

# MINUTES

## MAINLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

MARCH 5, 2013 - 6:00 P.M.

Historic Courthouse, 701 G Street

-----

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Brunson, Chairman  
Buddy Hutchinson, Vice-Chairman  
Thomas Boland, Sr.  
Larissa Harris  
Tim Murphy  
Eddie Wildsmith  
John Williams

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

-----

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

-----

### MINUTES

#### February 5, 2013 - Regular Meeting

Upon a motion made by Mr. Eddie Wildsmith and seconded by Mr. Tom Boland, the Minutes of the *February 5<sup>th</sup>* Regular Meeting were approved and unanimously adopted.

-----

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

-----

**ZM2567 Solid Rock Holdings:** Consider a request to amend a Planned Development for a 2 acre property near the northeast corner of Highway 99 and Spur 25. The request is to develop a multi-family project. Parcel ID: 03-23455. Property owned by Solid Rock Holdings, LLC.

Mr. Larry Bryson and Mr. Peter Schoenauer were present for discussion.

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

Under the current zoning of this property this location is designated for “Commercial-Retail” as described in the existing PD text and master plan. The proposed request is to amend the text to allow a multi-family development on a two acre parcel near the northeast intersection of Highway 99 and Spur 25. Specifically, the request is for a 32 unit apartment complex. The proposed density is 16 units per acre.

The primary issue for engineering will be drainage of the site; however, other comments and issues will be addressed when this parcel begins the development process. Also, this project will be served with JWSC utilities.

**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 request is consistent with surrounding development, which includes various multi-family developments (Odyssey Lake, The Villas).**

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

**The proposed change is consistent with the proposed land development pattern of the area as a multi-use corridor.**

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

**Yes, the existing zoning allows this location to be used as commercial space.**

- 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, with the condition that this project is developed in accordance with applicable regulations.**

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

**Yes, this property is identified as Village Center on the Future Land Use Map.**

- 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. Landon stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2567** to amend a Planned Development for a 2 acre property near the northeast corner of Highway 99 and Spur 25.

Mr. Peter Schoenauer of Tide Water Engineering gave a brief presentation and a general discussion followed. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to recommend approval of application **ZM2567** to amend a Planned Development for a 2 acre property near the northeast corner of Highway 99 and Spur 25. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Murphy and unanimously adopted.

-----

### **IPC Action on Staff's Presentation**

Mr. Hainley stated that by a vote of 5 to 2, the Islands Planning Commission elected to change the format of staff's presentation, specifically, eliminating staff's recommendation and recommended motion. At the end of staff's presentation, in lieu of a recommendation, staff would state that if the Planning Commission chooses to approve or act upon a request there would be three alternatives that may or may not reflect what the actual motion would be.

The Islands Planning Commission recommended the following: "Should the Planning Commission approve the proposed application it may consider the following conditions...The report and presentation shall also contain the following: A statement that all applicable requirements for the requested action have been satisfied; and a range of suggested possible motions for approval, disapproval and deferral."

Chairman Brunson stated that the Planning Commission Members are not professional planners and they have to rely on staff who he feels is very competent. He stressed that he has great confidence in county staff. Chairman Brunson pointed out that the Planning Commission doesn't always agree with staff but he feels very comfortable with staff listing a recommendation, and whether they agree or disagree with staff, each member votes his own conscience. Mr. Hutchinson concurred and added that he likes the current process and doesn't see a need to change it.

Ms. Harris stated that staff's recommendation helps to move the process along. She asked Mr. Hainley what would be the next step if they vote not to change this process. Mr. Hainley stated that a work session would be scheduled with both Planning Commissions for additional discussion. He pointed out however that if there is an impasse, staff will only do one report. In other words, staff will present the same format to both commissions.

Mr. Boland wanted to know what would staff gain by this proposed change. Mr. Hainley stated that it would actually be less work for staff. When staff receives an application, what the Planning Commission sees is the part of the application after staff has filtered through to make the necessary findings for review.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Buddy Hutchinson to not change the format of the staff's presentation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Eddie Wildsmith and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Tim Murphy wanted to know what prompted the decision to change the format. Mr. Hainley stated that the Islands Planning Commission cited a previous request which involved giving away 40 acres of a public park. The IPC felt that it was not staff's intention to give away the 40 acres but because all requirements had been satisfied, staff's recommendation was for approval.

Mr. Hainley stated that all members will be notified when a date is set for the work session.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.