

# MINUTES

## ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 15, 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  
Iris Scheff, Planner III  
Eric Landon, Planner II  
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

#### April 17, 2012 Regular Meeting

Upon a motion made by Ms. Desiree Watson and seconded by Mr. Stan Humphries, the Minutes of the *April 17<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting* were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

#### ZM2376 Yacht Club Tract, Revised

Consider a request to rezone from Planned Development Zoning District, to Planned Development Zoning District by revising the planned development text for Yacht Club Tract, a 15.442 acre property. The Yacht Club Tract is located along the eastern bank of the Frederica River, just south of the F.J. Torres Causeway on St. Simons Island. The purpose of the rezoning is to allow for a less dense development option. Parcel IDs: 04-15788 and 04-15821. Bill Edenfield, agent for C.T. Graham, Yacht Club, LLC.

Mr. Bill Edenfield was present for discussion. Mr. Vassa Cate was also present to answer questions.

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

In 2008 the Yacht Club Tract PD was created consisting of 15.442 acres. This application is a request to allow single family detached residential development, which was not formerly listed among the allowed residential uses. It also incorporates standards within the district for lot sizes and the subdivision of lots, establishes planting standards for potential hotel and commercial uses, and describes allowed signage.

The proposed permitted uses include a mixture of residential, mixed commercial, hotel and marina uses. The maximum number of dwelling units for this PD is capped at 110. This proposal for mixed uses is consistent with other nearby and adjacent development. Allowing single family detached dwellings to be developed would result in a lower density than the existing PD allows. It is not known at this time what final balance or composition of uses will be developed.

This site is to be served by public utilities provided by JWSC. Engineering will review at the site development phase for Yacht Club Tract.

Access will be from Torres Causeway, as it was for the existing approved Planned Development. If developed with 110 dwelling units, this project could generate 1,100 average daily trips (10 trips per dwelling unit x 110 units).

If built to maximum density for residential units, this development could generate up to 60 school aged children (110 dwelling units x 0.54 per unit).

Overall, no potential life safety or fire protection issues were identified for this rezoning proposal at this time. Specific issues may be identified at time of development.

**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:**

- 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 use is consistent with the recently approved Yacht Club Tract PD from 2008.*

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

*None*

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

*Yes, but the proposed change will give the applicant flexibility in the development of the project to allow single family lots.*

- 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.

*None*

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

*Yes, this area is designated for Low Density Residential which is consistent with the proposed use.*

- 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*

Ms. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of **ZM2378**, to rezone from the current Planned Development to a revised Planned Development of the property consisting of 15.442 acres, amending the text to add the single family detached residential use and other criteria for 15.442 acres of property known as “Yacht Club Tract” fronting on the Torres Causeway.

As part of his presentation, Mr. Edenfield distributed information containing the existing entitlements, two separate proposed alternatives and an in-depth summary of the proposed amendments. Acknowledging that the IPC members were seeing this information for the first time, Mr. Edenfield stated that he would not have a problem if they decide to defer this item to allow more time for review.

Chairman Dow stated that there is some concern, particularly from Mr. Humphries, about who the owner of this property is. He stated that he is also concerned about who the owner is. Mr. Edenfield stated that he and Mr. Vassa Cate, who is a native of this area, are working on this project together. He stated that there is an investment group from Texas and Atlanta who is behind this project but he does not know their names. Mr. Edenfield stated that he actually wrote the text that is being amended. With his documented experience and that of Mr. Cate’s, he is confident that as this project unfolds the community will be quite pleased. The owners have entrusted him and Mr. Cate with the quality of this development.

Continuing, Mr. Edenfield suggested that if the single-family residential option is taken fully, he sees it as a significant improvement over the alternative, which is already in place. He feels that the presence of roof tops and trees is more attractive than large buildings, despite how beautifully detailed they might be.

Chairman Dow asked if any of the principals involved in this project have prior experience developing on St. Simons. Mr. Edenfield replied no, not to his knowledge.

Mr. Humphries stated that he would like to know who the developer is. Mr. Vassa Cate stated that he and Mr. Edenfield represent the owners of this property. He then gave a brief overview of his family history and their many contributions to the area. Mr. Cate stated that he and Mr. Edenfield are the designers and they take great pride in their work. They intend to help the owners achieve the highest quality of their efforts, just as they have done for over 20 years for Sea Island, Frederica and others.

Regarding their quality of work, Ms. Desiree Watson pointed out to Mr. Cate that they have exempted the single-family residential uses from the architectural review standards. Mr. Edenfield stated that there is a reason for that exemption. He explained that going before the Planning Commission for a single-family residential building permit for all 40 units seems a little unusual, but they could do that. He was thinking however that it would not be required at the Planning Commission level, but certainly the developer will have its own architectural review process, as all high quality residential developments have on St. Simons, Sea Island, Frederica, Kings Point, etc.

For clarification, Ms. Watson stated that she was not referring to Item 5 of the summary handout. She is concerned about Item 8, which indicates that they would “exempt traditional single-family residential uses from the existing 2008 PD Planning Standards and Architectural Review Standards, but retain those standards for all other uses.” Mr. Edenfield explained that the 2008 document has standards that were created for quality control. They were standards that simply said if you’re going to build a big architectural structure make it look similar and attractive. The Planning Commission was vested with a right to control that aspect.

In looking at the alternative approach, Mr. Edenfield stated that it doesn’t make a lot of practical sense to have houses subject to the same review at the same process. He stated that it seems more practical to rely on the market place. Ms. Watson stated that she doesn’t have any problems with the architectural review standards being taken away from the IPC, but what she doesn’t want to see is that there are no construction standards in place, other than state law. Mr. Edenfield stated that the forthcoming subdivision will include the preliminary plat process. Ms. Watson stated that she simply wants a means to protect this particular area with the same high quality of review as other areas. Mr. Edenfield stated that it is a declarant driven process. He stressed that they would include the same high quality of standards, but it would be done through the declaration.

Mr. Kirkendall had concerns about the number of units that would be allowed on 7,000 sq. ft. lots. He specifically expressed concerns about the concept or the idea of

swapping units for units as opposed to what is actually written in the text. Mr. Edenfield stated that Mr. Kirkendall's concerns are valid and this could all be adjusted in the language. He stated that they could amend the text to address these issues and resubmit the request for review and approval.

Ms. Watson had additional concerns about traffic. She stated that if this property is approved for single-family there would be over 1100 additional trips per day in an area that has only one access point. She stated that perhaps some consideration could be given to having larger lots with less density. For the record, Mr. Hainley stated that this proposal would only generate 400 additional trips if it were all single-family. The 1100 daily trips were based on 110 dwelling units.

At this time, Chairman Dow asked if there were any public comments or questions, to which there were none.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders and seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to defer application **ZM2376** to a Special Called Meeting of the IPC scheduled for Tuesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup> beginning at 9:00 a.m., Room 108 of the Casino Building. However, discussion continued.

Mr. Humphries was adamant about knowing who the owner of the property is and his qualifications. Mr. Kirkendall stated that in his opinion, knowing who owns the property is not within the Planning Commission's purview. Mr. Humphries disagreed. Mr. Kirkendall stated that it doesn't matter who the owner is; he has to follow the written text. Requests are not approved or denied based on who owns the property. Chairman Dow asked Mr. Hainley to provide a response at the May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting as to whether or not the owner can legally be disclosed. Mr. Hainley stated that he would have to agree with Mr. Humphries in this case. He stated that the owner has to be able to demonstrate the ability to do the project in accordance with the PD Text and in a timely manner. He believes that this particular district gives the Planning Commission the right to inquire about the owner. Chairman Dow asked Mr. Hainley to confer with the developer and report back at the May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting for additional clarification on this issue.

At the end of discussion, the motion for deferral was unanimously adopted.

-----

**SP2365 Brumbach Development**

Consider a request to approve a site plan for the construction of two office/retail buildings with a total of 11,332 sq. ft. for property consisting of 1.52 acres. The property is located on the east side of Airport Road approximately 200 ft. north of its intersection with Gary Moore Court. This request also includes a variance from the parking paving requirements. The property is zoned PD Planned Development. Parcel ID: 04-02922. Brad Brumbach, applicant, Glynn County Airport Commission, owner.

Mr. Brumbach was present for discussion.

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

This site plan is a proposed office/retail development, which is consistent with the surrounding land uses of the area. The proposal is compliant with the requirements of the adopted Planned Development.

The site will be served by JWSC utilities.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance the Planning Commission review shall be guided by the following standards and criteria:

- 1) The application, site plan, and other submitted information contain all the items required under this Section. ***Staff comment: This requirement has been met.***
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. ***Staff comment: This requirement has been met.***
- 3) Adequate provisions are made for ingress and egress, off-street parking, loading, and the flow of traffic, which may reasonably be anticipated. ***Staff comment: This requirement has been met.***
- 4) Adequate provisions are made to control the flow of storm water from and across the site. ***Staff comment: This requirement has been met, subject to review by Engineering as part of the review of the building permit.***
- 5) Adequate provisions are made to protect trees that are selected to remain as depicted on the site plan. ***Staff comment: There are multiple trees on the northern and southern boundary to be retained. This site requires 12 tree canopy credits. The trees to be retained provide 21 credits.***
- 6) Adequate provisions are made to buffer intensive uses and to screen all service areas from view of the adjacent properties and streets. ***Staff comment: The applicant is required to provide a type "A" buffer where adjacent to residential zoning and a type "E" buffer adjacent to the Airport Road right-of-way.***
- 7) Adequate provisions are made to control the location, intensity, and direction of all outdoor lighting so that it will not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties. ***Staff comment: This requirement has been met.***
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. ***Staff comment: Not applicable.***

- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. *Staff comment: Fire and JWSC have determined this site plan compliant.*

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of **SP2365**, Brumbach Development Site Plan, including a variance to Section 611 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a portion of the parking lot to be gravel, subject to meeting all requirements.

It was pointed out that the Airport Commission actually owns the property. Mr. Brad Brumbach is the applicant/developer representing the Airport Commission. Mr. Jonathan Roberts of Roberts Civil Engineering is representing Mr. Brumbach.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Roberts explained that Mr. Brumbach has entered into a 30-year lease agreement with the Airport and if he were to sell, the new owner would have to meet with the Airport Commission and the Islands Planning Commission to propose any changes. Mr. Roberts also explained that the gate, as noted on the plans, is a decorative barrier that isolates the paved parking from the gravel area. The gravel allows them to cut back on the retention pond.

Chairman Dow wanted to know if the entire area would be retail or would part of it be used for a construction office and equipment. Mr. Brumbach stated that the larger building is already being leased to Golden Isles Martial Arts Academy, so it won't be retail. They will however, have an afterschool program. The smaller building has three units approximately 1500 sq. ft. each. He stated that he has a list of proposed uses that the Airport Authority has agreed to. They will allow office retail but there will be no restaurants. Mr. Brumbach stated that he would provide the list to the IPC members for review. He explained that if the Golden Isles Martial Arts Academy leaves after their five-year lease is up, the area could be converted to retail space, which is why they have allocated the parking spaces that they need. He further stated that the gate, referenced by Mr. Roberts, will also provide protection for the afterschool program and security at night for employees parking in the back.

There was continued discussion about the proposed uses that are included in the PD Text, architecture, landscaping, etc. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to approve **SP2365**, Brumbach Development Site Plan, including a variance to Section 611 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a portion of the parking lot to be gravel, subject to meeting all requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.