed by the ordinance. Therefore, they are examined on a case by case basis. The tree issue is a safety precaution. Two items that are taken into account with connection to trees are traffic volume and speed. This particular road is a low volume road with low speeds, so safety is not much of an issue. However, trees being too close to the road can damage the pavement with root growth.

Chairman Cole wanted to know who would be responsible for maintaining the road. Mr. Bruner stated that according to the applicant, the road will be private and therefore will be maintained by Mr. Tolar. However, if the road becomes public in the future, the responsibility will rest with public maintenance.

Mrs. Touw had further questions about the trees. Mr. Bruner stated that according to the ordinance, no trees are permitted on the right-of-way no closer than 8 ft. from the edge of pavement or 19 ft. from the center line. In some cases there have been exceptions to the rule. He reiterated that trees are examined on a case by case basis with exceptions. Mr. Fields then asked Mr. Bruner if the trees are approved in this particular project. Mr. Bruner replied yes. He stated that he met with Mr. Tolar who has agreed to cut down the trees if necessary. Mr. Tolar confirmed that this is correct. Mr. Bruner stated that he feels confident that he and Mr. Tolar could work out the situation with the trees.

Mr. Peterson explained that this proposal initially was for 10 lots on a dirt road not to exceed 2000 ft. Mr. Tolar paved the road at his own expense to improve the road. Now he has come back to seek further subdivision of the property. In essence, Mr. Peterson contends that this is not acceptable as an 801 because it is a multi-phase project. The distance of the road also presents a problem. However, Mr. Fields pointed out that the distance of the road could be addressed by a variance. He also disagreed somewhat with Mr. Peterson's interpretation of a multi-phase development in relation to an 801 application. Mrs. Touw suggested examining the ordinance with regard to this issue, recommend adjustments and advertise for a public hearing. Chairman Cole agreed that this should be passed on to be examined by the Ordinance Review Sub-Committee.

Mr. Peterson pointed out that there are two issues for consideration: 1) two lots on a paved road; and 2) extension of a road as a private easement with three lots at the end.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve Lots 1A and 1B. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted. (It was noted that Mr. Stewart felt ill and left the meeting shortly after making this motion.)

There was a brief discussion regarding wetlands and the definition of a private access easement. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve Little Oaks Minor Plat Subdivision of 8.802 acres. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

King & Prince Hotel Remodeling (SP01-03)

159,847 Square Feet, Located on Arnold Road and
Downing Street, Zoned Resort Residential
Inn of Lake City, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Ussery and Mr. Gaines Sturdivant, owner of the King & Prince, 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 proposes to renovate the interior of the "Historic" rooms section of the 124-room hotel. The construction of the 18-room hotel, which is presented as a separate site plan, is also being suggested. Minor modifications are suggested to the exterior of the main hotel, with 69 rooms being reconfigured to provide 55 rooms with larger areas. Also, 168 parking spaces are required and 211 are suggested. Site coverage tabulations indicate 71% coverage with building and impervious surface.

Modifications are being suggested to Arnold Road and Downing Street. Areas of paving will be removed to create more green space. Sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks will be designated to provide for a greater degree of pedestrian safety. According to the applicant, these changes to Arnold Road and Downing Street should provide a calming effect on the vehicular traffic making the area safer for pedestrians. There are no changes suggested to the public parking on Neptune Drive.

Building Inspections, Planning and Zoning, Engineering, as well as, Environmental Engineering, GIS and the Fire Department have reviewed this project. Engineering and Environmental Engineering have requested additional Construction Plan information that will be reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Building Inspections has indicated all construction will comply with FEMA requirements and the project requires an LDA application be approved and issued prior to receiving a Building Permit.

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

Mrs. Touw had questions about handicap access. Mr. Ussery explained that a key card is necessary at the gate entrance, which is not public access. Public access is located near the canopy. Mrs. Touw wanted to know how a disabled person would gain entrance at the north end of the old hotel. Mr. Ussery stated that Mrs. Touw is referring to the old lobby area known as the solarium and they have found that entrance to be a problem. He stated that they are looking at ways to modify the entrance to solve the problem and maintain the integrity of the architecture. A ramp would have to be approximately 18 feet long because of all of the steps. He stated that an elevator would be installed to serve the upper floors to the rooms.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

Retreat Clubhouse (SP01-04)

.948 Acres, Located at Sea Island Club Golf Course
Zoned Planned Development
Sea Island Company, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion.

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

The applicant proposes to renovate and expand the existing golf course clubhouse and related facilities including a restaurant, locker rooms, meeting rooms, and retail space. Coinciding with the golf course renovation, the plan includes a new entry road, a new cart path system, and additional parking. 71 parking spaces are required and 349 are provided. Site coverage tabulations indicate 9.4% coverage with building and impervious surface.

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

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

Mr. Fields wanted to know if the architecture would be in keeping with the current structure, and also if the addition would be inside or outside. Mr. Edenfield stated that the architecture would be the same as the current structure and the addition would take place on the west side.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if the PD Text for the entire development allows 45 ft. maximum height. Mr. Edenfield stated that according to Mr. Buddy Akins of the Building Inspections Division and other staff who assisted with the research, 45 ft. is allowed for the entire development. He pointed out that according to a letter that he received from Mr. Akins, the criteria for Planned Development refers to Resort Residential requirements. Mr. Edenfield stated that they have no intentions of changing the building elevation.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Discussion continued.

Mr. Jonathan Williams wanted to know if the public would continue to have access to the Avenues of Oaks. Mr. Edenfield replied yes. He stated that the county has an access easement across the Avenues of Oaks, and Sea Island will continue to honor that access. Ms. McCormick had questions about the gate entrance. Mr. Edenfield stated that the gate at the Avenues of Oaks will be manned and will be designed to control access to the golf course. The general public won't necessarily be allowed through that access point.

After discussion, the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

Hitting Pavilion (SP01-05)

.948 Acres, Located at Sea Island Club Golf Course
Zoned Forest Agricultural
Sea Island Company, Owner/Developer

Mr. Bill Edenfield was 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 construct an instructional hitting pavilion sited on the practice range at the Sea Island Golf Club. The structure includes office space and restrooms. Access to the site is by golf cart from the nearby Golf Clubhouse.

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

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

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

537 Beachview Drive (VP01-01)

11,229 Square Feet, St. Simons Island
Zoned General Commercial/Village Preservation
Mr. and Mrs. Irvine, Owner; Larry Bryson, Developer

Mr. Larry Bryson and Mr. & Mrs. Irvine 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 construct a "Carriage House" addition to be 836 square feet, and 20 feet 10 inches in elevation to the peak of the roof. Currently there is a 1774 sq. ft. building and a 197 sq. ft. utility building on the property.

The appearance of the "Carriage House" is tabby finish over block with applied timbers and standing seam metal roofing. A block layout showing adjacent buildings and architectural characteristics was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

The applicant intends to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals on February 8, 2001 for the purpose of seeking a variance to allow an additional 10% site coverage (sections 712.3 and 502.4). Staff would like to offer the Planning Commission an opportunity to forward comments to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The existing gazebo will be removed as will a 4 inch "unknown" tree. A palm tree and a dogwood tree will be relocated.

A previous application for an additional single family structure was considered by the Planning Commission and deferred for sixty days. This application is only for the "Carriage House."

The Traffic Safety Engineer's office reviewed this plan and has not taken issue with the sight clearance at the intersection of Oglethorpe Avenue and 14th Street, both of which are graded (unpaved) 50 ft. rights-of-way.

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

Mr. Larry Bryson gave a brief overview of the project since its inception, and a general discussion followed. Afterward, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

GC-2001-01A

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Section 704, to allow for Medical Hardship Mobile Homes in FA Forest Agricultural Zoning District as a Special Use Permit.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Halbig. Also included in the packages were comments from staff, which included two items of concern with regard to this amendment: 1) Equity; and 2) Regulation. These items were outlined in detail for the Planning Commission's review.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of the above referenced amendment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

GC-2001-01B

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 701.4 and 702.4, clarifying the renewal period and expiration of Medical Hardship Mobile Home Special Use Permits.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Halbig, along with the general description as follows: The proposed amendment clarifies that extensions to medical hardships may be requested for as long as the hardship condition exists. Previous language created ambiguity as to whether one or several extensions could be requested.

Following review, a motion was made by Mrs. Iris Touw to recommend approval of the above referenced amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Stewart was no longer in attendance.)

Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve the Minutes of the January 9, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mrs. Iris Touw was not present for the January meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

Staff Items

Mr. Peterson stated that the County Attorney advised that the Chairman of the County Commission suggested that we put together a list of changes to be made to the Subdivision Regulations and to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Peterson stated that he informed the County Attorney that the Ordinance Review Subcommittee (appointed by the Chairman of the Planning Commission) is already in the process of working on the Ordinances. He stated since that time, he obtained copies of reports compiled by the former Ordinance Review Committee and he is in the process of reviewing those reports. Copies will be provided for the Planning Commission's review.

Mrs. Touw asked for volunteers to serve on the subcommittee and possibly select a new chairman. Also, she feels that the subcommittee should focus on the needed changes to assist staff so that there are fewer misunderstandings in interpretations between staff and applicants. She further stated that we need to look at what is causing the confusion and what can be done to alleviate the problem. Ms. Ann McCormick volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, but she made it clear that she did not want to serve as chairman.

Mr. Fields expressed dissatisfaction in the operating procedures of the former Director of Community Development with regard to amendments proposed by the Planning Commission. He also expressed concerns about piece-meal items being presented to the Planning Commission and stressed that they will not vote on an item that has to be changed. Mr. Fields stated that it is imperative that they see the finished product before proceeding with a vote. Mr. Peterson concurred.

At this time, Chairman Cole advised that a motion is needed to recess the meeting (rather than adjourn) until February 22nd in order to revisit *Application #GC-36-00*. This item was reviewed at the January 9th Planning Commission meeting; however, the County Attorney deemed that it was improperly advertised in that the press inadvertently listed the meeting as being conducted by the Board of Commissioners rather than the Planning Commission. The corrected notice did not meet the 15-day criteria. Mrs. Touw pointed out that according to Gary Moore, who stated to her on a previous occasion, once the written notice is sent to the press we have no control over whether they publish the notice or not, nor are we responsible for their mistakes. She stated that Mr. Moore's ruling in this case is just the opposite. Mrs. Touw stressed the importance of consistency. In an effort to clarify the issue, Mr. Fields explained that there could be a number of reasons why Mr. Moore would have a different opinion now than he would have had two years ago. He then elaborated on the difference between substantial compliance and strict compliance.

Mr. Fields stated that if it is permitted, he would also like to revisit *Application #PP01-01* at the February 22nd Called Meeting.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recess the meeting at this time (1:30 p.m.). The meeting will resume on February 22, 2001 at 9:00 a.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.
