

# MINUTES

## ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

JUNE 19, 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  
Paul Sanders  
Desiree Watson

**ABSENT:** William Lawrence

**STAFF PRESENT:** Paul Forgey, Planning Manager  
Iris Scheff, Planner III  
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

Chairman Dow pointed out that the Minutes of the May 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting reflect that Mr. Brumbach, applicant for site plan application **SP2365**, agreed to provide the IPC members with a list of proposed uses that the Airport Authority had decided on. However, this list has not been provided to the members. Chairman Dow asked if staff had received anything from the applicant. Mr. Forgey replied no, but stated that he would get the information and forward it to the members. Chairman Dow directed staff to follow-up on all actions or agreements expressed at meetings to ensure that they are carried out.

#### **May 15, 2012 Regular Meeting**

A motion was then made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve the Minutes of the **May 15<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall and unanimously adopted.

#### **May 22, 2012 Called Meeting**

A correction was made to the spelling of the owner's name in application **ZM2376** (Page 3, Last Paragraph) as follows: **~~Bing~~ Bean**. Afterward, a motion was made by Ms. Patricia Laurens to approve the Minutes of the **May 22<sup>nd</sup> Called Meeting** with the

noted correction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall. Voting Aye: Mr. John Dow, Mr. Stan Humphries, Mr. Preston Kirkendall, Ms. Patricia Laurens and Ms. Desiree Watson. Mr. Sanders did not attend the May 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

-----

**ZM2380 Epworth by the Sea Methodist Center**

Consider a request to amend a PD Planned Development by revising the planned development text for Epworth by the Sea, a 87.9 acre property. The property is generally located west of Sea Island Road and south of Lady Huntingdon Street. The purpose of the rezoning is to allow a columbarium as a permitted use. Parcel IDs: 04-01705, 04-13905, 04-13906. Property owned by Epworth by the Sea.

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

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

In 2008 this property was rezoned to planned development to consolidate the existing and future uses for the Epworth campus. The uses on site include lodging, meeting, administrative, educational, and other various functions. The applicant is proposing to amend the existing text and master plan to add a columbarium as a permitted use on the property for areas “A” and “E” as shown on the master plan.

The site is to be served by public utilities provided by the Joint Water and Sewer Commission.

**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 uses of a church campus.*

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

*The proposed use is to be located away from adjacent properties and/or other uses.*

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

*Yes, but the property is currently being used as a campus for the Methodist Church.*

- 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*

Mr. Forgey stated that staff recommends approval of **ZM2380** to amend the Epworth by the Sea Planned Development to allow a columbarium as a permitted use. He pointed out that the only change in this text is the columbarium.

Mr. Kirkendall had questions about certain criteria being met with respect to what was set in place for a previous columbarium at St. Williams Catholic Church. Mr. Forgey stated that there were no standards put in for height in this PD text. The previous application included a site plan, which allowed you to know exactly where everything would be located in relation to the overall property and the surrounding property. The issue of buffers was also examined.

Mr. Forgey explained that while the height and buffer criteria were included in previous discussions involving the Catholic Church, they are not included in this request. The applicant in this case will have to come back with a site plan as well and the height criteria will be examined at that time, which could possibly be the maximum height of 35 ft. currently allowed in the district. But for now, there would be no regulation on the height unless a standard is put in place by the Planning Commission. Also, because this is a Planned Development next to residential there would be no required buffer, unless stipulated by the commission members as well. Ms. Watson pointed out that the height in the previous request was 15 ft. inclusive of embellishments.

Chairman Dow asked staff if there is a reason why there aren't similar specifications associated with this PD text as there were with the Catholic Church. Mr. Forgey stated that he is not sure. He stated that the applicant would have to address this issue.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Robert Ussery stated that there is a buffer requirement for this entire property regardless of whether it is a columbarium or any other use. Currently in miscellaneous provisions (in accordance with the ordinance) Type A buffer shall be required along the buffer lines adjoining single-family zoning districts. This is for all uses in Epworth, to include a columbarium, which is in excess of what was required for the columbarium at St. Williams Catholic Church.

Regarding the height issue, Mr. Ussery stated that one of the potential sites in this case is the bell tower, which is probably 35 ft. tall and if it is included as part of the columbarium site it would exceed the 15 ft. Mr. Ussery stated that it is a practical site and is very significant to Epworth; therefore, they did not include an additional height restriction.

Chairman Dow asked if there is a limit to the amount of space that could be consumed by a columbarium. Mr. Ussery stated that there was no limit at St. Williams. He stated that at Epworth they have limited it to Areas A and E. Chairman Dow stated that this is not really a concern but Area A has 10 acres and Area E has 11 acres. It may not be practical but there is up to 21 acres that they could use.

Mr. Joel Willis, Director of Epworth by the Sea, elaborated on the use of the prayer tower, and a general discussion followed. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to recommend to the Board of Commissioners approval of **ZM2380** to amend the Epworth by the Sea Planned Development to allow a columbarium as a permitted use in either Area A or E. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall 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. Forgey explained that this is an amendment that the commission members have already seen but there were other changes made based on the county attorney's review that had not been reviewed by the commission. Staff felt that the best thing to do was to incorporate all of the changes and bring the amendment back in its entirety for review.

The amendment shows the proposed additions underlined, and deletions in strike through text. Modifications are also proposed for the amount of time required for compliance.

Mr. Forgey stated that staff recommends approval of text amendment **TA2363**.

Following review, a motion was made by Ms. Patricia Laurens to recommend approval of text amendment **TA2363**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall and unanimously adopted.

-----

**VP2388 - 540 Poplar Avenue**

Consider approval of the demolition of a wood deck and the addition of a 251 sq. ft. living area to an existing home. The property is located on the south side of Poplar Ave., approximately 60 ft. east of its intersection with Neptune Way in the Island Preservation District. The property is zoned VR Village Residential. Parcel ID 04-10623. Ussery-Rule Architects, P.C., agent for Ray and Thea Jarvis, owners.

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the applicant is proposing to demolish an existing porch on the rear of the home to make room for a 251 sq. ft. living-space addition.

Section 709.4 in the Island Preservation District gives the standards for review, as follows:

(a) Construction, or remodeling or enlargement of an existing building in a manner inconsistent with the existing building massing (the three-dimensional bulk of a building: height, width, and depth), articulation (the pattern of the building base, middle and top, created by variations in detailing, color and materials or stepping back or extending forward a portion of the facade) and fenestration (the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building) in the immediate area; or

(b) An absence of unity or coherence in composition which is in opposition to the character of the present structure in the case of repair; or

(c) Violent contrasts of materials or intense colors not representative of the existing buildings in the immediate area; or

(d) A multiplicity or incongruity of details resulting in a disturbing appearance.

Mr. Forgey stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP2388** to allow the demolition of a wood deck and the addition of a 251 sq. ft. living area at 540 Poplar Avenue.

Chairman Dow had questions about setbacks and site coverage as to whether they meet existing requirements, and if not, are they grandfathered in. He also wanted to know if decks are included as part of the site coverage in the existing ordinance.

Mr. Forgey stated that decks are generally included under site coverage. However, he is not sure about the maximum site coverage in this request. He believes that it is possible that it was grandfathered in because the site coverage was changed in the ordinance in the past ten years. He stated that setbacks are enforced and if a structure does not meet the setback requirements, it would have to go through the variance process before it gets to the Planning Commission.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Robert Ussery explained that currently there is a deck which is considered part of the site coverage. The house was built in 1998 and it was compliant at the time of construction. He stressed that the plans did include the deck at the time and it was compliant with the Village Preservation Ordinance at that time. The applicant is simply putting a structure on top of the existing deck, but they are not increasing the site coverage.

Chairman Dow stated that although Mr. Ussery has clarified the site coverage issue for this application, these types of questions will probably have to be addressed at some point for future reference with other applications.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries to approve application **VP2388** to allow the demolition of a wood deck and the addition of a 251 sq. ft. living area at 540 Poplar Avenue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

**VP2394 - 604 May Joe Street**

Consider approval of a freestanding carport/utility room on the east side of an existing single-family dwelling located in the Island Preservation Overlay District. The property is zoned VR, Village Residential. Property owned by Stephen and Melissa Rivers. Parcel ID: 04-04616.

Mr. Stephen Rivers was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the applicant proposes to build a carport/utility room at the rear of the house. The property is located on the corner of May Joe and Oak Streets, and although the address is on May Joe, the front of the house faces Oak Street. Tax records show the house was built in 1945, prior to the enactment of zoning regulations.

The applicant provided a site plan showing the existing footprint of the house and depicts the carport meeting the minimum side and rear setbacks of 7 ft. An elevation of the proposed structure was also submitted.

Section 709.4 in the Island Preservation District gives the standards for review, as follows:

(a) Construction, or remodeling or enlargement of an existing building in a manner inconsistent with the existing building massing (the three-dimensional bulk of a building: height, width, and depth), articulation (the pattern of the building base, middle and top, created by variations in detailing, color and materials or stepping back or extending forward a portion of the facade) and fenestration (the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building) in the immediate area; or

(b) An absence of unity or coherence in composition which is in opposition to the character of the present structure in the case of repair; or

(c) Violent contrasts of materials or intense colors not representative of the existing buildings in the immediate area; or

(d) A multiplicity or incongruity of details resulting in a disturbing appearance.

Materials to be used for the accessory building:

- Metal windows
- Metal doors on the utility room
- 30-year architectural shingles to match house
- Wood-grain fiber cement siding to match house

Mr. Forgey stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP2394** to allow an addition to the east side of an existing single-family dwelling at 604 May Joe Street, SSI, Georgia.

Mr. Kirkendall questioned the site coverage on this particular lot. Mr. Forgey stated that the previous plan was prepared by an architect and was done as a standard practice. This particular plan was prepared either by the homeowner or the contractor. Staff did not request the site coverage calculation because it appears that they have less than 50% coverage.

Chairman Dow stated that in the previous request the site coverage stayed the same, a structure was built, and in that case it was over the 50%. He stated that there was a lot of time spent on the Village Preservation Ordinance/Village Mixed Uses and now applications are coming in and he feels that it is necessary to apply what they spent time developing. Mr. Forgey explained that site coverage is not a requirement of the Village Preservation; it is a zoning requirement as part of construction under the zoning district and it does need to be checked and considered.

Chairman Dow stated perhaps in this case the site coverage does appear to be 50% or less but it is a significant calculation that is not included but needs to be looked at closely. If not, it sends a message that all other subsequent applications should be based on the appearance that they look nice, etc. He stated that he would feel more comfortable

with a deferral in this case until the calculation on the site coverage is revealed. Mr. Paul Sanders suggested an approval contingent upon the site coverage being 50% or less. Chairman Dow agreed.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Stephen Rivers pointed out the amount of open area and the number of oak trees on the property, which he stated is his reason for requesting to add the carport in order to protect his vehicle from the falling limbs. He stated that his property is almost identical to the property across the street. Mr. Rivers stated that with the amount of open space that he has, he is almost positive that the site coverage in this case is at 50%; however, Mr. Kirkendall stated that the Planning Commission needs to know for sure. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve application **VP2394** to allow an addition to the east side of an existing single-family dwelling at 604 May Joe Street, contingent upon meeting the site coverage requirement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stan Humphries and unanimously adopted.

-----

#### **VP2395 - 264 Demere Way**

Consider approval of a remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling located between Demere Road and Oak Street at 624 Demere Way in the Islands Preservation Overlay District. Parcel I.D. 04-09679. Robert C. Ussery of Ussery-Rule Architects, P.C., agent for Kenneth Massaroni and Lori Ziemba, owners.

Mr. Robert Ussery was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the 0.15 acre property is located on the south side of Demere Way. The applicant proposes to remodel and put an addition on the existing Cape Cod style cottage, built in 1995. Total proposed site coverage, including dwelling, at-grade pavers, and other outdoor structures, is 49.9%.

The applicant provided a site plan showing the existing footprint of the house and depicts all improvements meeting the minimum side and rear setbacks of 7 ft. Plans with elevations of the proposed structure were submitted, with color chips.

The proposed remodel and addition meet Glynn County's zoning requirements as to allowed uses, setbacks, and height. The remodel includes the moving, removal or addition of such structures and architectural elements as a dormer, chimney, windows, siding, gable trim, decks, steps, fences, rails, outdoor hardscape, porch columns, and the like, on each side of the cottage as depicted in proposed plans (see Exhibit B).

Section 709.4 in the Island Preservation District gives the standards for review, as follows:

(a) Construction, or remodeling or enlargement of an existing building in a manner inconsistent with the existing building massing (the three-dimensional bulk of a building: height, width, and depth), articulation (the pattern of the building base, middle and top, created by variations in detailing, color and materials or stepping back or extending forward a portion of the facade) and fenestration (the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building) in the immediate area; or

(b) An absence of unity or coherence in composition which is in opposition to the character of the present structure in the case of repair; or

(c) Violent contrasts of materials or intense colors not representative of the existing buildings in the immediate area; or

(d) A multiplicity or incongruity of details resulting in a disturbing appearance.

Ms. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP2395** to allow a remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling at 624 Demere Way, SSI, Georgia.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Ussery assured the Planning Commission that the property and the new addition meet the site coverage and setback requirements.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to approve application **VP2395** to allow a remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling at 624 Demere Way, SSI, Georgia. The motion was seconded by Ms. Patricia Laurens and unanimously adopted.

-----

**VP2401 109 Strachan Lane**

Consider request for approval of a reconstruction that will replace two porches, occupying the same footprint as the existing porches, at an existing single-family dwelling located between Georgia and Floyd Streets at 109 Strachan Lane, in the Islands Preservation Overlay District.

Mr. Bert Flexer was present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the 0.14 acre property is located on the north side of Strachan Lane. The applicant proposes to replace two existing rotted porches with porches on masonry foundations to occupy the same footprint as the original porches.

The applicant provided a site plan showing the existing footprint of the house, depicting the minimum side and rear setbacks of 7 ft. and the front setback of 20 ft. The side porch on the north side of the dwelling is within the building envelope. However, the porch fronting the Strachan Lane cul-de-sac encroaches into the front setback in

accordance with Jackson Surveying, Inc., Lot 8, Butler Mews. This encroachment was granted a variance by the Zoning Board of Appeals in May of 1999.

Plans with elevations of the proposed structure were submitted, with color chips. The proposed reconstruction meets Glynn County's zoning requirements as to allowed uses, and height, but one porch does and one porch does not meet setbacks.

Section 709.4 in the Island Preservation District gives the standards for review, as follows:

(a) Construction, or remodeling or enlargement of an existing building in a manner inconsistent with the existing building massing (the three-dimensional bulk of a building: height, width, and depth), articulation (the pattern of the building base, middle and top, created by variations in detailing, color and materials or stepping back or extending forward a portion of the facade) and fenestration (the arrangement, proportioning, and design of windows and doors in a building) in the immediate area; or

(b) An absence of unity or coherence in composition which is in opposition to the character of the present structure in the case of repair; or

(c) Violent contrasts of materials or intense colors not representative of the existing buildings in the immediate area; or

(d) A multiplicity or incongruity of details resulting in a disturbing appearance.

Ms. Scheff stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP2401** to allow a reconstruction of two porches at an existing single-family dwelling located at 109 Strachan Lane, SSI, Georgia.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall to approve application **VP2401** to allow a reconstruction of two porches at an existing single-family dwelling located at 109 Strachan Lane, SSI, Georgia. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.