

**MINUTES**  
**MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**APRIL 5, 2005 - 6:00 P.M.**  
**Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street**

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Wayne Stewart, Chairman  
Gary Nevill, Vice Chairman  
Bill Brunson  
Tommy Clark  
Jeff Counts  
Buddy Hutchinson  
Barbara Stephens

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Peterson, Director  
York Phillips, Planning Manager  
Iris Scheff, Planner III  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

-----

Chairman Stewart 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.

-----

Upon a motion made by Mr. Gary Nevill and seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson, the agenda for the April 5, 2005 Mainland Planning Commission meeting was approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

ZM-2005-010 (M)  
Consider a request to rezone from Forest Agriculture to Planned Development-Residential, property located at the east end of Ratcliff Road, approximately 7,500 feet east of US 82. The total site area is 123.7 acres. Atlantic Survey Professionals, agent for Wis-A-Wis Partners, LLC, owner. This item was continued from the March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

Mr. Ernie Johns, Mr. Ron Martin and Mr. Mike Wilson were present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Iris Scheff:

This is a request to establish a significant residential development (148 lots) in an area that is largely remote from services.

The proposed PD text has been clarified as to how the lots will be developed. The development will consist of single family lots with a minimum area of 11,000 square feet, and with setbacks of 20 ft. front, 7 ft. side, and 15 ft. rear. The proposed number of lots has been reduced to 120. The applicant states that this is less than would be permitted under the existing Forest Agriculture zoning.

The proposed development will be served by a central water system and by a package wastewater treatment plant. These would require approval by the Board of Commissioners, although no request has been made to date.

The site is served by Ratcliff Road which while recently improved, may not meet right-of-way and construction standards for a road necessary to serve a development of this size. Staff has requested the County Engineer's office to review the road and offer an opinion as to whether or not it will be feasible to serve the development. Ratcliff Road extends approximately 4,500 feet to the nearest major road intersection (Emanuel Church Road). In addition, the development is separated from main roads by the Colonel's Island Railroad.

The Glynn County Comprehensive Plan designated this property as Agriculture/Forestry, which allows scattered residential development, as exhibited by the existing residences. Those residences were developed intermittently; not as the result of a planned subdivision reviewed for access, traffic circulation, lot size, and provision of public services, including fire and medical safety and police protection. Because there are so few residences in the area, there has so far not been a problem with access.

**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.

**The proposed zoning would allow a significant residential development in an area that is not close to other developments and is not served by most public services. Adjacent and nearby property consists of four private residences with a density of less than one unit per acre. Note, however, that a development of the size and density indicated could be permitted under the existing FA zoning.**

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

**In consideration of the nature of surrounding development and lack of services, the proposal may be considered premature.**

- 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.

**The development will produce demand for traffic, schools, parks, and other County services in excess of what is provided in this vicinity.**

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

**The future land use map identifies this area for agricultural and forestry use, which allows some low density residential development such as now exists. The requested rezoning may be too intense relative to the county's current capacity to provide services.**

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

**No.**

The applicant's property is located some distance from the nearest arterial roads or public services. The site is surrounded by wetlands and marsh, which will require care in site design and management. The proposal may be considered too intense and is premature, given the limitations of the area. Staff's recommendation is for denial.

It was noted that following the deferral of this application at the March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, staff met with the applicant and discussed changes to the plan. This report was updated to reflect that discussion and the amended PD text received March 29<sup>th</sup>. Staff also conveyed the suggestion that the applicant meet with the neighbors.

Mr. Ron Martin explained that Mr. Frank Norton was scheduled to give the presentation tonight but due to another engagement, he could not be here. Therefore, as one of the junior partners he would brief the members on the project.

Mr. Martin explained that it was their intention to divide the property into half acre lots, put in septic tanks and then sell the lots, but it became clear to them that what they had proposed would not be good for the project or for the surrounding neighbors, nor the county. He stated that they spoke with representatives of DNR about how to make the project work and decided that it would be marketed as a resort type development for second home buyers or retirement buyers.

Mr. Martin stated that they had proposed a few more lots but withdrew that idea after they were told that they needed to have a 100 ft. minimum average width for the lots. Therefore, the lots have been reduced to about 115. As pointed out by staff, he stated that they are not seeking any exemptions from the setbacks. They are proposing single-family upscale residences with a minimum of 1800 sq. ft. and feel very positive about the development. He stated that they have several amenities planned including a package system, which would have to be approved separately. However, they are not prepared to discuss the package system tonight.

Chairman Stewart pointed out that there have been two different site plans for this project. The first plan indicated zero setbacks, perhaps referring to duplexes, and although it is not listed in the current plan, the first plan also indicated that the sewage treatment plant would be dedicated to Glynn County. Because this is something new for the county, Chairman Stewart stated that he solicited guidance from the County Commission Chairman, Mr. Cap Fendig, who stated he feels that the residents and tax payers of Glynn County are not accepting these sewage treatment plants. Should these plants be approved, they will become the responsibility of the developers or homeowners. Chairman Stewart then asked the applicant if the new proposal is for the sewage treatment plant to remain with the homeowners. Mr. Ernie Johns replied yes, which is what they intended all along.

For clarification, Mr. Martin stressed that they never intended to have a duplex development; duplexes were never discussed. He explained that the first plan shows that the basic layout of the neighborhood is the same. The only thing that changed is the reduction in the number of lots. Based on the recommendation from their marketing consultants, they simply expanded the lots to 100 ft. The lake, the entrance features and all other amenities are the same. Chairman Stewart stated that for the record, the plan is back to one-family single lots. Mr. Martin acknowledged that Chairman Stewart is correct and added that he is not sure how it got turned around in the report, but he reassured the members that they never intended to develop duplexes.

Attorney Perry Fields, representing Wis-A-Wis Partners, stated that the staff's report contains a lot of negative comments. He stated that the area in question is growing and this is a good project. The roads in the area are going to be paved and are going to be used. He pointed out that there is a fire station, an EMS station and a police station not more than 4 miles from this location. Therefore, staff's comments on safety protection are not warranted. Mr. Fields stressed that this area is going to be developed and it is not economical to consider it to be Forest Agricultural. He stated that this "package plan" won't happen overnight; it requires permitting processes through DNR, EPD and through

the County Commission. He stated that water and sewer services are not coming to these areas unless a private developer puts them in, which is what these developers are offering with this waste water treatment plant. He stated that sewage plants are currently operating at New Hope Plantation and at Thornhill Mobile Home Park.

In conclusion, Mr. Fields asked the Planning Commission to look for specifics rather than generalizations as referenced by staff in reviewing this project. Again, he stated that this is a good project and the developers are trying to maximize the property with less economic impact.

By a show of hands, there were approximately 30 residents present to either voice concerns or oppose this request. Chairman Stewart stated that everyone would be given an opportunity to speak but to avoid repetition and in the essence of time, he asked that a spokesperson be designated to speak for the group. It was noted that staff received written letters of opposition from Gary Cross of 805 Ratcliff Road and Victor & Camille Powell of 721 Ratcliff Road. Also, a petition containing approximately 43 signatures of adjacent residents opposed to this request was submitted for the record. At this time, the floor was opened for public comments.

Mr. Gary Cross, a 13 year resident of Ratcliff Road, stated that he is not opposed to growth but he and other homeowners have had problems finding out information about this development. He stated that the plans have changed a couple of times and the homeowners don't seem to have access to any of the information. He stated that he is not sure but he believes that it doesn't matter which plan is being submitted because the verbiage is what the county has to review and approve. If he is correct in his thinking, the plan could change at anytime in the future and it wouldn't matter as long as it meets the text, which means that the lake could disappear, the old lots could be returned, etc. Chairman Stewart explained that having a PD Text allows Glynn County and the surrounding neighbors to have more control over the development. If changes are made in a PD Text, those changes are required to be reviewed again by the Planning Commission, which would also require another public hearing. The adjacent property owners would know what those changes are and would be allowed to have input in the discussion.

Mr. Cross stated that the text still contains 11,000 sq. ft. lots and the sewage treatment facility is still planned. The water usage is calculated to be 175 gallons per person, per day. When this is multiplied, the total is about 80,500 gallons of water per day, which is a lot of water. Mr. Cross is also concerned about the density and traffic. He stated that Ratcliff Road cannot accommodate the type of traffic that would be generated by this development. There is already a problem with police, fire, and emergency vehicles due to the railroad crossing.

Mr. Cross asked who would maintain the sewage treatment plant. Chairman Stewart stated that according to the applicant, the plant would be maintained by the homeowners association or the developer, but it would not be maintained by Glynn County. He stated that the plant would be monitored by EPD.

Mr. Cross stated that he is very concerned about the sewage treatment plant and the boat storage facility, which he considers to be commercial. His major concern is this system being located directly in his front yard. He is very much opposed to this. He also stated that no one has addressed the wetlands in the area. He reiterated that he is not opposed to growth, but stressed that people move to rural areas for a reason; they don't want to be next door to apartments or to condominiums and no one wants a sewage treatment plant in their front yard.

Mr. Victor Powell stated that he has lived on Ratcliff Road for 20 years. He agreed with Mr. Cross and stated that he doesn't want a sewage treatment plant in his front yard. He expressed concerns about buffers and the high density. He further stated that no one has considered the habitat that would be destroyed or who would be liable for this destruction. Mr. Powell stated that a sewage treatment plant would have a negative impact on their property.

Mr. Dick Troyer of 785 Ratcliff Road stated that at the curve of Ratcliff, the pavement is 2.5 narrower and the blacktop is thin. The road cannot support this type of development because it was constructed for light residential. He agreed with Mr. Powell that their property value would decrease and stated that if this plant is visible it should be buffered for lighting, etc. in order to protect the residents. Mr. Troyer stated that no one seems to know any details about this plant.

Mr. James Mikell of 437 Fish Hall Road asked for clarification on the number of lots being proposed and if this development would consist of duplexes. Chairman Stewart stated that duplexes are not being proposed; that concept was a misunderstanding. He stated that the proposal is for a maximum of 120 single family lots with the probability of 114 lots being constructed. Mr. Mikell stated that he owns property on two sides of this development and 114 lots consists of families with a lot of children all over the place. He stated that he has cattle on his property and there is already a problem with people harming his livestock. He is also concerned about the improper drainage and stated that if this proposal is approved, the developers should prepare a ditch to divert the water away from his property into the river. Chairman Stewart explained that before any subdivision is approved it has to meet county standards on drainage, etc. He elaborated on the requirements for this process for clarification.

Mr. Calvin Waye of the Brookman community stated that this proposed development will affect everyone over a period of time. He stated that the residents are not against the development but they are concerned about each other and would like to see things done right. He is asking the commission to try and understand their needs.

Mr. Tommy Clark stated that two issues of concern are location and buffers. He asked the developers if they had any suggestions about the location of the plant. Mr. Mike Wilson stated he feels that they've selected the most ideal location. He stated that the plant cannot be seen. He explained that when speaking of a sewer system, most

people think that it is huge, brown and sticks up from the ground. He stated that this current package system is 12 ft. wide, 12 ft. high and about 34 ft. long and would accommodate 140 lots or up to 300 lots. However, it could be smaller. He stated that the system is totally new to him and he really doesn't have much information to offer.

Mr. John Hunkele, Coastal Engineering Consultants, expounded more on the package system. He explained that the area designated as the waste water disposal plant indicates the subsurface disposal field, which will all be underground. The package treatment plant unit itself does not have to be in that particular location; although the closer it is to the disposal area the more economical it is. He stated that it could really be located anywhere. Again, he stated that most of the disposal area is underground.

Mr. Clark wanted to know what the life expectancy is of the plant. Mr. Hunkele stated that the life expectancy is probably 25 plus years. Mr. Clark reiterated that the neighbors are concerned about this plant being located in their front yard and they have stated emphatically that they don't want it there. He asked again if it could be moved somewhere else on the property. Mr. Martin stated that they chose that particular site for the system because of the soil testing and the fact that houses could not be built on the lot. He stated that even if the zoning is approved they still have to bring the plan back for additional review. Therefore, the homeowners and the planning members have some protection. Mr. Martin stated that the entire area is going to be developed and under the present zoning they could have proposed more houses with a greater impact, but what they are proposing is to actually reduce the number of houses and do this in a way with less impact and more safety for the environment.

Chairman Stewart stated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Clark about moving the system and contrary to Mr. Wilson's comments; anything that is 12 ft. high and 30 ft. long can be seen. Mr. Clark stated it appears that the answer to his question is that the developers might consider moving the system in the future, but right now the plant will remain in its current location until site plan approval. Mr. Martin stated that at this point, they are not in a position to say definitely where or if the plant could be moved.

Mr. Clark stated that the area in question is rural and the applicant is proposing a high density development. Some of the residents are concerned about their livestock; therefore Mr. Clark stated that he would like to know what is being proposed for buffers. Mr. Ernie Johns stated that the buffers vary between 15 and 25 ft. and they are all around the entire project. Mr. Clark stated that the buffers need to be more defined especially for the livestock. He asked if more consideration could be given in this area of concern. Mr. Martin stated that they are willing to consider everything but they are not in a position to commit to anything at this time.

Chairman Stewart stated that he is still concerned that the road is not adequate to handle the traffic that this development might generate. Mr. Clark agreed and added that any repairs would be at the tax payers' expense. However, the road needs to be upgraded.

Mr. Jeff Counts reminded everyone that the applicant is willing to put fewer homes on the property than what could actually be built in an FA zoning. He stated that he does not have a problem with changing the zoning from FA to PD, but he considers the package plant more of an industrial use. He feels that a more in-depth site plan review should be done relative to buffer requirements, etc. Mr. Brunson agreed. He then asked what would be the due diligence process for the County Commission relative to the decision of the sewage treatment plant. Mr. Phillips stated that he is not exactly sure, but according to what has been done in the past for water systems under the ordinance, a variance request would be required. Staff would then review the request and submit a recommendation that may or may not include restrictions.

Mr. Buddy Hutchinson stated that it is difficult to support a project without knowing all of the basic details.

There was continued discussion about the location of the treatment plant, buffers and the stability of the road. During the course of discussion, Chairman Stewart indicated that perhaps the developers should meet with the neighbors and go over more details of this project in an effort to satisfy their concerns. Mr. Martin stated that he would be amenable to a deferral in order to meet with the residents.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Tommy Clark to defer this request until the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Tommy Clark, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Mr. Gary Nevill, Ms. Barbara Stephens and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Jeff Counts. (Mr. Phillips advised that the request would be re-advertised.)

-----

The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 8:00 p.m.

-----

### Variance Request

Request by Elmer E. Millison, Jr., for variance from Section 602.6 (a) of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, which requires a width of 60 feet for a private access easement. The subject property is located off Baumgardner Road and Cederdale Road.

Mr. Elmer Millison, Jr. was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the property can be divided in compliance with the regulations, except that two of the accesses are slightly smaller than 60 ft. in width. The

applicant indicates that he cannot acquire additional property to meet the requirement. The 60 ft. provision is a standard in the regulations. Section 901 provides that the Planning Commission may approve a variance to the standards in certain circumstances. Staff's recommendation is for approval.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Jeff Counts to approve the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bill Brunson. However, during the course of discussion, the motion was amended to include that the two access easements are to serve a total of 6 lots only. The amendment was accepted and the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Jeff Counts, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Mr. Gary Nevill and Ms. Barbara Stephens. Voting Nay: Mr. Tommy Clark and Mr. Wayne Stewart.

-----

PP-2005-0030(M) Alpine Court

Application for the approval of a preliminary plat for property located on the north west side of Gateway Center Boulevard approximately 676 feet southwest of its intersection with Canal Road. The property is zoned Planned Development.

Mr. Ray Richard and Mr. Bobby Shupe were present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mrs. Iris Scheff stated that the proposed subdivision consists of a "street only" plat, which is being established for the purpose of accessing further development for which lots will be configured and established based upon market demand. She stated that staff discovered that there are recorded lots with this development. A minor plat was done; the lots were recorded and configured. Alpine Court was done as a private access easement first, the applicant is now bringing this back as a "street only" plat. The proposed plan depicts Alpine Court as a 60 ft. right of way approximately 359 ft. long terminating in a radial cul-de-sac.

Mr. Bobby Shupe pointed out an error in the staff's report. He stated that there have been no lots platted in this case. The Planning Commission is being asked to approve the road only.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Tommy Clark to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Counts and unanimously adopted.

-----

## Request for Extension

Request by Oak Grove Island Limited, LLP, for extension of preliminary plat approval for Oak Grove Island.

Mr. Bobby Shupe was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the preliminary plat for the Oak Grove Island development was originally approved in 1990 or earlier. The approval was subsequently extended on several occasions, generally for two years at a time. The most recent extension was approved in January 2003 to run through November 30, 2004. This is a request to extend approval from that date.

Staff bases its recommendations for extensions on; 1) whether there have been any changes in the regulations that would affect the project; and 2) whether there have been any changes in conditions that would affect the project. In this case, there have been no changes. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the extension from November 30, 2004 to November 30, 2006.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Bill Brunson to grant the extension. The motion was seconded by Ms. Barbara Stephens. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Tommy Clark, Mr. Jeff Counts, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Ms. Barbara Stephens and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Gary Nevill.

-----

## Request for Extension

Request by Live Oaks Company, LLC, for extension of site plan approval. The property consists of approximately 90 acres, located generally east of New Jesup Highway (US 341) and generally west of Green Swamp Road in the Sterling area. The original approval was granted June 4, 2002. One-year extensions of approval were granted March 18, 2003, and May 4, 2004. The request is for an extension of 12 months.

Mr. Richard Zwolak and Mr. Burt Wallace were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this application was reviewed on June 4, 2002 by the Planning Commission. The application was approved subject to (1) staff's review and approval of detailed plans in connection with specific building permits, and (2) execution of an agreement for use of treated wastewater. Extensions of the site plan approval were granted on March 18, 2003 and May 4, 2004. Extensions may be approved by the Planning Commission for up to 12 months. If approved, the new expiration date would be June 4, 2006.

This project required approval by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division (EPD) for groundwater withdrawal, as well as certain

other permits. Applications for these permits were made to EPD in 2002 and were approved in early 2004.

The applicant has also indicated that he has been working on an agreement with the City of Brunswick for use of treated wastewater. There have been no formal discussions yet with the county over the route of the necessary pipelines or any county permitting associated with the pipeline.

Staff bases its recommendations concerning extensions on (1) whether there have been any changes in the regulations affecting the development and (2) whether there have been any changes in the conditions affecting the development. While there have been no changes in the regulations, there may soon be changes in the situation with respect to connection to the Academy Creek WWTP. Staff recommends that the extension be approved, but that if the arrangements to use of treated wastewater are changed, staff recommends that the Planning Commission be given the opportunity to review the site plan.

Mr. Richard Zwolak, representing Live Oaks as the Director of Environmental Planning for Golder Associates, gave a brief overview of this project. He stated that when the original approval was granted, Live Oaks did not have state and federal permits. However, last year they did secure the air quality permit, the water use permit, and the Army Corps of Engineer wetlands permit. Also since that time, two significant events have occurred; one was to have progress made on the proposed Cypress Pipeline Project. He stated that Southern Natural Gas has submitted documents to the federal agencies; the second event being a function of marketing, supply and demand. Mr. Zwolak stated that within the next several months, GA Power will present a series of requests for proposals for new generation. Live Oaks will be one of the contenders for that new generation.

Chairman Stewart stated that when this request was approved he was one of the Planning Commission members, and as he recalls, it was a very controversial approval. The applicants found an industrial site to attempt to build the plant. At that time, the Planning Commission was told that about 200,000 gallons of water would be used. One of the issues of concern was when the permitting process happened, the project went from one well to four wells, to 1.5 million gallons of water. Glynn County was told in essence that this was a state matter and things would be done their way.

Chairman Stewart stated that Live Oaks had an original agreement in hand from the City of Brunswick to use the gray water. However, he is under the impression that they no longer have that agreement, which means that it would have to be renegotiated. He then asked Mr. Zwolak if they have that agreement from the City of Brunswick in writing at this time. Mr. Zwolak stated that to his knowledge, they do have an agreement to have exclusive ability to purchase the water. He stated that it is a 10 year agreement with the potential for two 10 year extensions of that agreement. Chairman Stewart asked if they in fact have a signed agreement; to which Mr. Zwolak replied yes.

Mr. Burt Wallace, also representing Live Oaks, explained that the agreement that Chairman Stewart is referring to has been enforced since they executed it on June 13, 2002. It has not expired or lost its validity in any way. Mr. Wallace stated that he had a conversation with representatives of the City of Brunswick and presented the agreement, they walked through the agreement and it was determined that it was still in effect.

Chairman Stewart stated that the situation as he sees it is that Live Oaks may still have the agreement with the City of Brunswick but they are using county right-of-way. The agreement between the city and the county is in limbo and appears to be headed for the judicial system. He stated that Glynn County needs a copy of the agreement, and the County Commissioners, who are the elected officials, should submit a letter to the Planning Commission stating that Live Oaks has permission to use the right-of-way.

For clarification, Mr. Zwolak stated that the agreement that they have with the City of Brunswick is to obtain or purchase reclaimed water from the existing Academy Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant and pipe it up to the project site and then return a process wastewater line to Academy Creek for disposal. It does not provide, at this time any agreement for provision of portable water or sanitary sewer. This project would be self sufficient in that regard. Mr. Zwolak stated that they have met with the city and the county as recently as last week to evaluate the potential routes for the project lines. At the same time, they are aware of the county's proposal to bring additional sanitary lines from the Sterling area south and eventually interconnect with the city. He stated that it is their intent to make sure that both of those Capital Improvement Projects would be planned and potentially constructed together to minimize costs.

Chairman Stewart stated that he understands Mr. Zwolak's position, but he does not want to obligate the county. He reiterated that he would prefer to have something in writing from the County Commissioners, who are the elected officials. He then suggested that this request be deferred until the next meeting, provide staff with the written agreement and move forward from there. Mr. Zwolak stated that they could consider that; however, they are obligated to cross county right-of-way as they proceed from Academy Creek out to the project site. He stated that they would need county approval for this project even if the extension is granted.

For clarification, Mr. Burt Wallace asked if the two questions are: 1) Does Live Oaks have a valid and enforceable agreement regarding the water at Academy Creek; and 2) Does Live Oaks have permission to run the pipes through the county right-of-way. Chairman Stewart replied yes. Mr. Wallace stated that they would be amenable to having an approval contingent upon obtaining a valid and enforceable agreement. Chairman Stewart stated that normally he would agree, but the situation between the city and the county is critical and he would rather have something in writing beforehand. Mr. Tommy Clark agreed with Chairman Stewart. He added that there is a dispute and he does not want to give Live Oaks a false sense of security. Therefore, he concurs with the deferral. He suggested that Mr. Wallace contact the County Administrator and the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners and take their direction.

Mr. Bill Brunson stated it appears that the Planning Commission is getting into the operation of this facility, which is going beyond what this body is chartered to do. He stated that they are being asked to give an extension of a site plan. The applicants cannot do anything unless they have the ability to obtain the water. Mr. Zwolak stated that they are willing to accept conditions to the extension regarding the ability to meet the county and city requirements for the pipelines.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Gary Nevill to approve the 12 month extension subject to confirmation from the County Administrator confirming that there is no problem with transmitting the treated affluent supply to and from the site. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Counts. Voting Aye: Mr. Bill Brunson, Mr. Jeff Counts, Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, Mr. Gary Nevill and Ms. Barbara Stephens. Voting Nay: Mr. Tommy Clark and Mr. Wayne Stewart.

-----

## MINUTES

### **March 22, 2005 Regular Meeting**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Tommy Clark and seconded by Mr. Gary Nevill, the Minutes of the March 22<sup>nd</sup> Mainland Planning Commission meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

Under *Chairman Items*, Chairman Stewart suggested that staff review and incorporate the proposed changes in the By-Laws and redistribute them for everyone's review. He also suggested a joint workshop be scheduled with both Planning Commissions as well as the County Commissioners to discuss the new interpretation of the rules and regulations, some of which were mentioned at the recent planning workshop that some of the members attended. Mr. Phillips agreed to confer with Chairman Ussery of the Islands Planning Commission and Chairman Stewart and work out the details of the joint workshop.

Under *Planning Commission Items*, Mr. Gary Nevill suggested that staff include the ordinance amendment regarding the dead-end cul-de-sac issue on the agenda for discussion at the next regular meeting. Also, Mr. Jeff Counts reminded staff to include the Parcel ID and Map Number on the agendas for easier access in obtaining detailed information on the GIS website.

Under *Staff Items*, Mr. Phillips advised that staff is in the process of scheduling a workshop perhaps on April 25<sup>th</sup> or April 26<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. to review updated information on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). One of the items to be discussed will be

traffic projections for the year 2030 based on the existing road system and improvements. Staff will inform both commissions when a date is finalized.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.