

MINUTES

MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 3, 2012 - 6:00 P.M.

Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Brunson, Chairman
Buddy Hutchinson, Vice-Chairman
Liane Brock
Buck Crosby
Larissa Harris

ABSENT: Terry Carter
Tim Murphy

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director
Eric Landon, Planner II
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Alan Ours, County Administrator

Chairman Brunson called the meeting to order and the invocation was given, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

June 5, 2012 - Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to approve the Minutes of the *June 5th Regular Meeting*. The motion was seconded by Ms. Liane Brock. Voting Aye: Ms. Liane Brock, Mr. Bill Brunson, Ms. Larissa Harris and Mr. Buddy Hutchinson. Mr. Crosby did not attend the June 5th Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

At this time, Chairman Brunson gave a brief recap of the rules, voting procedure and audience participation in discussing agenda items.

SP2398 - Gateway Center Retail

Consider a request to approve a site plan for the construction of a 7,750 sq. ft. retail building and a gas island/canopy on a 1.54 acre parcel. The property is located on the southwest corner of Glynco Parkway and Canal Road. Parcel ID: 03-15749. Peter Patel, applicant for Kushal Properties, LLC, owner.

Mr. Don Hutchinson was present for discussion.

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

This request is to construct a retail shopping development including a gas station. This site plan was approved by the MPC in 2009, but has since expired. The applicant has returned with the project. The project includes a five (5) unit building with a convenience store, gas pumps, and four (4) other retail units. Utilities to be provided by the Joint Water & Sewer Commission.

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: This site has been previously cleared.*
- 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's property is adjacent to similar zoning/uses to the rear. It has direct frontage on right-of-way on the other three sides. In this case a type "E" buffer is required as specified in Section 613 of the Zoning Ordinance.*

- 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: This requirement will be met during the building permit process.*

Mr. Landon stated that staff recommends that application **SP2398** be approved subject to meeting all requirements.

Following a brief presentation by Mr. Don Hutchinson, a motion was made by Mr. Buck Crosby, seconded by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson and unanimously adopted to approve application **SP2398** subject to meeting all requirements.

TA2363 - Text Amendment

Consider 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, representing Glynn County, explained that this item is a slightly different version of the previous proposal and is being presented as a unified text amendment. (*Proposed additional text is underlined; deleted text is depicted by strike-through lines.*)

Mr. Hainley stated that the Islands Planning Commission recommended approval of this amendment at their June 19th regular meeting. Staff also recommends approval.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson, seconded by Ms. Liane Brock and unanimously adopted to recommend approval of Text Amendment **TA2363** to the Glynn County Board of Commissioners.

In other business, the Planning Commission members took issue with a site plan previously approved at their April 3rd meeting for the new Glynn County Detention Center (*SP2345*).

Chairman Brunson stated that the site plan indicates that egress and ingress would be on Sulphur Springs Road; however, had he known that GA Pacific had severe safety issues with traffic and is therefore against it he would not have voted to approve this site plan. He pointed out that GA Pacific has a multi-million dollar payroll, they provide more than 600 jobs and they have donated a substantial amount of money to local organizations; however, none of this is relevant. What is relevant is the fact that GA Pacific has an issue with the access road from a safety standpoint and they have made this an issue in the Brunswick News.

Chairman Brunson stated that there appears to have been a lack of communication or miscommunication with GA Pacific and they should have been at the meeting when this site plan was presented. He stated that the Planning Commission cannot make good decisions without good information. GA Pacific is no “litigation lightweight,” and they will turn around and file a suit against Glynn County. He reiterated that he would not have voted to approve this site plan had he been made aware that there was a problem.

Chairman Brunson stated that GA Pacific had requested that the access point be moved at least 500 to 600 ft. north of Sulphur Springs Road. He then asked staff if the county would consider relocating the access. Mr. Hainley stated that he will do what the County Commission directs him to do. He pointed out however that GA Pacific’s request was not part of the county’s original site plan application.

Other members of the Planning Commission expressed the same concerns as Chairman Brunson. Mr. Crosby feels that it is a little disrespectful to the people who sit on this board to not have vital information that would allow them to make sound decisions on behalf of the county, and having this information after the fact is more like a “slap in the face.” Mr. Hutchinson stated that several meetings have been conducted with county officials and Mr. Randal Morris of GA Pacific where apparently issues of concerns were discussed, and if others in the county knew there was a problem, they should have informed this board. Mr. Hutchinson stated that not having this information has put the Planning Commission in a bad light for approving a plan that contains a problem that the members knew nothing about.

Mr. Hainley explained that staff has assured GA Pacific that as part of the master plan for the entire site they would look at the access points. He stated that as part of the report, the Planning Commission received comments from an experienced PE Traffic Engineer who has found no problems with the access point and has recommended utilizing Sulphur Springs Road.

Mr. Hainley stated that there have not been any accidents added on Sulphur Springs Road. Southern Road, which is the proposed access road, has had accidents added. Speed has been a major concern and has recently been evaluated and found to be

the same at both access points. He stated that the difference in truck generation and traffic generation has been reviewed relative to the jail being at full occupancy and it is two-tenths of 1% maximum change, assuming that all peak a.m. traffic comes to the site.

Mr. Hainley stressed that he does not purport to represent any side with regard to negative representation and he cannot speak on behalf of GA Pacific's inability to be in attendance. He stated that staff has addressed issues expressed by GA Pacific earlier and continuously throughout this process; one of which was a commitment to not have the primary access point off of Highway 341 or Ross Road. Instead, there will be a secondary access provided off of Ross Road. There was also a ramp added to the TIA (Transportation Investment Act) projects at the request of GA Pacific.

Mr. Hainley pointed out that staff has secured letters from the Georgia Department of Transportation analyzing the two sites that were under consideration. The letters state that there are no issues from DOT's standpoint as long as they access from the side street.

Mr. Hainley explained that the Planning Commission would have gotten a perception from GA Pacific if they had been at the meeting and they would have then gotten the technical data from staff during discussion, but "if you're not here to testify and/or offer written evidence, then the testimony is not entered into the record," which then becomes a technical problem.

Mr. Hainley stressed that he could not have represented GA Pacific. In fact, it would be more dangerous, particularly if he were to misrepresent their position. Chairman Brunson agreed. He stated that staff should not invoke anything for GA Pacific. They should have been here. He has no issue with that, but he does have an issue with all of the empirical data that is coming forth. Again, he stated that the fact that GA Pacific has a 60 million dollar payroll is irrelevant, but what is relevant is the fact that we live in a litigious society and once GA Pacific pointed out in print that they have a safety issue, then it becomes "1-800- lawyer."

Ms. Liane Brock stated that she doesn't want to blame anyone but she understands the Chairman's concerns. She pointed out however that since the county owns the land and the project has not begun perhaps it could be redesigned. In fact, according to a copy of an e-mail that the members received, it appears that it has already been directed to be redesigned and maybe there will be a new site plan submitted for approval. Mr. Hainley reiterated that he would do what the County Commissioners direct him to do.

Chairman Brunson asked Mr. Ours if he would like to comment on this issue, to which he replied no. However, he did state that he understands both sides.

There was no further discussion on this subject and no other business was brought forth. Therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.
