

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

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

ABSENT: Perry Fields

STAFF PRESENT: John Peterson, Director
Lee Sutton, Planning Official
Ellis Carter, Building Official
Tyler Frazier, Planner II
Carolynn Segers, Planner II
Buster Reese, Assistant County Engineer
Gail Wendell, Planning Technician
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

Chairman Lamar Cole called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He then gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

Chairman Cole stated that due to the *June 5, 2001 Minutes* being delayed for several months for lack of a quorum, he would like for the Planning Commission to address this item first on the Agenda in that the members who attended the June 5th meeting are present at this time. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the June 5, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Mike Aspinwall was not a member at that time and therefore abstained from voting. Mr. Wayne Stewart did not attend the June 5th meeting and also abstained from voting.

At this time, Mr. Hal Hart excused himself from the meeting room in order to avoid a conflict of interest regarding Application GC-2001-24.

GC-2001-24

Request to rezone from R12 Residential to PD-C Planned Development Commercial, 3.4 acres, described as 100 Glyndale Circle located just west of Highway 341; the parcel having 282.32 feet of frontage on Glyndale Circle. Property owned by Stephen K. Hart and Mary S. Hart.

Mr. Stephen K. Hart was present for discussion.

Before presenting the staff's report, Mrs. Carolynn Segers distributed replacement sheets of the applicant's Planned Development Text, which contained minor changes and corrections. She stated that this information was received after the Planning Commission packages had been delivered. She then proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

Staff's recommendation is for denial based on the future land use map. Keep in mind, changes that have occurred since the plans' introduction warrant consideration.

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.

On one side of this parcel, Freeway Commercial (FC) development has occurred along 341. The other side has continued to enjoy the benefits surrounding a residential environment. Whether suitable or not the question must be asked, Where do we establish a buffer between the uses? The dynamic impact of commercial property adjoining residential properties has almost always created an unharmonious relationship between neighbors. No it is not a use that is suitable on the west side of this parcel. It is however a use compatible with development on the east and north side. The south is not affected because of the marsh and tidal creek.

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

If adequate buffers are mandated and maintained adverse impact could be minimized. Continued encroachment into the subdivision could adversely affect the existing residential use and usability.

- 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.

It could increase the average daily traffic count, on a street designed originally to support residential traffic.

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

It is not in keeping with the future land use map. This area is identified 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.

Yes, the issue of commercial uses adjoining residential uses should be looked at when considering this application.

Mr. Stephen Hart gave a brief presentation. In response to staff's comments regarding the residential use to the west, Mr. Hart pointed out that the neighbors are in favor of his request and have submitted letters of support. Regarding the buffer, he stated that there would be a natural undisturbed buffer, which is why he chose the PD zoning change. Mr. Hart explained that since moving to Glyndale Circle, the entire complexion of the road has changed. What use to be a two-lane road is now a four-lane road that runs straight to his driveway. He stated that commercial developments have engulfed the residential area. He elaborated on how this has impacted his property and presented photographs depicting the commercial establishments surrounding his property.

Mr. Mack Burgess stated that he has lived in the area for 31 years and he's concerned that if this request is approved it would only allow commercial developments to keep coming until it ends up in his yard. Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Burgess if he thought a restricted buffer would make a difference. Mr. Burgess stated that it would help.

Mr. Stewart further stated that the applicant's property is surrounded by commercial but he doesn't know where to draw the line. He stated that the next door neighbor doesn't seem to have a problem with this request. Mr. Stewart stated that normally he would have received phone calls for this type of request, but he did not receive any calls, for or against the rezoning. He stated that there is no doubt in his mind that the area has become commercial.

Chairman Lamar Cole stated that he received one phone call, but the caller was concerned about when commercial developments would stop.

Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that from looking at the developments that have occurred in recent years, he is not sure if voting would change things at this point. He stated that commercialism is there. He also stated that this is about the third time that this has come up and each time they end up with the same thoughts, "where will it stop." Perhaps the 50 ft. buffer will help, but it is incumbent upon the Planning Commission to give the best judgement possible and perhaps some of the neighbors will be pleased.

Mr. Stewart suggested making the rezoning contingent upon a 50 ft. deed restriction. Mr. Hart stated he would not have a problem with that. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend approval of this rezoning contingent upon a 50 ft. undisturbed deed restricted buffer. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Discussion continued.

Ms. Ann McCormick commented that she is very much concerned about the residential neighborhood with regard to the commercial intrusion. Mr. Aspinwall stated that the market forces would probably take care of most of the area because the land that is located on the road frontage has commercial value. He stated that this type of buffer might end the intrusion; however, the land is clearly commercial.

For the benefit of Mr. Burgess, staff read the proposed uses allowed under this particular zoning classification. It was noted that the applicant deleted *repair garage, vehicle/boat sales and service* and added *outdoor advertising sign* to his text. Chairman Cole asked the applicant if he wished to make any other deletions or changes. Mr. Hart replied no.

After discussion, the following vote was taken. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay Ms. Ann McCormick. (It was noted that Mr. Hal Hart was not in the room and did not participate in the discussion or the vote.)

(Mr. Hal Hart re-entered the meeting room at this point.)

GC-2001-27

Request to rezone from PD Planned Development to FC Freeway Commercial, 111.983 acres, described as northeast quadrant of the intersection of Interstate 95 and Spur 25 located at Millennium Boulevard; the parcel having 5,662 feet of frontage on Spur 25 (Golden Isles Parkway). Property owned by Sawdawg, L.L.C.

Mr. Ron Sawyer 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 approval conditioned on the applicant addressing air traffic safety issues with the Airport Commission prior to approval of individual building permits.

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, all adjacent property now requires development to Freeway Commercial standards.

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

No.

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

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

The current zoning of the property presents the potential for excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, or utilities. These issues will have to be addressed either zoned as PD-G or developed to the Freeway Commercial standards.

- 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 commercial with pockets of undeveloped or unused lands.

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

This application, if approved, would remove the requirement of site plan approval, in accordance with Article VI, Section 619 of the Zoning Ordinance. Effectively, the Planning Commission would be eliminated from the review process on the entire 111 acres.

Chairman Cole asked staff if this property is part of Branigar's original PD Text. Mrs. Segers replied yes. Chairman Cole then asked if that could be changed because he thought that it had to be amended. Mr. Sutton explained that if the CR-6 Tract is removed, the PD Text for Branigar would have to be amended. Chairman Cole stated that the amendment would have to be done first. Mr. Sutton agreed and added that this was brought to staff's attention late yesterday afternoon. With that in mind, Mr. Stewart suggested a deferral to allow time for the applicant and staff to make the necessary changes. The Planning Commission and Mr. Sawyer concurred. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this request until next month's meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

GC-2001-28

Request to rezone from MR Medium Residential to PD-R Planned Development Residential, 7.55 acres, described as Phase V, Cypress Run Subdivision located on Cypress Run Drive; the parcel having 1192 feet of frontage on Cypress Run Drive. Property owned by Sawyer and Associates.

Mr. Ron Sawyer 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 approval.

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.

Proposal will provide for a use suitable with and similar to development of adjacent and nearby property, namely Cypress Run Subdivision Phases I through IV.

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

Proposed change in zoning category will not adversely affect existing use or suitability of adjacent and 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.

While the zoning proposal will provide for a use as stated above, owner has previously developed improvements to streets, utilities and storm drainage.

- 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 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.

Adjacent and nearby property has been developed as Cypress Run Subdivision Phases I through IV. The proposed zoning change would provide for completion of the Cypress Run residential development.

Regarding the applicant's PD Text, Chairman Cole asked for clarification concerning the 3,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size coming from a 9,000 sq. ft. lot. Mr. Sawyer explained that he followed the same guidelines previously used for Cypress Run. He stated that there is no change. He took the same Text and applied it in this case. He further explained that sometimes because of the way a unit is set on the lot, it ends up in an area that is smaller due to the shape of the lot. Mr. Sawyer stated that this is the final phase of Cypress Run Subdivision.

Ms. Ann McCormick asked if there would be any inlets or outlets on the Golden Isles Parkway for this last development. Mr. Sawyer replied no, it is a limited access highway.

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

GC-2001-29

Request to rezone from LI Light Industrial to LC Local Commercial, 1.0248 acres, described as Parcel C Dynamic Investments located at 614 Crispen Boulevard; the parcel having 155 feet of frontage on 614 Crispen Boulevard.

Ms. Sherrill Langley, property owner, was present for discussion.

Mrs. Segers distributed copies of the general layout plan, which was submitted by the applicant at the last minute. She then proceeded with the staff's report as follows:

Staff's recommendation is for denial based on the difference of intent between LI and LC. The intent of LI is to discourage the encroachment of commercial uses. The intent of LC is to discourage the encroachment of industrial uses.

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.

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

Potential exists that as a result of LC and LI discourage the encroachment of each other.

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

Yes.

- Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.

No.

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

The future land use map identifies this area as industrial.

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

The intent of LI is to discourage the encroachment of commercial uses. The intent of LC is to discourage the encroachment of industrial uses.

During a brief presentation, Ms. Sherrill Langley explained that when she purchased the property she thought that it was commercial. She had planned on renting the offices, which had been subdivided and previously used as commercial. She stated that the property is currently being used as a floral shop. Ms. Langley pointed out that she lives in Stately Oaks behind the subject property. She stated that as a homeowner, she understands the concerns of commercial developments. Therefore, she would like to restrict the uses that would be allowed if the rezoning is approved. She is asking to restrict the following uses: grocery store, package liquor store and marina. Mr. Stewart commended Ms. Langley for her efforts and stated that her neighbors would probably appreciate this gesture.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to recommend approval of this request with the stipulation eliminating grocery store, package liquor store and marina from among the permitted uses of this rezoning. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart and unanimously adopted.

In order to avoid a conflict of interest, Chairman Lamar Cole stepped down and turned the following item over to Vice Chairman Wayne Stewart.

GC-2001-30

Request to rezone from R-12 One-Family Residential to OC Office Commercial, 41,689 square feet, described as Lot 5, Suburban Estates and adjacent Parcel A located at intersection of Suburban Drive and Altama Avenue; the parcel having 200 feet of frontage on Suburban Drive. Property owned by Brunswick Jaycees.

Ms. Valerie Harrison, agent, 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. Lot 5 is zoned residential. Parcel "A" apparently is acting as a buffer between the residential use of Suburban Subdivision and the commercial development adjacent to Lot 5. Access to the property, required buffers and impacts on the residential use are all factors governing staff's recommendation.

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, encroachment of the proposed commercial use is not in keeping with the intent of the R-12 character associated with the existing residential subdivision.

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

Yes, buffer requirements and curb cuts affording ingress/egress of the proposed commercial development would adversely affect the character of the residential development already established by previously accepted land use patterns. Access to property suggested for rezoning would be required from Suburban Drive because of requirements described in Article VI, Section 614 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. Refuse collection, loading and unloading areas, lighting and noise buffer requirement are major concerns from staff.

- 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, existing zoning and land use planning has described that area as not being affected by commercial encroachment in accordance with the intent of the R-12 zoning classification.

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

The future land use plan identifies this area as residential adjoining an intense commercial use, which is the current character affording the residential use with the require buffer between the two uses.

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

Changing the residential use to one of commercial would adversely impact previous land use planning that affords residential uses with an adequate buffer between the two.

During a brief presentation, Ms. Valerie Harrison stated that most of the people here today are against this request because of the traffic. They do not want the traffic in the neighborhood and would like to keep the lot as a buffer. However, she feels that this is not a good enough reason to deny the request. She pointed out that traffic would be routed to Altama Avenue and not through the subdivision. Ms. Harrison further stated that the Jaycees lost portions of the lot on two different occasions; 1) when Altama was widened, and 2) when the Spur was built. She is asking for the Planning Commission's approval of this request.

Ms. Mary Lange, adjacent property owner, explained that most of the houses in the neighborhood (including hers) have open back yards with no fences. She's concerned about privacy if an office or some other type of commercial building is constructed on the lot. She stated that she would have no privacy unless she installs a fence at her own expense. She pointed out that there is nothing between her property and Suburban except a county ditch with a 15 ft. easement on each side. Ms. Lange asked that the buffer be defined. She further stated that if the applicants want to get the best use of the land, they should conform to the wishes of the residents in the area and make this a private building. She stressed that she is opposed to this request if the buffer is not defined to the satisfaction of her having privacy in her backyard.

In an attempt to address Ms. Lange's concerns about the buffer, Mr. Stewart stated that the county is working very hard on defining buffers. He pointed out that a buffer could be anything from a mowed strip of grass, to planted, or undisturbed, a wooden fence, a block fence, a chain-linked fence, or a road.

Mr. Horace Shurling of 204 Suburban Drive was present to oppose this request. He stated that the area is already congested and he's concerned about the safety of the children who play in the streets. He stated that approving this request would be detrimental to the neighbors. Mr. Shurling stated that he would like for the property to remain in its current zoning of R-12.

Also present to speak in opposition of this request were Ms. Carolyn Wilkes of 211 Suburban Drive, Mr. C. D. Wilkes of 211 Suburban Drive and Ms. Kelly Knox of 217 Suburban Drive. In addition, several letters of opposition were submitted from homeowners who could not attend today's meeting.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Mike Aspinwall to recommend denial of this request. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained from Voting: Mr. Lamar Cole.

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; the parcel having 179.75 feet of frontage on Walker Road. Property owned by Preston Kunda.

This request was deferred until later in the meeting pending arrival of a representative.

GC-2001-32

Request to rezone from FA Forest Agricultural to PD-R Planned Development Residential, 11.017 acres, described as a rectangular-shaped lot located on Andy Tostensen Road near the intersection of U.S. Highway 17; the 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 that district is to be developed and reserved for low to medium density residential purposes. This suggests a maximum density of 16 units per acre as compared to a maximum density under current zoning of 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 that could cause excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities and utilities.

- 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 indicated expectation of the commercial and residential growth experienced in this area.

Ms. Julie Chapman gave a brief presentation. However, during the course of discussing the density with regard to the 50 ft. right-of-way, Ms. Chapman stated that she would like to request a deferral until the density is worked out. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this request for 30 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Aspinwall and unanimously adopted.

It was noted that there was still no one in attendance to represent Agenda Item #6, **Application GC-2001-31**. Several residents were present to speak in opposition of this request and complained that they had missed work to be here. Chairman Cole explained that without the applicant or his agent being present, this item could not be discussed. Therefore, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to defer this item until next month. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted. Chairman Cole advised that in an effort to accommodate the residents, this item would be placed first on the agenda for the December 4th Planning Commission meeting.

At this time, the Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 11:00 a.m.

Kirkywood Estates (Variance Request)

88 Acre Tract, Located on Blythe Island
 Zoned R-20
 J D & D Properties, Inc., Owner/Developer

Mrs. Marie Thomas and Mr. Ernie Johns were present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting a variance in accordance with Article IX, Section 901 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. The variance that is being requested is from the design standards in Article VI, Section 602.2g, which requires that dead end streets not exceed 1200 ft. The center of the cul-de-sac at Daniel Trace to the nearest thru street in this instance is Georgia Highway 303. Staff consistently recommends denial of any dead end street in excess of subdivision design standards. Additionally, staff questions whether the potential exists of connecting Daniel Trace to Blythe Island Drive. Two apparent possibilities exist either from the parcel shown on page 1 and identified as being now or formerly Keen, et.al., or from the access point behind lot number 26. Staff's detailed comments were included in the packages and are on file. Also on file is a letter from the Department of Transportation recommending approval of this request provided no access breaks be allowed to serve the property along State Route 303.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff is recommending denial of the variance and the preliminary plat due to outstanding issues.

Mr. Hart had questions pertaining to the dead end street definition. Mr. Sutton stated that according to the ordinance, it is indicated that a dead end street is from the center of the cul-de-sac to the nearest thru street. The nearest thru street in this case is Highway 303. There was further discussion about this definition. Mr. Sutton stated that staff agrees that the definition of a dead end street needs to be clarified. In the mean time, he pointed out that staff's recommendation for denial is based on the thru street, which he stated once again is Highway 303. Mrs. Marie Thomas stated that the problem in this case is where her house is located and where staff is saying the road needs to come out, which would be right through the middle of her house. She explained that she owns 22 acres, most of which is cypress swamp.

Mr. Stewart asked if wetlands delineation had been done. Mr. Johns replied no, not on this particular portion of the property. Mr. Stewart had questions about the intersection. Mr. Glenn Bolinger, Traffic Safety, stated that it should not be less than an 80-degree angle. Measuring perpendicular off of Highway 303, the intersection appears to be 55 or 58 degrees. He stated that he's concerned about site distance with regard to safety. The state normally prefers that it be closer to a 90-degree angle. Mr. Johns presented photographs and new drawings, which satisfied Mr. Bolinger's concerns.

Mr. Stewart had questions about the proposed bar pit. He wanted to know if the applicants are planning to dig a lake on the site. Mrs. Thomas stated that the proposed bar pit is the old sedimentation pond of the original bar pit done 30 years ago. She stated that they want to connect them all together. She stated that it's there now and they just want to connect them up. The back bar pit is about 10 to 12 ft. deep. The front bar pit at Highway 303 is deeper.

Mr. Stewart stated that the neighbors do not want any more mining done on Blythe Island and neither does he. He stated that they are not opposed to the applicants building houses, but they are opposed to the digging, dredging and hauling dirt in and out of the area. Mr. Hart disagreed. He stated that at the meeting when the rezoning was discussed, he felt that the neighbors really did not have a problem with the bar pit, mining or digging the dirt, but they did not want a landfill. Ms. McCormick stated that it was also discussed at that time to not sell the dirt, which would not make this a mining operation. The dirt was going to be used as a buffer along I-95, rather than mining. Mr. Hart concurred. It was noted that a mining operation would not be allowed under the current zoning classification. As an observation, Mr. Jonathan Williams stated that the residents were against the landfill and a mining operation. However, the issue today has nothing to do with either one of those.

Mr. Sutton reminded the members that this is a two-part application requiring two separate votes, with the first being the variance for approval of the dead end street.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to deny the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Discussion continued. For clarification, Mr. Sutton read Article IX of the Subdivision Regulations

under which variances are granted. After discussion, the following vote was taken: Voting Aye (for denial) Mr. Lamar Cole and Mr. Wayne Stewart. Voting Nay (against denial) Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. The motion for denial was defeated. A new motion was made by Mr. Jonathan Williams to approve the variance based on Article IX. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ann McCormick. Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Nay: Mr. Wayne Stewart.

Kirkywood Estates (PP200110051254)

88 Acre Tract, Located on Blythe Island
Zoned R-20
J D & D Properties, Inc., Owner/Developer

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

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the Preliminary Plat of Kirkywood Estates. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

The Village At Glynn Place, Phase III, Tract 1 (PP200110100956)

2.746 Acres, Located on Altama Connector and Altama Avenue
Zoned Planned Development-Shopping
Partridge Green, Inc., Owner/Developer

Staff advised that the above referenced item was deferred by the applicant's agent prior to the meeting.

The Cove (Variance Request)

2 Acre Tract, Located on Demere Road at Thompson
Cove, Zoned R-6 One-Family Residential
Coastal Acquisition & Dev., LLC, Owner/Developer

Mr. Richard Altman was present for discussion.

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

The applicant is requesting a variance in accordance with Article IX, Section 901 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations. The variance is from the design standards in Article VI, specifically Section 602.2b. Staff has asked for clarification on center points of two large oak trees with regard to the location of the entrance and exit intersecting with Demere Road. After discussions with the Traffic Engineer, staff's recommendation is for approval of the variance contingent upon clarification of the location of the two oak trees.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve the variance request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained from Voting: Mr. Mike Aspinwall.

The Cove (PP200110090851)

2 Acre Tract, Located on Demere Road at Thompson Cove, Zoned R-6 One-Family Residential
Coastal Acquisition & Dev., LLC, Owner/Developer

Mr. Frazier stated that staff's recommendation is for approval.

For the record, Mr. Richard Altman pointed out that the name of this subdivision is "Shelter Cove." He stated that the original approval was for the name "The Cove." However, in accordance with the GIS Department, the name had to be changed to avoid confusion with a similar sounding subdivision, "Thompson Cove."

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Wayne Stewart to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hal Hart. Voting Aye: Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick, Mr. Wayne Stewart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Abstained from Voting: Mr. Mike Aspinwall.

Shadow Brooke (SP200110091546v2)

6 Acre Tract, Located on Demere Road, St. Simons Island
Zoned Medium Residential
Buchanan, Celia & Estate of Clyde Knight, Owner/Developer

Mr. Robert Jenkins and Mr. Tom Pruitt were present for discussion.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff's comments include the need for a 50 ft. taper on the exit and a 75 ft. deceleration lane on the entrance, or execute an agreement approved as to form, by the County Attorney, to address potential safety concerns. He pointed out that staff received a Letter of Credit from Mr. Robert Jenkins with stated conditions.

Mr. Frazier stated that staff's recommendation is to approve this site plan in accordance with Section 619.4 c of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance. Also, staff recommends consideration of build-out density along the road in the future, and consideration of the Letter of Credit in the amount of \$25,000.00

Mr. Lee Sutton explained that the preliminary plat for this development was approved with a variance granted to the Average Daily Traffic Count of a maximum of 1000 ADT. Mr. Jenkins met with staff and discussed the possibility of an alternative to putting in the decel lane and the 50 ft. taper. One of the ideas discussed for consideration was a Letter of Credit at the final plat stage of this subdivision. However, the request before the Planning Commission at this time is the site plan. Mr. Sutton stated that all of the issues of concern have been resolved.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Robert Jenkins explained that they were not against putting in the accel/decel lane. He stated that it just could not be done because there was no property on that particular side of the road to accomplish this, and there was no right-of-way that the county owned on that particular side of the road. He stated that it was their belief that the exit that had been designed would be sufficient for the traffic generated by the development. However, after meeting with staff, he did agree to the Letter of Credit if it was determined that the intersection was inadequate for the development.

Mr. Sutton stated that for legal purposes, staff has specified that any Letter of Credit be approved by the County Attorney as to form.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

GC-2001-01D

An Amendment To Change The Zoning Ordinance Of Glynn County, Georgia, Article X, Section 1005.3 To Require The Building Official To Determine Compliance With Section 1005.3 Variance Standards Prior To Acceptance Of A Variance Application, And For Other Purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Segers, along with an "Explanation of Changes."

Following review, 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-2001-01E

An Amendment To Change The Zoning Ordinance Of Glynn County, Georgia, Article VI, Section 607.3 And 607.4, To Allow Interior Structural Alterations To Non-Conforming Uses And For Other Purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Segers, along with an "Explanation of Changes."

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

GC-2001-01F

An Amendment To Change The Zoning Ordinance Of Glynn County, Georgia, Article III, Section 302, To Define Community Development Director And For Other Purposes.

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mrs. Segers.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams and unanimously adopted.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the October 2, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. During the course of discussion, it was noted that at the October 2nd Planning Commission meeting, a Public Hearing was scheduled for October 23rd to discuss the Proposed Addressing Ordinance and Proposed Ordinance Amendments. However, that Public Hearing was cancelled and to date has not been rescheduled. Therefore, Mr. Hart amended his motion to include as part of the record that the October 23rd Public Hearing did not take place. The amendment was accepted and the following vote was taken: Voting Aye: Mr. Mike Aspinwall, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Jonathan Williams. Mr. Wayne Stewart did not attend the October 2nd Planning Commission meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

STAFF ITEMS

a) Adoption of 2002 Meeting Schedule & Deadline Dates

A motion was made by Ms. Ann McCormick to approve the Meeting Schedule and Deadline Dates for the year 2002. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Stewart and unanimously adopted.

The following staff items were included in the packages for informational purposes only:

- b) Review 1999 Report from Ordinance Review Committee**
- c) Proposed Changes to Sub. Regulations from the Fire Department**
- d) Status of Amendment to Section 602.2**
- e) Proposed Changes to Sub. Regulations from Traffic Safety**
- f) Proposed Amendments to Sections 302, 604, 714.4, 722.2, 1104, 1105
1106, 1107 & 1108**

Following review, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to schedule a work session for Thursday, November 15th at 9:00 a.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building to discuss the above items in detail and to subsequently advertise the proposed changes for the December 4th Planning Commission Meeting. Also, staff was asked to provide copies of the 1999 report from the District 2 Ordinance Review Committee.

At this time, Chairman Cole appointed Ms. Ann McCormick and Mr. Hal Hart to the Nominating Committee for the upcoming December Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Glynn County Planning Commission for the year 2002.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.