

# MINUTES

## ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION

**AUGUST 26, 2014 - 6:00 P.M.**

**The Casino Bldg., 530 Beachview Drive, SSI**

-----

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Dow, Chairman  
Paul Sanders, Vice Chairman  
Stan Humphries  
Preston Kirkendall  
Oliver Seabolt

ABSENT: William Lawrence  
Robert Ussery

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director  
Eric Johnson, Planning Manager  
Cayce Dagenhart, Planner II  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Commissioner Dale Provenzano, BOC  
Commissioner Clyde Taylor, BOC  
Alan Ours, County Administrator

-----

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

#### **June 17, 2014 - Regular Meeting**

A motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries to approve the Minutes of the *June 17<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preston Kirkendall. Voting Aye: Messrs. Dow, Humphries, Kirkendall and Sanders. Mr. Seabolt did not attend the June 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting and therefore abstained from voting.

-----

**AGENDA - Additions, Deferrals, Deletions, Postponements**

Mr. Hainley reported that the applicant for *SP2850*, Southern Soul, requested a deferral. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders, seconded by Mr. Oliver Seabolt and unanimously adopted to defer application *SP2850*.

-----

**ZM2878 Sea Palms Fitness Center:** Consider a request to amend the PD Planned Development Text for the Sea Palms Resort, located on the east side of North Windward Drive. The purpose of the request is to reduce the setbacks for the property. Parcel ID: 04-14089. Gamble & Gamble Architects, agent for Sea Palms Resort and Conference Center LLC, owner.

Mr. Michael Gamble was present for discussion.

The staff’s report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Cayce Dagenhart as follows:

The applicant is requesting a reduction in the setback in order to construct a 1,377 sq. ft. fitness center on the property. The Development Text requires the following setbacks:

- 10 ft. from property lines of areas outside of this Planned Development
- 20 ft. from right-of-way or access easement; and
- 0 ft. from other property lines subject to approval by the Planning Commission at the time of site plan approval and subject to approval by the Fire Chief to ensure accessibility to structures for emergency proposes.

The requested text amendment would reduce the setback requirements for club house facilities uses from “20 ft. from right-of-way access easement to 6 ft. from right-of-way easement.”

**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 requested amendment would not change the uses permitted on this property.**

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

**The requested text amendment will not adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.**

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

**The properties that will be affected by the zoning proposal currently have reasonable economic use within their current zoning.**

- 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.

**The proposed text amendment will not cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities or schools**

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

**The proposed request is consistent with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Plan.**

- 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. Dagenhart stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2878** to amend the Planned Development Text for the Sea Palms Resort.

For clarification, Chairman Dow asked if this is a request to reduce the setback from residential. Ms. Dagenhart replied no; this is a request to reduce the setback from the right-of-way access easement only on the clubhouse facilities use; basically, the roadway. She pointed this area out and stated that the clubhouse will be closer to the road than currently allowed. Chairman Dow also had questions about landscaping. Mr. Hainley stated that he believes there will be landscaping but this will be addressed during the site plan review process. For additional clarification, Mr. Michael Gamble pointed out the landscaped area as well as the location of proposed landscaping, and confirmed that landscaping details will be included on the site plan.

There was no one present to oppose this request, and at the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders, seconded by Mr. Stan Humphries and unanimously adopted to recommend approval of application **ZM2878** to amend the Planned Development Text for the Sea Palms Resort.

-----

**ZM2882 The Palmettos at Demere aka The Reserve at Demere:** Consider a request to rezone a parcel from FA Forest Agricultural to PD Planned Development and amend the Development Text for The Palmettos at Demere. The purpose of the request is to incorporate this 0.67-acre parcel into The Palmettos at Demere. Parcel ID: 04-14458. Bill Edenfield, agent for Celia Mitchell Buchanan and W. Eugene Caldwell, Sr., owners.

Messrs. Edenfield, Vassa Cate, Bobby Shupe and Johnathan Roberts were present for discussion.

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

This is a request to rezone the subject parcel from FA to PD and incorporate the land area (0.67 acre) of the subject parcel into the greater planned development of The Palmettos at Demere, including modifying its Development Text. Under the FA zoning district regulations, the anticipated type of residential units (townhouses) and project density and would not be permitted.

The following is a brief timeline of the project known as The Palmettos at Demere Planned Development:

- a) On April 17, 2007, the Islands Planning Commission recommended denial of the original application [ZM-2007-3 (I)], which proposed to rezone 9.663 acres from FA to PD-R. However, on June 7, 2007, the Board of Commissioners approved the application, which ultimately allowed for up to 100 dwelling units. The dwelling units were restricted to two habitable floors. The subject site was shown to be a component of this original application.
  
- b) On March 19, 2013, the Islands Planning Commission recommended approval of a subsequent rezoning application (ZM2574) for the Palmettos at Demere. This application would amend the Development Text by reducing the size of the project from 9.663 to 9.04 acres and the density/maximum allowable number of units (from 100 to 93). Other changes to the Development Text included new regulations pertaining to building and paving setbacks, sidewalks, buffers, and off-street parking. This rezoning application and its corresponding site plan application (SP2573), which was approved by the IPC, excluded the subject site.

At the IPC meeting, it was reported that Parcel 04-14458 was not a part of the legal transaction that occurred as part of the original rezoning application, and that the owners were now requesting the property be rezoned back to FA.

Both the site plan and rezoning application contained the condition that the developer installs a center turn lane after the completion of 26 units. The rezoning application (ZM2574) was unanimously approved at the April 18, 2013 Board of Commissioners meeting, including the IPC's condition regarding the left turn lane.

c) The Glynn County Superior Court ruled that Parcel 04-14458 was to be removed from The Palmettos at Demere PD. As such, on April 16, 2014, the Islands Planning Commission recommended approval of application ZM2587, which would rezone Parcel 04-14458 to its original FA zoning. The Board of Commissioners approved the application on May 16, 2013.

d) The applicant submitted this rezoning application (ZM2882) on July 23, 2014.

**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 zoning and accompanying Development Text would be suitable as it would represent the third phase of The Palmettos at Demere planned development, which currently abuts the subject parcel on three sides.**

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

**The proposed change will allow for townhouses and will not adversely affect the Palmettos at Demere planned development.**

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

**The subject parcel is vacant and may remain as currently zoned; however, the FA district would not allow for townhouses, which are currently being developed around three sides of the property.**

- 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.

**This area is designated for Low Density Residential but it is also within the Corridor Mixed-Use, which generally recommends a mix of commercial, office, and higher density residential uses.**

- 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. Johnson stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2882** to rezone from Forest Agricultural to Planned Development.

Mr. Kirkendall asked if the density would be taken back from 93 to 100 units. Mr. Johnson stated that the density would be increased in this case. The Development Text will indicate the maximum number of units that would be proposed. However, this number is less in accordance with the preliminary plat. Chairman Dow asked if at one time the number of units were either 101 or 103. Mr. Hainley stated that he believes that there were 103 units. However, Mr. Johnson pointed out that the maximum number of units, according to the development text for tonight's purposes, is 101.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Bill Edenfield stated that this is a fairly straight forward application. They are simply annexing 1.67 acres. He stressed that they could live with 100 units if that is more acceptable to the Planning Commission. He stated that the plat shows 97 lots. There is the potential for more units by rearranging the plat. He explained that he took the acreage, times the density, and thought he ended up with 101 units, but he could have been mistaken. He reiterated that they would stay with 100 units if that is more acceptable. Mr. Kirkendall stated that if this was in the original approval by the County Commissioners he just wants to make sure that the number is exactly what the County Commissioners approved when it was all together, which he thought was 100 units. It should not go over that amount.

For clarification, Mr. Vassa Cate stated that he did a land swap with Sea Island Company to have additional setback off the golf course, and in doing so, the square footage was increased, which is why the calculations are off. The whole back property line was redone with Sea Island on the land swap.

Mr. Paul Sanders asked Mr. Cate if he approves of this action which he stated is adding to his development. Mr. Cate replied yes.

At this time, Chairman Dow opened the floor for public comments beginning with Ms. Monica Smith who expressed concerns about stormwater facilities. She stated that she was actually impressed with the construction of the current lake which is going to service the stormwater retention area. However, she is wondering whether or not there will be accommodations for additional units. Mr. Jonathan Roberts of Roberts Civil Engineering stated that he will be overseeing the detailed engineering design, which has not been complete for Phase III. He stated that the footprint of the lake will likely remain the same. They may have to modify the outfall structure but they will have to approve the calculations during the full engineering plan review phase of the project.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed and a motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries to recommend approval of application **ZM2882** to rezone The Palmettos at Demere (aka The Reserve at Demere) from Forest Agricultural to Planned Development. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

**ZM2883 Saint Simons Island Airport:** Consider a request to amend the PD Planned Development for the Saint Simons Airport located on Kings Way, Frederica Road and Demere Road. The purpose of the request is to add and remove some of the allowable uses in the district to make them more compatible with the current uses. Parcel IDs: 04-02922, 04-02803 and 04-02924. Glynn County, applicant and owner.

On behalf of Glynn County, Mr. David Hainley was present for discussion and delivered the following report which was included in the packages for review:

This application proposes to amend the Planned Development Text and Master Plan. The proposed amendment would completely replace the Planned Development Text for the Airport, which includes the McKinnon Saint Simons Island Airport properties. In response to a revised development concept, the proposed McKinnon St. Simons Island Airport PD enables land uses and development standards not currently allowed within the existing PD. The proposed amendment is intended to be a planned mix of airport operations areas, hangars, office, limited commercial, light industrial and governmental land uses. Proposed overall changes are generally as follows:

- In the proposed text, site plan approval would go directly to the Glynn County Airport Commission and then to the Islands Planning Commission.
- Setbacks have been established for each tract.

- The architectural guidelines have been removed from the proposed text.
- “Exterior lighting requirements” refers back to the Zoning Ordinance Article VI, Section 622.
- There are statements in the proposed text about the developer being responsible for the expense involved in all roads, drainage systems, water distribution, wastewater collection systems, parking areas, common open space, buffers, landscaping, site lighting, drainage ponds, signage, and other related infrastructure improvements.
- The development schedule in the proposed text states that the properties will be developed as the market demands and not by an established timetable.
- The proposed text updates the state of development for the parcels.
- Instead of providing detailed requirements for the treatment of trees, the proposed text references the Saint Simons Island Tree Canopy Preservation Ordinance. Proposed Tract A would be exempt from the tree canopy regulations.
- “Hotel” has been added as an allowable use within the district.

**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 subject parcels are located in a highly active commercial, industrial and residential area. The airport will continue to keep the use and development on these properties in harmony with the surrounding area.**

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

**The proposed changes will not adversely affect the existing use or usability of the adjacent property.**

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

**The property has a reasonable economic use as it is 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.

**The proposed text amendment may increase the traffic on the existing streets. The question of whether or not it would cause an excessive burden would need to be evaluated at the site plan stage of the proposed use.**

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

**Yes, the proposed request is consistent with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.**

- Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property, which give supporting grounds for approval or disapproval.

**There are none.**

Mr. Hainley stated that staff recommends approval of application **ZM2883** to amend the Planned Development for the St. Simons Airport.

During discussion, Mr. Hainley pointed out that Tract A is the airport property and Tracts B & C are the support commercial industrial areas that are also part of the airport property. He stated that there was a question raised as to why staff proposed 25 access points on the PD Text which deals with the existing conditions out in the field. He reminded the members that the county rebuilt Airport Road which became known as Demere Road. He then proceeded to point out the existing points of access, minus two that are being proposed. He also pointed out the FBO facility currently located at the airport and some of the commercial developments on Tracts A and B. Continuing, he pointed out Rich Sea Pack, Demere Road and the Fire Department in relation to Tracts A and B. He stated that staff cannot find any record of what is actually approved for the airport property on Tracts A or B and have been using the GC District as a governing guide due to the similarities of the mainland terminal airport support which is zoned GC.

Chairman Dow wanted to know if there is anything in Tract A that is not aeronautical. Mr. Hainley replied yes, there are some uses inside some of the hangers that are not aeronautical. He stated that there are some offices inside some of the hangers that are not related to flying airplanes.

Under permitted uses, Mr. Oliver Seabolt wanted to know if the hotel is being proposed for Tract A. Mr. Hainley replied yes, the hotel is considered as a support facility for the airport. He pointed out that the Tree Ordinance deals with specific retention standards and standards for replacing trees that may not be appropriate for the site based upon FAA rules. Therefore, it would not be applied to this particular area. In

accordance with the Tree Ordinance, Chairman Dow wanted to know what is the most extreme height of trees that could be required. However, Mr. Hainley stated that it is not what size is required, but rather what size the tree grows to, which primarily pertains to the Live Oaks. Chairman Dow feels that there are species of trees that would accomplish a landscaped buffer and stay within or near the height of the hanger, and if FAA accepts the height of the hanger, why would the trees or the hotel be any different. Mr. Hainley stated that Mr. Robert Burr, the Executive Director of the Airport Commission would have to address the difficulties of putting trees on airport property and the FAA rules relative to this issue. He stated that aside from trees we have to consider wildlife; “wildlife and airplanes don’t mix.”

Chairman Dow stressed that there has to be a balance. He stated that the Hampton Inn is 35 ft. but this proposal at 45 ft. will have greater visibility from Frederica Road with no landscaping or tree cover to block it. He stated that this particular section of the Island deserves the same consideration as the Yacht Club entrance in that it impacts the entire Island. The airport is a very integral part of our industry but it should not be done at the expense of doing something spectacular. Since this is Glynn County’s property, he feels that we should be held to a higher standard. Again, he noted that 35 ft. seems to work for the Hampton Inn and the Sea Island Inn.

Mr. Hainley stated that General Commercial on the Island allows 45 ft. If we’re being governed without the lack of a PD Text on the property and General Commercial allows 45 ft. on this property, he feels that this is what the guidance should be for this Planned Development area. He pointed out that there are other areas immediately adjacent to the airport that also allow for the 45 ft. height, i.e. along Kingsway. He stated that the FAA actually has more control over height on this particular site than the Commission does. Chairman Dow wanted to know what the compelling reason is for the 45 ft. Mr. Hainley stated that he received an e-mail from the architect of the project, Mr. Robert Ussery, who expressed a desire to have some flexibility in the floor height and the mechanical areas on top of the building that may pose an issue of the 35 ft. Mr. Hainley reiterated that if staff goes by the guidelines governing this particular property, the height is 45 ft. under the GC zoning. Mr. Kirkendall asked Mr. Hainley if he has anything indicating originally that the height was 45 ft. Mr. Hainley replied no, but staff is using the guidelines of what has historically been developed and how it’s been applied, as well as the other airport with the terminal area being zoned GC.

For clarification in protocol, Mr. Kirkendall asked if Mr. Hainley is acting as agent/applicant as well as staff for Glynn County. Mr. Hainley replied yes.

At this time, Chairman Dow opened the floor for public comments beginning with those speaking in favor of this request. There were none. He then called for opposition and/or those wishing to make comments or ask questions.

Mr. David Allison of 1605 Demere Road wanted to know the location of the proposed hotel. Mr. Hainley stated that the hotel is proposed to be located at the current site of the airports FBO (Fixed Base Operator). Mr. Allison expressed concerns about the

“Boy Scout Hut” and asked if the proposed request would in any way affect this site relative to being opened for development. Mr. Hainley replied yes, under the current PD Text the area in question is subject to the Tree Ordinance. He also explained that the additional entrance at the end of East Beach Causeway is a planned improvement by the Airport Commission to improve circulation within the airport and to provide access to the causeway. (Mr. Allison was helpful in pointing out areas of interest to Ms. Vivian Holmes of 503 Baisden Lane who needed to know the significance of this proposal in relation to her property.)

Mr. Julian Smith of 61 Maxwell Avenue asked if there is a shortage of hotels on the Island, and if so, is this the reason for having a hotel adjacent to the airport. Mr. Hainley stated that there was a request made of staff included in the PD Text. Mr. Smith suggested that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to come back with an amended request or with a stronger argument as to why they need a 45 ft. height hotel other than the fact that the Ordinance allows 45 ft. on the Island.

Mr. Scott Beveridge of Kings Terrace wanted to know if the areas of Tract A, especially the wooded areas near Kings Terrace, would be left open for development or tree loss. Mr. Hainley replied no. The Tree Ordinance is separate from the Buffer Ordinance. The Buffer Ordinance is not being exempted out from this requirement. There are fixed buffer requirements that are part of the standard zoning text. To further clarify Mr. Julian Smith’s concerns, Mr. Hainley stated that there is a pending proposal for a hotel before the Airport Commission that would involve re-doing the airport terminal and building the hotel. There is not a pressing need, but there is a pending proposal.

Ms. Melissa Oswald of 2332 Ocean Road wanted to know if there are any other uses planned in the proposal for Areas B and C. Mr. Hainley replied yes, the Glynn Arts Studio is proposing to be relocated to Area C pending review. Ms. Oswald commented that the area in question is so wide that it makes you wonder about other possibilities of what could be located there. She noted that there is room for caution.

There being no further comments from the public, Chairman Dow closed the public hearing portion of this item. Discussion continued among members of the Planning Commission and staff.

Mr. Seabolt had questions about the FAA jurisdictional line. Using the map in his power point presentation, Mr. Hainley demonstrated the location of the jurisdictional line for clarification.

Mr. Robert Burr, Executive Director of the Airport Commission, stated that FAA has many different standards for many different reasons. The use of the facility is also under their control. Every complex analysis determines whether a structure is a conflict with the airport. As a representative of the Airport Commission, he stated that they are very much in favor of landscaping. He elaborated on the process of bringing a request to be considered by the Airport Commission. Mr. Burr stressed that they want to be a good neighbor and they understand the importance of landscaping which will not be excluded

from the development plans. It would more likely be a requirement of the development plans; however, they still have to follow the rules to make a safe airport. He pointed out that this development will be an improvement for the Island and it will be compatible with the Island.

Chairman Dow stated that two years ago there was a thought of putting a gymnasium within the airport property; however, it was said that it couldn't be done because it would put too many lives in one area, but now we're going to have a hotel. Mr. Hainley pointed out that the location of the gym was proposed for a different area in relation to the runways.

In all due respect to Mr. Burr and the Airport Commission, Mr. Stan Humphries stated that the Airport Commission in the past has been very critical of all business owners and made life very difficult for them. He has personal knowledge of a widow who was given a very difficult time after her husband died. Also, garden clubs have offered to do some landscaping and were told that they couldn't. He stated that when there were discussions of building a recreation facility they were told no because it might put the lives of children at risk. Mr. Humphries stated that the Airport Commission has always invoked the idea that the FAA says you can't do this and you can't do that, which is a very arrogant approach in his opinion. He stated that the Islands Planning Commission is now being asked to approve a hotel, a conference center, restaurants, etc. and it seems to him that the Airport Commission is being hypocritical when all other requests and uses have been turned down due to the FAA.

Mr. Humphries stressed that he has great concerns about the traffic, which has not been addressed relative to tonight's request. He has great concerns about the number of curb cuts that are being proposed and feels that it would make the area a very unattractive place. He also has great concerns about the height. Mr. Humphries stated that his biggest concern is the landscaping. He then read the following into the record:

"The St. Simons Island Airport has a long and memorable history. However, never did the airport operators envision the airport perimeter being one of the main corridors to the magnificent beaches and tourist attractions of the Golden Isles. Yet with the re-routing of Demere Road, that is what it has become. To say that the appearance along the new Demere Road is unattractive is a gross understatement. It certainly is not what our visitors should see on the way to the beach. Now is the time to do something.

"The Islands Planning Commission is being asked to approve the addition of a hotel, restaurant, conference rooms and many other uses to the Airport Planned Development. The Airport Manager has stated that the revenue from these additions will help fund improvements to the airport.

"Behold, a magic moment for the Golden Isles! The Glynn County Commission, the Brunswick-Glynn County Economic Development Authority and the Glynn County Airport Commission are leaders in promoting the Golden Isles, and especially tourism, its primary economic activity. They all want to make the Golden Isles attractive to residents

and visitors. This is a wonderful opportunity for these community leaders to take positive action.

“The Reserve at Demere has a practical buffer and vegetation requirement in its PD Text. The Yacht Club has done a good job with landscaping.

“It is suggested that the Airport PD Text be amended to include similar requirements, adjusted for needs specific to the airport. In addition, particularly unsightly areas such as the car wash, parking lot, and maintenance facilities should be screened from public view.

“Let’s all work together to make the Golden Isles the best place to live, work and play!”

Mr. Humphries stated that more thought needs to go into this request. Chairman Dow agreed with Mr. Humphries. He also commended Mr. Hainley for his creativity and diligence on this item; however, he views tonight’s presentation as the first draft and suggested that all comments and issues pertaining to height, landscaping, curb cuts, traffic, etc. be taken into consideration and re-worked.

Mr. Kirkendall stated that his biggest concern is with the 45 ft. height. He would prefer to have the height set at 35 ft. and then perhaps consider a variance if they actually need the 45 ft. height for the hotel. Mr. Hainley pointed out that the Islands Planning Commission does not have legal power to grant a variance in this case. It would have to be done through a rezoning and without creating a self-imposed hardship.

At this time, Chairman Dow suggested that this item be deferred to allow staff to go through the list of uses and take all comments into consideration. However, before calling for a motion, Chairman Dow asked Mr. Hainley, “Is this a done deal?” to which Mr. Hainley replied “no, I don’t think so.” Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries to defer application **ZM2883** to the next IPC Meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted.

-----

**PP2879 The Reserve at Demere Phase III:** Consider preliminary plat approval for the third phase of The Reserve at Demere (aka The Palmettos at Demere). The property is located on the south side of Demere Road, in the vicinity between Main Street and Brockinton Drive. Parcel IDs: 04-14458 and a portion of 04-05879. Mary Wann, LLC, applicant.

Mr. Bill Edenfield and Mr. Vassa Cate were present for discussion.

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

The proposed preliminary plat represents Phase III of The Reserve at Demere (30 lots). Phase II consisted of 24 lots. Phase I consisted of 43 lots. This phase will eliminate 1 lot in Phase II. Also, this phase, along with the entire development, is subject to the Development Text of **ZM2882**. Phases I and II were approved with a 40 ft. wide right-of-way (in lieu of the required 50 ft.), which the County Engineer determined was sufficient.

The following are preliminary plat requirements (and staff's comments) in accordance with Section 703 of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations - The preliminary plat shall consist of a map or maps, drawn at a scale of not less than one inch, two hundred feet depicting the following:

1. The proposed name of the subdivision and proposed street names shall not duplicate or too closely approximate phonetically the name of other subdivisions or streets in Glynn County. If shown to the contrary, the Planning Commission or Geographic Information System (GIS) office may refuse to accept such subdivision and street names; must indicate whether the streets are to be public or private.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

2. Name, address and telephone number of the owner of record.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

3. Name, address and telephone number of the subdivider.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

4. Date of survey, north point and graphic scale, source of data, date of plat drawing, and space for revision dates.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

5. Preliminary Plat Certificates and Statements.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

6. A vicinity map locating the subdivision in relation to the surrounding area with regard to well-known landmarks such as major streets and thoroughfares, railroad rights-of-way, rivers, streams and other named bodies of water. Vicinity maps may be drawn in freehand and at a scale sufficient to show clearly the information required, but not smaller than one inch to one mile.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

7. Name of former subdivision(s), if any.

**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

8. Exact boundary lines of the tract or parcel to be subdivided, indicated by a heavy line giving length and bearings, and total subdivision land area in acres. The boundary lines shall apply to the entire tract to be subdivided.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
9. Natural features within the proposed subdivision, including drainage channels, bodies of water, flood plain, wetlands and other significant features.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
10. Cultural features within the proposed subdivision, including rights-of-way widths, and names of existing and proposed streets and alleys, existing structures, existing easements, buildings, city and county lines, zoning districts and boundaries, and other significant information.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
11. Proposed layout including lot lines with rough dimensions, lot numbers, block letters, street and alley lines, sites reserved through covenants, dedication or otherwise for public uses.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
12. Location of existing water and sewer utilities, if a connection to these public systems is proposed.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
13. Proposed unit division or stage of development, if any, by the subdivider.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
14. The names of owners of record and zoning of land adjacent to the tract to be subdivided.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
15. FIRM Panel Number and flood zone designation.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**
16. Building setback information per Zoning Ordinance including setback lines on odd shaped lot.  
**Staff Comment: Provided by applicant on plat.**

Mr. Johnson stated that staff recommends approval of a variance of Section 602.4 Design Standards for Paved Streets a) Minimum Right-of-Way Width of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations for **PP2879**, The Reserve at Demere Phase III. Staff also recommends approval of application **PP2879**, The Reserve at Demere Phase III, subject to meeting all requirements during the development process, including all requirements of **ZM2882**, if approved.

Mr. Vassa Cate gave a brief presentation and a general discussion followed. Afterward, a motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall, seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted to approve the variance of Section 602.4 Design Standards for Paved Streets a) Minimum Right-of-Way Width of the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations for **PP2879**, The Reserve at Demere Phase III.

A motion was also made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall, seconded by Mr. Oliver Seabolt and unanimously adopted to approve application **PP2879**, The Reserve at Demere Phase III, subject to meeting all requirements during the development process, including all requirements of **ZM2882**, if approved.

-----

**VP2884 321 Mallery Street:** Consider approval to resurface two signs and replace the asphalt shingle roof with a metal roof on a portion of the building. The building is located at 321 Mallery Street in the Island Preservation District. Parcel ID: 04-04462. Property owned by Clarke Downey & Al Downey.

Mr. Clarke Downey and Mr. Al Downey were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, this property is located at the corner of Ocean Boulevard and Mallery Street. It is one of the properties people first see when getting ready to go into the historic St. Simons Island Village shopping area. The previous business at this location was the *4<sup>th</sup> of May Café*.

The applicant is proposing to resurface the two signs that were previously attached to the building. These signs were/will be wall mounted and are both approximately 7.34 sq. ft. (24 inches by 44 inches). One of the signs will be located on the Mallery Street side of the building and one will be located on the Ocean Boulevard side of the building.

The applicant would like to replace the "stained" asphalt roof with a metal roof, which would be painted hunter green.

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.

The building is not going to be enlarged. The theme of hunter green and cream provides unity and is in keeping with the character of this structure. There are not going to be any violent contrast of materials or use of intense colors. None of the proposed changes will result in a disturbing appearance.

Ms. Dagenhart stated that staff recommends approval of application **VP2884** for property located at 321 Mallery Street.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries, seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders and unanimously adopted to approve application **VP2884** for property located at 321 Mallery Street.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.