

MINUTES

ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

APRIL 17, 2012 - 6:00 P.M.

The Casino Bldg, 530 Beachview Drive, SSI

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Dow, Chairman
Stan Humphries, Vice Chairman
Preston Kirkendall
Patricia Laurens
William Lawrence
Paul Sanders
Desiree Watson

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
Paul Forgey, Planning Manager
Janet Loving, Administrative Assistant

Chairman Dow 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.

MINUTES

March 20, 2012 Regular Meeting

Upon a motion made by Mr. Paul Sanders and seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall, the Minutes of the *March 20th Regular Meeting* were approved and unanimously adopted.

TA2363

An amendment to Article VIII Sections 805.1,(o), 808.1 (e), 809 (d) 1 (i), 810.2, 811.2, 811.7 and 812 to provide for clarification of prohibited signs, additional standards for banners and outdoor advertising signs, allowable signs in Neighborhood Commercial districts and Village Mixed Use districts, modification of compliance time for violations, and for other purposes.

Mr. David Hainley, applicant/agent, presented the following report from staff:

The proposed changes to Section VIII of the Zoning Ordinance are largely for the purpose of clarification of Glynn County's sign regulations. Modifications are also proposed for the amount of time required for compliance. The "Explanation of Changes,"

which was also included in the packages, shows proposed additions underlined and deletions in strike through text.

Staff's recommendation is for approval of Text Amendment **TA2363**, Article VIII of the Glynn County sign regulations.

During a brief discussion, Ms. Desiree Watson asked if there is a reason why the title and subsequent sentence listed for *Section 811.7* (Lines 253, 254, 255) in the "Explanation of Changes" was omitted from the text of Line 97, *Section 811.7*. Mr. Hainley stated that the title and text of Line 97 was inadvertently omitted and should be included.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Desiree Watson to recommend approval of Text Amendment **TA2363**, Article VIII of the Glynn County sign regulations subject to the title and subsequent sentence of *Section 811.7* Lines 253, 254 and 255 under "Explanation of Changes" being included to the text of Line 97. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

For the record, a motion was made by Ms. Desiree Watson, seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted to change the title within the text of the next agenda item to Dog Day School (as oppose to day care).

CUP2366 Dog Day School

Consider a request for a conditional use permit for an animal boarding facility under Section 712.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is located to the west of Frederica Road at 133 Center Street. The purpose of the conditional use permit is to allow a ~~day care~~ **dog day school** and training facility for dogs with no overnight accommodations. Parcel ID: 04-05160. Thomas Stark, agent for Edward Collins, owner.

Mr. Thomas Stark was present for discussion.

The following report from staff was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Forgey:

This is a request to utilize an existing concrete block commercial building as a facility for keeping and training dogs. The applicant intends to keep approximately 30 dogs during the day only as well as provide training classes. All animals will be kept inside - there will be no outside pens.

The site will be served by public utilities provided by Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Water & Sewer Commission.

Access is from Frederica Road by way of Sylvan Boulevard or Palm Street. It is estimated that there will be no significant additional traffic trips generated based on no change of general commercial use.

In conformance with Section 1103 of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact are to be considered in making a decision on a request for rezoning, special use permit, or a conditional use permit:

- 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 conditional use is not substantially different from the allowed uses in a General Commercial zone. The purpose of the Conditional Use permit is to determine if the specific use meets the conditions outlined in the zoning ordinance. Section 712.3 4) allows as a conditional use “Animal hospital and/or boarding facility provided all boarding arrangements are maintained within a building and no noise connected with the operation of the facility is perceptible beyond the premises.”

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

Provided noise and sanitation are controlled, the proposal would not create an adverse environment for adjacent or nearby property.

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

Yes, it has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

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

While the proposed conditional use will generate some additional traffic to the area, permitted General Commercial uses would generate similar increases.

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

Yes, this is consistent with Village Center uses by providing services to neighborhood residents and businesses.

- 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 property proposed for this conditional use is located in the center of largely non-retail commercial development that contains a mix of office uses. Most of the properties are constructed of concrete block which will help minimize sound transmission, although there is not much separation between adjacent buildings.

Mr. Forgey stated that staff recommends that **CUP2366** be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

Ms. Desiree Watson asked if there would be any parking issues associated with this proposal. Mr. Forgey replied no, due to the proposed being mostly a drop-off facility. Ms. Watson also had questions about sanitation. Mr. Forgey stated that as reported, the site is served by public utilities, but he believes that the applicant has additional information on how they intend to handle the sanitation.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Thomas Stark stated that he contacted sanitation companies via e-mail to inquire about the specifics of sanitation issues, i.e. special pick-ups or daily pick-ups. He was also advised that triple bagging is one possibility. He pointed out that there won't be any hosing out of the building and no seeping into the building. Everything will be taken care of immediately in an effort to avoid sanitation problems.

Chairman Dow wanted to know how many dogs could be accommodated at one time. Mr. Stark stated that in a 2500 sq. ft. building he could accommodate up to 45 dogs at the most. He estimates being able to house 15 to 20 small dogs and about 15 large dogs.

Ms. Patricia Laurens asked if the dogs would be walked outside or inside of the facility. Mr. Stark stated that the dogs would be walked inside. He pointed out that there is a small green space area in the back for bathroom breaks for the dogs, and he has also looked into acquiring portable septic facilities for dogs. Mr. Stark stated that there is a 10 ft. cement wall on both sides of the building and there are no windows; noting that the dogs will not be able to climb out of the building and noise will not be a factor. The hours of operation will be from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. with no overnight accommodations. Also, Saturday and Sunday will be for training only.

Ms. Watson pointed out to Mr. Stark that the staff's report indicates that there would be approximately 30 dogs. Mr. Stark stated that depending on the size of the smaller dogs, he could have a maximum of 45 dogs. To avoid any discrepancies or future conflicts with the amount of dogs being housed, Ms. Watson stated that she would prefer language that states "approximately 45 dogs."

There was no one present to oppose this request.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve ***CUP2366 Dog Day School***, allowing approximately 45 dogs. The motion was seconded by Mr. William Lawrence and unanimously adopted.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:24 p.m.