

MINUTES
GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 4, 2001 9:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lamar Cole, Chairman
Wayne Stewart, Vice Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Perry Fields
Hal Hart
Ann McCormick (Arrived at 10:20 a.m.)

ABSENT: Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: Lee Sutton, Planning Official
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
Tim Ransom, Utilities Engineer
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Lamar Cole called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. At this time, Vice Chairman Wayne Stewart requested a moment of silent prayer in remembrance of Mr. Harry Driggers who recently passed away.

Chairman Cole then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

GC-2001-31

Request to rezone from R9 One-Family Residential to GR General Residential, 2.155 acres, described as near the intersection of Walker Road and Michael Drive located at 415 Walker Road; parcel having 179.75 feet of frontage on Walker Road. Property owned by Preston Kunda.

Mrs. Missy Stokes was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mrs. Carolynn Segers stated that staff is recommending denial of this request based on proposed increase in dwelling unit density conflicting with the future land use map.

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;

The potential exists as a result of the proposed increase in density.

- 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;

Yes, the current zoning classification allows for a maximum density of four dwelling units per acre and the proposed amendment suggests a maximum density of 10 dwelling units per acre. The increased average daily traffic count could impact streets.

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

No, the future land use map identifies this 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;

General Residential, Medium Residential and High Residential zoning classifications are the only residential classifications in the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance in which group dwellings are permitted uses.

During a brief presentation, Missy Stokes, director of the proposed residential halfway house known as "Alkies Place," explained that in the beginning when the application was submitted, she believed that changing the entire zoning of the property was in her best interest and in the best interest of the owner, Mr. Kunda. However, since that time she has discovered that for her personal use, she has no desire to increase the zoning anywhere other than the original house. She stated that it has also been brought to her attention that if possible she could request a special use permit for the house only.

Mrs. Stokes stated that her only interest at this time is to have a certain number of women living in the existing house and not to make any changes to the property. She would just like to be allowed to have more than four single-family members living in the current building.

Mr. Stewart wanted to know if Mrs. Stokes is asking not to rezone the property at this time. Mrs. Stokes replied yes. Mr. Stewart then asked if she is requesting to withdraw the application, because the only thing that the Planning Commission could consider at this time is what was legally advertised, which is the rezoning application. Mrs. Stokes stated that she's not sure what she's asking for at this point. Mr. Fields attempted to explain by stating that if the Planning Commission recommends denial of the request, this action is then forwarded to the County Commission who may in fact uphold the Planning Commission's decision. The applicant would have to wait 6 months before resubmitting another rezoning application for the property. As a point of clarification, Mr. Sutton stated that the applicant would have to wait 6 months if the request is withdrawn or 1 year if it is denied.

Mr. Sutton addressed the applicant's concerns regarding the special use permit. He stated that there is no zoning classification listed in the ordinance that allows for a group dwelling as a special use. A group dwelling is allowed however as a permitted use in General Residential, Medium Residential and High Residential as pointed out in the staff's report. In order for the applicant to accomplish her goal, Mr. Sutton stated that she would have to do so within a zoning classification that allows for a group dwelling, which is what she is asking to do.

At this time, Mr. Hart referred to Article III, Section 302 and stated that according to the ordinance, the applicant's request does not comply with the definition of a group dwelling.

For the benefit of the applicant and the Planning Commission, Mr. Sutton pointed out the state's ruling on discriminating against people who are trying to re-enter society.

Mr. John Waldron stated that he is a member of the recovery community and he is in favor of this request. He stated that this organization is trying to help people to get back on their feet so that they can return to being productive citizens in the community.

Mr. Fields wanted to know the maximum number of people that the applicant would be allowed to care for. Mrs. Stokes replied 16. She also gave an overview of the halfway program including membership, funding and the outpatient services.

The following surrounding residents were present to speak in opposition of this request: Leo Hopkins, Tom VanAlstyne, Conrad Shannon, Louann Madray, Malcolm Woodard, David Beverly, Don VanAlstyne, Art Manning, Jim Hodges, John Pearson and Randy Altman. Most of the residents were not opposed to what Mrs. Stokes was trying to do, but they were strongly opposed to it being in their neighborhood. They voiced concerns about traffic safety and the establishment being detrimental to their neighborhood and property value.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Discussion continued. Mr. Hart noted that the applicant raised her hand to speak before the motion was made, and in accordance with the ordinance, she is allowed a rebuttal. At this time Mrs. Stokes stated that she would like to withdraw her application. However, Mr. Stewart stated that the motion was already on the floor and remains for denial. Voting Aye (for denial): Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Nay: None. Abstained From Voting: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Hal Hart. Members abstaining were not sure if they were violating the ordinance with regard to the rebuttal and therefore did not feel comfortable voting *for* or *against* this request. Without there being a majority vote, the request would be forwarded to the County Commission with "no recommendation" from the Planning Commission. The applicant was advised to submit her request for withdrawal in writing to staff.

GC-2001-32

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agricultural to PD Planned Development, 11.017 acres, described as a rectangular-shaped lot located on Andy Tostensen Road near the intersection of U.S. Highway 17; parcel having 611 feet of frontage on Andy Tostensen Road. Property owned by Robert C. Bryan.

Ms. Julie Chapman was present for discussion.

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

Staff's recommendation is for denial. The PD text allows, as permitted uses, those of the General Residential District. The intent of this district is to be developed and reserved for low to medium density residential purposes. This proposal suggests a maximum density of 16 units per acre as compared to a maximum density under the current zoning 2 units per acre.

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;

No. All parcels on this side of U.S. 17 present a maximum density of 2 units per acre. This proposal suggests 16 units per acre.

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

The proposal could adversely affect the existing use or usability if no infrastructure is included to support it.

- 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 proposed zoning classification, as detailed in the Planned Development text, may result in a use which could cause excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities and utilities. Additionally, county sewer service is available in proximity to the subject property, and Glynn County has received permits for a well in proximity to the subject property.

- 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 as Forest Agricultural.

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

Neither the Future Land Use map nor the Comprehensive Land Use Plan indicates expectation of the commercial and residential growth experienced in this area.

Ms. Julie Chapman, representing the property owner, presented a plat of the property for review. She also presented a letter from the Tostensen family indicating their support for this rezoning. Ms. Chapman stated that utility improvements are being made along the road for water and sewer in this particular area. She further stated that Mr. Bryan is not building anything on the property and is planning to sell the property, which is why she is presenting the text to the Planning Commission so that they are afforded a chance to review it before the property is sold.

Mr. Gene Lee, president of the Royal Oaks Homeowners Association, was present to oppose this request. He stated that the homeowners recognize that there will be additional growth in the area; however, they would prefer low density or single-family residential. Mr. Stewart pointed out that this proposal could possibly be a nice transitional zoning surrounded by low density. He also noted that water and sewer would be in the area.

Mr. Bob Terjesen stated that the homeowners are not opposed to development in this area and would welcome more neighbors, but they are concerned about what could possibly be allowed on the property once it is sold in that some of the permitted uses could depreciate their property.

(It was noted that Ms. Ann McCormick arrived at 10:20 a.m.)

Additional concerns were expressed about the permitted uses. Specifically, the par three golf course and the timesharing use or facility. Ms. Chapman agreed to strike these uses from the text. Mr. Stewart asked Ms. Chapman if she would consider reducing the density from 16 units to 12 units. However, Ms. Chapman stated that she could not

make that decision for Mr. Bryan. She would have to defer this request again but she would rather not.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this request with the deletion of the following permitted uses from the zoning text: unlighted, regulation size or par three golf course; and timesharing use or facility. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Abstained From Voting: Ms. Ann McCormick.

GC-2001-34

A request to rezone from MH Mobile Home Park to GR General Residential, 1.392 acres, described as 220 Carteret near Golden Isles Parkway; parcel having 376 feet of frontage on Carteret Road. Property owned by Delia Aultman, Lynette Brown, Frances Taylor and Guy Harris.

Mr. Bill Edwards was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mrs. Segers stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

In conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Yes. The proposed zoning classification is not in conflict with adjacent uses and zoning classifications.

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

No. Permitted uses of the proposed General Residential classification would not adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.

- 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. Permitted uses in proposed zoning classification would not result in impacts significantly greater than those of the current classification.

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

Yes.

- 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.

Following a brief 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.

Hardwood Forest, Phase I (PP200111051323)

26 Acres, Located at Altamaha Loop North
Zoned Planned Development
International Paper Realty Corp., Owner/Developer

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

Mr. Tyler Frazier stated that staff has reviewed this request as compliant with the ordinances and therefore recommends approval.

Mr. Hal Hart had questions about a time limit on the temporary cul-de-sac. Mr. Sutton stated that Article VI, Section 602.2g) does not indicate that there is a maximum time limit on a temporary cul-de-sac. Section 602.2 h) states that "temporary dead-end streets shall meet the requirements of the Planning Commission for design, maintenance and removal." Mr. Sutton further stated that there is no time limit on the life of the variance in accordance with Article IX, Section 901. Mr. Ray Richard explained that they have to have a temporary turn around until Phase II is developed, and at that time there will be a permanent circle. He assured Mr. Hart that the temporary cul-de-sac would not be there any longer than it needs to be until they progress with the next phase of the development.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

The Planning Commission took a 15 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:10 a.m.

Village at Glynn Place, Phase III (PP200110100956)

3 Acres, Located at Altama Connector at Scranton Connector
Zoned Planned Development-Shopping
Partridge Greene, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mr. Tom Pruitt was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that staff has reviewed this request as compliant with the ordinances and therefore recommends approval.

Mr. Sutton stated that according to the County Attorney's office, a recommendation for denial cannot be based on the applicant not completing the road as promised by the developer several years ago. Mr. Stewart suggested that in the future, any promises from developers be submitted in writing. Staff concurred. Also, Mr. Stewart stated that there was a great deal of discussion about an 80 ft. right-of-way versus a 50 ft. right-of-way. He wanted to know if staff concurs with the 50 ft. right-of-way. Mr. Sutton stated that the County Engineers Office has agreed to a 50 ft. right-of-way and according to Mr. Wheeler, the only reason this preliminary plat is being reviewed today is so that staff can get something in writing indicating that the right-of-way would be 50 ft.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields and Mr. Hal Hart. The motion failed due to a tie vote and therefore the request is deemed denied.

Mr. Sutton explained that Jim Fowler's Life in the Wild includes three site plans. The applicant is requesting a twelve-month extension in accordance with Article VI, Section 619.6 of the Zoning Ordinance. At the time that these applications were initially reviewed in July 2000 they included a number of conditions, most of which have been satisfied. However, the staff reports for the site plans will remain the same, including the conditions. Staff's recommendation is for approval of the twelve-month extension.

Mr. Jeff Haliburton and Mr. Cameron Bland were present for discussion and to answer questions. The requests were acted upon as follows:

Jim Fowler's Life in the Wild, Phase I East (SP00-11)

74 Acres, Located at Golden Isles Gateway Tract
Zoned Planned Development
Parks & Wildlife Services, Owner/Developer

This phase involves only the parking area for the park. As per the PD, a 50 ft. tree buffer will be on all sides abutting neighboring properties except for the canal side because it abuts other PAWS property. The applicant has chosen to keep a 100 ft. undisturbed buffer along GA 99. The main frontage road is proposed to be named Fowler Boulevard and the park road is proposed to be named PAWS drive. Access will be from GA 99. Petersville Road will be used for emergency access only.

This phase will need to go before the Board of Commissioners as a condition to the approval of the PD Text with the following special conditions: 1) The additional provision of supplemental planting/buffering material within the 50 ft. tree buffer; and 2) Said planting subject to Board of Commissioners approval. (A copy of the resolution approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 6, 2000 to amend the PD Text for the Golden Isles Gateway Tract was included in the packages.)

Per the PD Text, the Wildlife Park property owner will be permitted to construct up to 5,000 parking spaces for visitor parking. Parking provided equals 1,726 automobile spaces, 109 Bus/RV spaces and 16 handicap spaces for a total of 1,851 parking spaces. Total impervious coverage in phase E1 equals approximately 26.6 acres, and pervious coverage equals approximately 47.4 acres. Open/green space equals 64%.

The Building Inspection Division and the Planning and Zoning Division of the Community Development Department, as well as Engineering, Environmental Engineering, GIS and Fire Departments have all favorably reviewed this project. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Issuance of an LDA Permit;
2. Issuance of an Army Corps of Engineers permit to impact any wetlands;
3. A variance from the State must be obtained to disturb the buffer around the state waters (Brunswick-Altamaha Canal);
4. Approval from the State Historic Preservation Office for any impacts to the Brunswick-Altamaha Canal;

5. The Planning Official may approve changes to the site plan provided that such changes do not decrease the setbacks from property lines, decrease the effectiveness of buffers, or add any specific uses not already approved on the site plan
6. Approval by the Board of Commissioners for the buffer as per the zoning conditions.
7. The buffer along Highway 99 may be reviewed by the Board of Commissioners within one year of the date the park opens to ensure that it is adequately screening the parking facilities. If it is found that the buffer is insufficient in some areas, additional plantings, berms or fences may be required.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the extension subject to all conditions being satisfied. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

Jim Fowler's Life in the Wild, Phase II East (SP00-14)

1,863 Acres, Located at Golden Isles Gateway Tract
 Zoned Planned Development-General
 Parks & Wildlife Services, Owner/Developer

This phase involves the Animal Adventure Theme Park, which has an entrance and exit from Georgia Highway 99. The property is located west of the Brunswick Altamaha Canal and east of I-95.

The Planned Development Zoning Text, which outlines the permitted uses within the PAWS District, was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

This phase consists of access drives, maintenance and service roads, observation walks, expedition and walking trails, animal holding areas, pasture area, barns, petting zoo, lagoons and lakes, as well as development pods, with the following:

- Maintenance Facility - maintenance & storage for animal food, including a paved delivery service area and 18 parking spaces for employees
- Sawmill and Loggers Camp
- Indian Village
- Train Depot
- Crafts & Railroad Camp
- Birds Park
- Trader's Camp, including Youth Education, Restrooms and Observation Tower
- Bartram's Camp & South Georgia Wildlife Research Center, including 36 parking spaces
- South/Central American Village

All structures developed will have to meet the requirements of the Planned Development Zoning Text and Building Code Requirements.

The Building Inspections Division has reviewed the project and recommends approval subject to detail construction plans for the structures being submitted meeting all Building Code requirements.

The GIS Department's review states that the drive serving the buildings in the Research Center will need to be named for 911 purposes when a building permit is obtained.

Environmental Engineering and the Water and Sewer Division commented that no water or sewer extensions are shown or proposed for this phase. The Assistant County Engineer has reviewed the project and approves the drainage plans. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Issuance of an LDA Permit;
2. Issuance of an Army Corps of Engineers Permit to impact any wetlands;
3. A variance from the state must be obtained to disturb the buffer around state the waters (Brunswick-Altamaha Canal);
4. Approval from the State Historic Preservation Office for any impacts to the Brunswick-Altamaha Canal; and
5. The Planning Official may approve changes to the site plan provided that such changes do not decrease the setbacks from property lines, decrease the effectiveness of buffers, or add any specific uses not already approved on the site plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the extension subject to all conditions being satisfied. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

Jim Fowler's Life in the Wild, Phase III West (SP00-15)

1,050 Acres, Located at Golden Isles Gateway Tract
Zoned Planned Development
Parks & Wildlife Services, Owner/Developer

This project involves the third phase of Jim Fowler's Life in the Wild. This stage offers future camping sites, a future lodge, and wildlife including giraffe, cheetah, antelope, lions, rhino and zebra.

This phase proposes to have 27 parking spaces. (General parking is in phase I.) Impervious coverage equals 100 acres. Open/green space equals 950 acres (90%)

The Building Inspection Division and the Planning and Zoning Division of the Community Development Department, as well as Engineering, Environmental Engineering, GIS and Fire Departments have all favorably reviewed this project. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Issuance of an LDA Permit;
2. Issuance of an Army Corps of Engineers permit to impact any wetlands;
3. A variance from the State must be obtained to disturb the buffer around the state waters (Brunswick-Altamaha Canal);
4. Approval from the State Historic Preservation Office for any impacts to the Brunswick-Altamaha Canal;
5. The Planning Official may approve changes to the site plan provided that such changes do not decrease the setbacks from property lines, decrease the effectiveness of buffers or add any specific uses not already approved on the site plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the extension subject to all conditions being satisfied. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

Sea Palms Housekeeping Addition (SP200111071343)

18,336 sq. ft., Located in Sea Palms Subdivision, SSI

Zoned Planned Development

Sea Palms Corporation, Owner/Developer

Mr. Larry Bryson was present for discussion.

Mr. Sutton explained that extensive efforts have been made by staff and developers to locate the Planned Development Text for Sea Palms East, with no success. Mr. Sutton reviewed this application as non-compliant and asked Mr. Bryson to provide confirmation that site coverage calculations include area of existing building in addition to the area of the proposed new construction, and to provide confirmation that site coverage in excess of 50% is permitted. In Mr. Bryson's response, he stated that a written Planned Development Text for Sea Palms does not exist and therefore maximum site coverage does not exist.

Mr. Sutton stated that previously when an application was considered for Sea Palms East, it was agreed that the Planned Development Text needed to be in place. It was also agreed upon that there was verbiage indicating that the property would be developed in accordance with Resort Residential characteristics. Mr. Sutton stressed that staff is being asked to review an application without a PD Text. Therefore, he suggested that a PD Text for Sea Palms East be created and approved as soon as possible to enable staff to make a well founded recommendation to the Planning Commission.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Larry Bryson stated that he was also unsuccessful in his search for the PD Text. In fact, he stated that he is not sure that a PD Text ever existed for Sea Palms East. However, Mr. Sutton pointed out that staff found information indicating that this Planned Development Text would be used as a "guinea pig." Also during staff's research, staff discovered that there had been 13 amendments made to the PD Text over the years.

Mr. Hart wanted to know if this would be the last development phase for Sea Palms. Mr. Bobby Shupe stated that according to Mr. Larry Singleton, this is the last phase. Mr. Hart then suggested that the information submitted to date along with specific guidelines be used as the current PD Text.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Discussion continued. Mr. Hart asked that the motion be amended to reflect that there is no PD Text. Mr. Fields amended his motion to include that the approval is with the understanding that this is the last project in Sea Palms. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted.

Microtel Inn Suites (SP200111071303)

2 Acres, Located at Gateway Center Parkway

Zoned Planned Development

Ricky Mitchell, Owner/Developer

Mr. Ricky Mitchell was present for discussion.

In presenting the staff's report, Mr. Frazier stated that staff is recommending denial of this request primarily because there is no bond to complete the road to the site. The county has no security that the road will be completed.

Mr. Stewart expressed concerns about the non-compliant items included in the staff's report as follows: "Parcel boundary indication on the site plan does not exist; The minor plat application submitted on November 5, 2001 has yet to be approved; Construction plans have not been approved for the construction of the road or the installation of water, sewer and storm water runoff devices."

Mr. Fields stated that according to the 801 process, staff has five working days to approve or reject a plan. The applicant submitted the plans on November 5, 2001, one month ago, and staff has not acted. He stressed that this is not the applicant's fault.

Mr. Sutton explained that there has been a preliminary plat approved by the Planning Commission, but there has been no construction plans reviewed or approved for the installation of a road. Also, staff received a minor plat application for the creation of a private access easement serving more than four lots. Staff received revisions to the minor plat application on yesterday (12-3-01). Mr. Sutton further stated that the applicant is asking for a building permit on a lot that does not have ingress/egress rights to county right-of-way via minimum design standard. Staff has never approved a building permit on any lot that does not meet this requirement.

Mr. Ricky Mitchell gave a brief presentation. He stated that he purchased the property in 1997 and he has been trying to develop and sell the property for four years. He has been working with the county along with Pruitt & Purcell and did everything that was asked of him regarding the road and sewer for this particular piece of property. After four years, he has found someone willing to purchase 1.72 acres to build a motel. He met with staff on several occasions and the only issue brought up was the bond. Mr. Mitchell stated that he does have approved drawings signed by county officials to build the road.

For clarification, Mr. Frazier stated that the contention is not that this is a minor plat, but that it would need to go to final plat at some point. He reminded the members to focus on the site plan application at this time. However, Mr. Fields stressed that he could not vote to approve a site plan on a lot that has not been created under the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Sutton explained that staff did not have a copy of the plans until the applicant provided them with a copy. As soon as staff received the plans the plans were distributed for review comments. He elaborated further on the site plan application procedure and construction plans with regard to approving the road.

Mr. Bobby Shupe stated that Mr. Mitchell is willing to post a bond to build the road to county standards.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to approve this site plan subject to the county either accepting or rejecting the amended minor plat application by the end of this week; access easement or street being built to county standards; all other construction issues being resolved; and a bond being posted to ensure construction of the road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Perry Fields, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Hal Hart.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

GC-2001-01G

An Amendment To Change The Zoning Ordinance Of Glynn County, Georgia, Sections 302, 604, 714.4, 722.2, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, And 1108 To Define Greenspace, Prohibit Variances For Reduction Of Lot Size, Set Forth Standards For Determining The Importance Of Streets, Correct Typographical Errors, Define Caretaker's Cottage, Set Forth That Motions That Fail For Lack Of A Majority Vote Are Deemed Denied, Require New And Separate Notice For The Reconsideration Of Zoning Amendments, And For Other Purposes.

Following a lengthy discussion regarding the definition of "Greenspace" and "Caretaker's Cottage," a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this amendment until the language is clearer and until the County Attorney can attend the meeting to clarify definitions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields and unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-01H

An Amendment To Change The Subdivision Regulations Of Glynn County, Georgia, Sections 602.2m, 602.5c, 602.6, 706 And 801.2 To Set Forth Design Standards For All Street Signage Including Regulatory, Warning And Street Names, Signals And Pavement Markings As Needed For Safety Purposes, And For Other Purposes.

A motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to defer this amendment for further clarification. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-01 I

An Amendment To Change The Subdivision Regulations Of Glynn County, Georgia, Article VII, Section 710 To Set Forth An Additional Final Plat Approval Procedure.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick and unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-01J

An Amendment to Change the Zoning Ordinance of Glynn County, Georgia, Article VII, Section 713.3.8 To Provide For A Manager's Residence For Mini-Warehouses In The HC Highway Commercial District.

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay: Mr. Perry Fields. (It was noted that during the course of discussion, Mr. Perry Fields felt that the same problem exists with the *Manager's Residence* as with the *Caretakers Cottage* and therefore voted against the motion for approval.)

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the Minutes of the November 6,2001 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Mr. Perry Fields did not attend the November 6th meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

Planning Commission Items

a) Election of Chairman & Vice-Chairman 2002

Ms. Ann McCormick reported that the nominating committee (consisting of Mr. Hal Hart and Ms. McCormick) recommended Mr. Wayne Stewart for Chairman and Mr. Lamar Cole for Vice Chairman of the Glynn County Planning Commission for the year 2002. The floor was open for nominations for Chairman. However, there were none. Therefore nominations were closed and by acclamation, Mr. Wayne Stewart was elected Chairman of the Glynn County Planning Commission for the year 2002. The floor was then open for nominations for Vice Chairman. There were no other nominations. Nominations were closed and by acclamation, Mr. Lamar Cole was elected Vice Chairman of the Glynn County Planning Commission for the year 2002.

STAFF ITEMS

a) Draft Digital Zoning Layer for Glynn County & Brunswick

The following report was included in the packages for review. Mr. Ed Halbig, Senior GIS Analyst, was present for discussion and to answer questions.

The Glynn County GIS has developed a draft digital zoning layer for all of Glynn County including the City of Brunswick. The digital zoning layer was originally based on the county parcel layer, and each parcel was assigned its appropriate zoning, as recorded on the zoning mylars. Where the mylars indicated that a zoning change had occurred, the pertinent files were researched to determine if the rezoning request, commission action and subsequent map change were in agreement. In the rare case of discrepancy, the commission action was used to determine the rezoning description.

In 1966, the Joint Planning Commission approved zoning lines across parcels that extended into the marshes, resulting in multiple zonings on a single parcel. In those instances, GIS staff compared the marsh line and the CP boundary shown on the mylars with the marsh line in the GIS database. The marsh line of the existing GIS layer was highly accurate when compared to the marsh line of the mylars. Sections 403.2 and 403.4 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance were used as the basis for determining these zoning lines.

The Brunswick portion of the zoning layer has been reviewed by city staff and corrections were made as requested. Staff has been reviewing the county portion of the zoning layer and corrections have been made as discovered.

With the digital zoning layer, the benefits are as follows:

1. Zoning information can be updated more efficiently.
2. Survey information can be used to accurately depict the extents of a rezoning.
3. Zoning file information can be linked to the digital data. File numbers were entered into the original zoning database and will become a separate layer. This will allow users to query a parcel and see its zoning history.
4. Zoning data can be published on the Internet.

Mr. Halbig stated that staff recommends holding public hearings to consider adopting the digital zoning layer as the official zoning layer of Glynn County. (Samples were provided for review.) It was noted that no action was required at this time. However, following a brief discussion, the Planning Commission concurred with staff's recommendations.

b) Live Oaks Power Project - Request for Maximum Bldg. Height

c) Live Oaks Power Project - DRI

Attorney Mark Johnson and Mr. Richard Zwolak were present for discussion and to answer questions.

Members of the Planning Commission expressed concern about taking action on the above referenced request in that it was not advertised. However, Mr. Sutton explained that there is no requirement in the Glynn County Ordinance to advertise height exceptions. He stated that the applicants have met all of the requirements in accordance with the ordinance. The following letter of request along with the project description was included in the packages for review:

"Golder Associates, Inc. on behalf of the Live Oaks Company, LLC respectfully requests the Glynn County Planning Commission to consider granting an exception to the maximum building height limit stipulated for General Industrial property (Section 720.4 of the Zoning Ordinance). This exception is requested for the proposed Live Oaks Power project located in Glynn County, Georgia.

“The Live Oaks Company is proposing to construct and operate a combined cycle power production facility capable of generating a nominal net electrical output of 600 megawatts in Glynn County. The site will be developed to include a potential expansion that would increase the power production capacity to above 600 megawatts. The project will be located in an unincorporated area of Glynn County, about ¾ of a mile to the northeast of the intersection of U.S. Routes 26 and 341 and State Routes 32 and 99. The project will be constructed on a site that consists of approximately 90 acres located in the Sterling Industrial Park, which is comprised of mainly light manufacturing companies...

“The project will be constructed in two phases. The first phase will consist of two combustion turbines, two heat recovery steam generators with duct firing, and one steam turbine operating in combined cycle mode... The first phase is planned for a construction commencement date of June 2002 and a construction completion date of June 2004. The construction schedule for the second phase has not been established yet. The facility will be designed to provide base load service and permitted at an annual capacity of 100%.

“The Live Oaks Company has filed the necessary applications with Southern Company for transmission services, completed an on-site aquifer test, and is now in the midst of acquiring all of the necessary permits for the construction and operation of the facility...”

Mr. Richard Zwolak, Director of Environmental Planning for Golder Associates presented photographs and elaborated on the concept drawings. According to Article VII of the Zoning Ordinance, a maximum building height of 60 ft. is specified for General Industrial zoning. An exception will be required for the proposed heat recovery steam generators and stacks. The height of these structures will be 90 ft. and 155 ft. above ground surface. Mr. Zwolak also addressed the tax revenue and its positive affect on Glynn County.

Attorney Mark Johnson stated that the applicants have met all of the requirements of the ordinance and they are hoping to receive affirmative action from the Planning Commission.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to approve the exception to the height requirement as outlined. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Wayne Stewart. (Mr. Perry Fields excused himself at 1:30 and was no longer in attendance.)

- d) Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Add Article XV**
- e) Amendment to Subdivision Regulations, Section 707 - Add 801.1**
- f) Amendment to Zoning Ordinance 302, 502, 503.3, 503.4, 504, 505, 611.6, 613.1, 619, 619.1, 619.2, 619.3, 619.5, 619.6, 701.5, 702.5, 703.4, 704.4, 705.4, 706.4, 707.4, 708.4, 709.5, 709.8, 709.9, 709.11, 710.4, 711.4, 712.4, 713.4, 714.4, 715.4, 716.3, 717.4, 718.4, 719.4, 720.4, 722.4, 723.4, 724.3, 726.3, 729.3**

Due to the members, staff and the general public not having enough time to review the above referenced amendments, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to schedule a work session at the January 8, 2002 meeting for further discussion and consideration.

g) Amendment to Sub. Regulations - Compliance with Addressing Ordinance
County Police Chief Carl Alexander and County Fire Chief Carl Johnson were present for discussion and to answer questions. However, due to the length of today's meeting, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to recess at this time (2:40 p.m.) and reconvene on Friday, December 7th at 9:00 a.m. to discuss this amendment.

Continuation of the December 4th Planning Commission Meeting
Friday, December 7, 2001 - 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lamar Cole, Chairman
Wayne Stewart, Vice Chairman
Mike Aspinwall
Perry Fields
Hal Hart
Ann McCormick

ABSENT: Jonathan Williams

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Brenda Pittman, Code Enforcement
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Henri Woodman, County Commission Chairman
Police Chief Carl Alexander
Fire Chief Carl Johnson
Ken Brown, 911 Director
Jackie Magnant, GIS Coordinator
Dan Coty
Terry Driggers
Ernie Johns
Jeff Counts

Chairman Lamar Cole called the meeting back to order.

Amendment to Subdivision Regulations
Compliance with Addressing Ordinance

A copy of the November 28, 2001 memorandum addressed to Police Chief Carl Alexander from Attorney Desiree Watson explaining that the Addressing Ordinance conflicts with certain provisions of the Subdivision Regulations was distributed to the Planning Commission members and to the public, along with a copy of the proposed amendment.

The proposed ordinance was discussed at length with the following recommended changes: (words in *italicized bold print* to be added; words with ~~lines drawn through~~ to be deleted)

2-5-250 Title, Scope, Intent and Administration.

- (d) Administration: The GIS Division is hereby authorized to and shall *approve* ~~assign~~ road names and numbers to all properties, and shall administer this Ordinance.

2-5-252 Naming System.

All roads that serve two or more properties shall be named. A road name *approved* ~~assigned~~ by the GIS Division for addressing purposes to a private road shall not constitute or imply acceptance of the road as a public way and shall include the letters "P.E." after the name...

- (a) No two roads shall be assigned or *approved* the same name...
- (g) No two subdivisions, condominiums... will be assigned the same name *in the same ESN Zone*.

2-4-254 Designation of Numbers and Duty to Display.

- (a) Number on the Building or Residence: Where the building or residence is within forty (40) feet from the edge of the road right-of-way, *whether public or private access easement*...
- (d) Temporary Numbers: Each person constructing a building of any kind shall, during such construction, erect or post a temporary number, designated by "0" by the GIS Division *unless a permanent number is assigned*...

2-5-255 Construction, Subdivisions and Business Licenses.

- (c) Business Licenses: All applications for new or renewed business licenses issued by the Glynn County Finance Department will be *reviewed* ~~verified~~ by the GIS Division for correctness and compliance with this addressing Ordinance.

2-5-256 Effective Date, Notification, Compliance.

- (a) This Ordinance shall become effective upon approval of the Board of Commissioners. *Pre-existing plans shall be exempt*.

2-5-257 Violations and Penalties.

- (a) Any person violating any provision of this Ordinance shall be liable for a ~~civil~~ penalty of ten dollars (\$10.00) per day for a house or dwelling unit and ~~twenty dollars (\$20.00)~~ *ten dollars (\$10.00)* per day for a place of business; the maximum penalty shall be up to one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00). ~~Each three (3) days the violation continues shall be deemed as one day for purposes of this Section and shall constitute a separate offense.~~ Penalties for each violation shall be as follows:

| <i>Written Warning</i> | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>First Offense</i> | <i>\$100.00 minimum</i> |
| <i>Second Offense</i> | <i>\$200.00 minimum</i> |
| <i>Third Offense</i> | <i>\$300.00 up to \$1,000.00</i> |

The written warning for a first offense shall be hand delivered or *certified* mailed to the location of the house, dwelling unit or place of business...

On behalf of the Glynn County Planning Commission, Chairman Lamar Cole recommended that the Addressing Ordinance be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners with the suggested changes. Chairman Henri Woodman thanked the Planning Commission, county staff and everyone involved for their time and effort.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.