

# MINUTES

## ISLANDS PLANNING COMMISSION NOVEMBER 18, 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  
William Lawrence  
Robert Ussery

ABSENT: Oliver Seabolt

STAFF PRESENT: David Hainley, Community Development Director  
Eric Johnson, Planning Manager  
Paul Andrews, County Engineer  
Janet Loving, Admin/Recording Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Commissioner Dale Provenzano, BOC  
Commissioner Clyde Taylor, BOC

-----

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

#### **October 21, 2014 Regular Meeting**

A motion was made by Mr. William Lawrence to approve the Minutes of the *October 21<sup>st</sup> Regular Meeting*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders. Voting Aye: Messrs. John Dow, William Lawrence, Paul Sanders and Robert Ussery. Abstained: Mr. Stan Humphries and Mr. Preston Kirkendall.

-----

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

A motion was made by Mr. Preston Kirkendall and seconded by Mr. William Lawrence to change the order of the agenda and consider site plan application **SP2929** first. Voting Aye: Messrs. John Dow, Stan Humphries, Preston Kirkendall, William Lawrence and Paul Sanders. As agent for the applicant in this case, Mr. Robert Ussery recused himself and abstained from voting.

-----

**SP2929 McKinnon St. Simons Airport Hotel:** Consider site plan approval to construct a terminal building, a three-story hotel building, and an auto detailing shed on 4.879 acres. The property is zoned Planned Development (McKinnon St. Simons Airport). Parcel ID: 04-02922. Robert Ussery with Ussery-Rule Architects, P.C., agent for Glynn County, owner.

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

The subject site, which is owned by Glynn County, represents a small portion of a large parcel known as the Planned Development for McKinnon Saint Simons Island Airport. According to the Master Plan, the site is predominately located in Tract A with only a small portion located in Tract B. The Islands Planning Commission recently recommended approval of a rezoning application (ZM2883) that updated the Development Text for the entire PD. In addition to the many changes, the amendment included adding hotels as a permitted use in Tract A. The Board of Commissioners approved the application on October 16, 2014.

In addition to the proposed site plan, the applicant is also requesting a height exception because the top of the parapet wall and elevator would exceed the maximum height allowed in this PD. The elevation drawings show the height of the roof slab at 30 ft., which complies with the Development Text. However, the top of the parapet wall, which is an architectural design element that screens rooftop mechanical equipment as well as the top of elevator, exceeds the maximum building height. These elements are eligible for consideration of a height exception by the Islands Planning Commission as provided for in the Development Text of the PD as follows: “Mechanical equipment located on the rooftop provided the equipment is screened with compatible material or a building component.”

When granting the exception, the Islands Planning Commission shall consider the following factors:

1. Maintenance of aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood;
2. Safety of any structure to be built above the maximum height in case of high winds;

3. The specific need of the property owner for the exception;
4. Availability of alternative means of satisfying the owner's need;
5. Impact on property values in the neighborhood; and
6. Any other adverse impacts on surrounding properties.

Approval of this site plan is contingent upon the approval of the concurrent request for height exception.

Under Section 619.4 (a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission's 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: The application, site plan, and other information submitted by the applicant are generally acceptable and any outstanding issues will be addressed prior to the issuance of a permit.**
- 2) The proposed uses, buildings and structures are in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance and other ordinances of Glynn County. **Staff comment: All proposed uses are permitted in the PD. As previously mentioned, the proposed height of the parapet wall and elevator of the hotel building will require the approval of a height exception. The location of ground signs shall comply with Section 616 of the Zoning Ordinance.**
- 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. The site plan proposes three points of ingress/egress. The adopted Enlarged Access Plan limits the total number of vehicular access points along Demere Road to 25 curb cuts. This subject site was approved with four curb cuts as per the Enlarged Access Plan, so this project would eliminate one vehicular access point, which is promoted by the Development Text.**
- 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 approval by the Engineering Division as part of 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 requirement has been met.**
- 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: This requirement has been met. Type "E" Buffers shall be provided along Demere Road where applicable. Also, a Type "D" Buffer will surround all dumpsters.**

- 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: The site is required to be compliant with exterior lighting standards at all times. A note on the site plan indicates that “outdoor lighting will be arranged in a manner which will protect the roadway and neighboring properties from direct glare of hazardous interference of any kind and will comply with Section 622 of the Zoning Ordinance.”**
- 8) Open space, as required, has been provided and appropriate means are proposed to assure maintenance of common areas and facilities. **Staff comment: The Development Text allows a maximum of 60% site coverage for the entire PD. The site plan proposes 160,323 sq. ft. which is 75.4% of the subject site. The applicant estimates however that the site is “well under 60% for the district” based on examination of aerial photography.**
- 9) Adequate provisions are made for water supply, fire protection, and sewage collection and treatment. **Staff comment: The Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Water & Sewer Commission and the Fire Department have approved this project.**

Mr. Johnson pointed out that staff believes that all site plan requirements have been met and that any outstanding issues can be addressed at the time of permitting. Pursuant to Section 619.4(b) of the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission shall take the following action:

- 1) Approve the site plan as presented;
- 2) Approve the site plan with conditions. In approving a site plan the Planning Commission may impose conditions and restrictions so long as the intent of the Zoning Ordinance is carried out and the zoning district regulations established herein are not varied so as to make them less restrictive. If the Planning Commission so acts, then it shall specifically state those requirements which must be met before an applicant may be granted final site plan approval and a building permit. The applicant shall submit a site plan revised in accordance with the decision of the Planning Commission to the Community Development Department for approval before a building permit can be granted. The Community Development Director may elect to resubmit the plan to the Planning Commission for final approval;
- 3) Defer action. When there are concerns about approval of a site plan, action may be deferred; or
- 4) Deny Approval. Approval of the site plan may be denied based upon findings that the proposed plan fails to comply with the requirements for approval. There shall be no waiting period required for submittal of a new site plan after a site plan has been denied, however it shall be considered a new application and shall be submitted with all required information and fees.

Chairman Dow asked for an explanation of a Type “E” Buffer as outlined in Item 6 of staff’s comments. Mr. Hainley stated that the Type “E” Buffer is considered as a 3 ft. hedge with interspersed and medium size trees along the parking area.

Mr. Humphries wanted to know if any traffic counts had been done and the impact that traffic would have on Demere Road relative to this proposal. Mr. Hainley stated that a traffic count was not done. Part of the Trip Generation is from an airplane. He stated that there are no particular concerns on this issue due to the capacity of Demere Road.

At this time, Chairman Dow reminded everyone that Mr. Bill Edenfield consented to gather resources and provide information on a landscape plan for a portion of Demere Road. Mr. Edenfield stated that the concept plan has been developed but it has not been reviewed by all participants. He stated that he will attempt to have everything in order for a formal presentation at the December 16<sup>th</sup> IPC Meeting.

As agent for Glynn County and planner for this site plan, Mr. Robert Ussery introduced the development team associated with this project as follows: Mr. Ken O’Keefe and Mr. Alan McCall of Mississippi Management, Mr. Danny Bounds with Bounds & Gillespie Architects of Memphis, and Mr. Johnathan Roberts of Roberts Civil Engineering. Mr. Ussery stated that they are available to answer questions.

Chairman Dow had questions about the height of the elevator; however, Mr. Humphries interjected and stated that with all due respect, he objects to Mr. Ussery giving a presentation on behalf of the applicant because he has recused himself which means that he is not supposed to address this issue as part of this meeting. For clarification, Mr. Ussery stated that he merely introduced the development team who is available to make the presentation. He stated that any questions pertaining to the hotel should be referred to Mr. Bounds.

Mr. Danny Bounds, architect for the hotel portion of this project, stated that he is available to answer questions. Chairman Dow wanted to know the height of the elevator in relation to the elevation of the parapet. Mr. Bounds stated that the parapet is at 35 ft. and the end of the building that Chairman Dow is referring to is 7 ft. higher. Chairman Dow wanted to know if it is 7 ft. higher because of the elevator. Mr. Bounds replied no, not entirely. He stated that the elevator is approximately the same height of the parapet but part of the structure is a decorative signature element from the hotel franchisee which is used as part of their identity motif described as a “beacon.”

Chairman Dow stated that all developers seem to want a little more for their signage. He stated that this entire project has been pretty well vetted and he feels that staff and the developer worked very carefully to come up with something that’s pleasing and consistent with the overall requirements of the Island. He further stated that he won’t buy into a site plan that has a height greater than what this Commission has already discussed and approved and that is to conceal mechanical equipment. Mr. Bounds stated that he understands and he agrees. He stated that they can certainly work around it

because they do not want to jeopardize any of the hard work that has gone into this project; he will take care of it.

Mr. Kirkendall stated that he has three questions pertaining to this project. His first question concerns the loading zone. He asked if the applicants intend to have 40 ft. loading trucks because he just doesn't believe that the loading zone that has been designed could handle this size truck. Mr. Bounds stated that there won't be any problems with the loading zone because this particular hotel type would not require anything larger than a small box truck.

Mr. Kirkendall's second question was concerning the parking. He wanted to know if the total amount of parking throughout the entire area is being used because it appears that they are using some parking in other places as well as around the terminal to meet the parking qualifications. Mr. Bounds replied that this is correct. He explained that the "L" shaped parking lot is dedicated for the hotel and there will be additional parking out front that the hotel will share.

Finally, Mr. Kirkendall's last question pertains to site coverage. He asked if it is correct that the site coverage is 74% for the area with the entire area being less than 50% which includes all of the runways and open areas. Mr. Bounds stated that he does not understand the question. Mr. Ussery asked Chairman Dow if he could assist Mr. Bounds with this question, which prompted Mr. Kirkendall to exclaim that he does not agree with Mr. Humphries on Mr. Ussery not being allowed to make a presentation. Mr. Humphries pointed out that when you recuse yourself you are recused from discussion and from all participation of the action. Mr. Kirkendall disagreed and stated that Mr. Ussery recused himself from voting. Mr. Hainley stated that perhaps staff could answer the site coverage question. Chairman Dow clarified that the answer doesn't necessarily have to come from Mr. Ussery; however, he stressed that in order to remain focused on the issue at hand, he respectfully asked Mr. Ussery to honor Mr. Humphries request.

Mr. Kirkendall reiterated that according to the text, Area A has a site coverage limitation of 50% which includes all of the runways and all of the open space. The site plan shows 74% site coverage for the proposed location of the hotel and the terminal. Mr. Kirkendall stated that if he is reading this correctly, it appears that the applicant is ok with the 50% as long as Area A is maintained to include the added space, etc. Mr. Bounds deferred to Mr. Johnathan Roberts who stated that the airport as a whole is meeting the 50% requirement.

Mr. Kirkendall wanted to know if they are clear on the height issue if the applicant can meet everything within the 35 ft. However, Mr. Hainley clarified that the drawings indicate 36 ft. which should be cited in the motion. Mr. Bounds explained that the 35 ft. is from the finished floor elevation to the top of the parapet, but it is actually 1 ft. additional height from the finished floor (*or from the grade*) down to the ground. He understands that the height is measured from the ground to the top, for a total of 36 ft.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Stan Humphries to approve application **SP2929** subject to approval of the accompanying request for height limitation exception of 36 ft. and meeting all requirements during the development process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paul Sanders. Voting Aye: Messrs. John Dow, Stan Humphries, Preston Kirkendall, William Lawrence and Paul Sanders. Recused/Abstained: Mr. Robert Ussery.

-----

**PP2933 Mariners Landing:** Consider preliminary plat approval for a 125 lot subdivision. The 15.037 acre parcel is located at the northwest intersection of Hamilton Road and Sea Island Road. Parcel ID: 04-01708. Gascoigne, LLC, applicant and owner.

Mr. Bobby Shupe and Mr. Vassa Cate were present for discussion.

According to the staff's report, the applicant is proposing 125 lots for one-family attached dwellings. The smallest lot would be at least 2,034 sq. ft., which complies with the RR Zoning District. The north and east sides of the project would contain buffers due to a buffer restriction agreement dated April 30, 2007. One point of ingress/egress is proposed on Hamilton Drive.

Staff has concerns regarding the traffic that would be generated by this development and requested the applicant provide a traffic study. The Traffic Impact Analysis was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

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.**

As previously indicated, staff has concerns regarding the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) as follows:

- TIA assumes 15% of units would be vacation homes. Staff believes the modeling should be conducted on the worst-case scenario, or the 15% needs to be substantiated.
- The existing/future delays of vehicles when turning left (northbound) on Sea Island Road from Hamilton Road.
- Bottom Line: The Hamilton Road approach to Sea Island Road is anticipated to experience significant delays with or without the project.
- Alternatives include 1) restrictions regarding eastbound left turns during peak hours; 2) the addition of turn lanes; 3) the installation of a signal; or 4) the reconstruction of the intersection to a roundabout.

With construction of the new residences, staff suggests the following: construct a right turn bay on eastbound Hamilton Road with approximately 150 ft. of storage. After construction of the new residences, monitor Hamilton Road approach to Sea Island Road to determine if eastbound left turn restrictions are needed during peak hours.

Mr. Johnson stated that staff believes that the submitted preliminary plat meets all ordinance requirements, and as such, the following are four possible motions for the Planning Commission to consider:

- Approve the proposed preliminary plat as presented; or
- Approve the proposed preliminary plat with conditions; or
- Defer action on the proposed preliminary plat; or
- Deny approval of the proposed preliminary plat.

Chairman Dow wanted to know if the statement indicating that 15% of the units are considered to be vacation homes suggests that 85% are permanent homes. Mr. Johnson replied yes.

Mr. Sanders asked when was the property zoned to Resort Residential (RR). Mr. Hainley stated that the property was rezoned to RR at least 10 years ago. However, Mr. Ussery stated that it was most likely rezoned 20 years ago.

Mr. Humphries asked for an explanation regarding the footnote on the plat which states that “this property *may be* subject to a buffer restriction agreement dated 1997.” Mr. Hainley stated that in the deed there is a restriction that sets forth a 60 ft. buffer along Sea Island Road and a 30 ft. buffer adjacent to Epworth and they are shown on the plat as being buffers. He stated that it is a private issue that is not imposed by the county as part of the zoning condition.

During a brief presentation, Mr. Bobby Shupe, surveyor, stated that he prepared this preliminary plat and to the best of his knowledge, it is in compliance with the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, he is soliciting the Planning Commission’s approval at this time. Mr. Shupe stated that several of the consultants are also in attendance to answer questions.

A large number of Island residents were present to oppose this request and in anticipation of this opposition, Chairman Dow explained that the zoning of this property supersedes everyone in attendance. He made it very clear that the time to speak out in opposition on zoning issues is when Zoning Ordinances are being amended. In this case, the Planning Commission is reviewing a request based on whether it complies with the current zoning. In retrospect, he stated that what is being done tonight is something that should have been done when the Resort Residential zoning was adopted. He stated that personally, his job is not to write laws or interpret his own laws. His job is to follow the law and he intends to pass judgment based on the application of the law. Chairman Dow encouraged everyone to attend meetings and work sessions that are scheduled to review and amend the Zoning Ordinance. He reiterated that the zoning in this case already exists and the item before the Planning Commission at this time is a preliminary plat.

Chairman Dow stated that this proposed development is not the only one impacting the intersection in question. He then named several existing developments that are already in place. He pointed out that the developer has submitted a traffic study with this request in which the consultant has identified several things that need to be done. He then asked to what extent and when is the developer prepared to engage in authorizing the improvements to be made and at whose expense. Mr. Shupe stated that after the preliminary plat is approved they will then go through an engineering design phase and the design for the roads within the development. The design of any alterations that are necessary for Sea Island Road and Hamilton Road would be part of those plans. He stated that if there are any requirements or an agreement by the developer to do improvements, he would suggest that it be done during the construction plan phase of the project.

At this time, the developer, Mr. Vassa Cate, gave a brief history of the property dating back 130 years when his family moved to the area. He stated that this property has been zoned with the existing density for at least 20 years (16 units per acre) and nothing has changed. He stated that he's proposing something at 10 units per acre; it meets the bedroom requirement of the new RR zoning that was just established by fewer than 25 units of density. Mr. Cate stated that he understands that the intersection will be taxed, it's not wide enough, the boat trailers come through and the hospital is there. He stated that he has hired a traffic engineer who is available to answer questions and he pointed out that he has increased the percentages of full time residences to 85% which increases the traffic count. Mr. Cate stated that he has traffic improvements estimated at approximately \$175,000.00, which he is willing to front the cost of but would like some participation from the county, and from the hospital.

Chairman Dow wanted to know if there is a means or if the county could create a mechanism for all of the landowners who would benefit by the proposed improvements to participate in the cost. Mr. Hainley stated that there may be a couple of mechanisms but it would have to be approved by the Board of Commissioners. He stated however that under the Laws of Georgia, the Hospital Authority cannot be made to get a building permit. He does not know if they would be willing to front any money for improvements because they don't have a plan for development for their tract.

Mr. Ussery asked for a clarification on the density. Mr. Shupe explained that the property is 15.037 acres. To arrive at net you have to remove the right-of-way of the road, which is 2.574 acres, leaving a net area of 12.463 acres, multiplied by 16, which is what the zoning allows, the property would be allowed to have 199 units. Presently, 125 units are being proposed, which would be 10.0 units per acre. Mr. Shupe pointed out that the other item that they have to look at is bedrooms. Mr. Ussery interjected for clarification and stated that currently, the Resort Residential (RR) zoning does not recognize units per acre anymore; it is all bedrooms. Continuing, Mr. Shupe stated that the RR standard is 35 bedrooms per acre and if you take the net acreage, 12.463, that would allow 436 total sleeping units, divided by 3 per building, this property would allow 145 three-bedroom buildings on the site; noting that the applicant is only proposing 125.

Mr. Humphries wanted to know the principals of Gascoigne, LLC. Mr. Cate replied that the principal is Vassa Cate and he currently owns the property which he purchased from St. Louis Bank and Trust.

Mr. Sanders wanted to know if a traffic signal is being recommended at the intersection of Hamilton Road and Sea Island Road. Mr. Doyle Kelly of Thomas & Hutton Engineers replied no. Mr. Sanders commended Mr. Kelly for the extensive work that they have done and he stated that Thomas & Hutton has a good name; however, he disagrees. He thinks that there should be a traffic signal at the intersection and stated that the county should pay for it.

Mr. Lawrence wanted to know if we are currently operating at Level C in that particular area. Mr. Kelly stated that Level of Service C is the Demere/Sea Island intersection and the other intersection is Level F. Mr. Lawrence asked if the Level of Service would remain at C with the increase. Mr. Kelly replied yes, Demere/Sea Island intersection will remain at Level C. He stated that Hamilton/Sea Island is not Level Service C; it remains at Level F. With the proposed improvements (turn lanes on Hamilton) the delays at the intersection is significantly cut in half. Mr. Humphries stated that he cannot imagine the proposed number of units not creating a traffic jam and he therefore agrees with Mr. Sanders. Mr. Lawrence stressed that traffic will be inconceivable.

Regarding recommendations from the consultant on the traffic issues, Chairman Dow wanted to know who's responsible for making the final decision, and how is the decision made whether you limit left turns during peak hours or if you add lanes. Mr. Paul Andrews, Glynn County Engineer, stated that the final recommendation would come from county staff. He pointed out that Thomas & Hutton has extensive experience in traffic modeling and they prepare plans in accordance with National Standards. He stated that staff relies on their design consultants for county projects as well as privately sponsored projects. The consultants take into account the factors that are normally taken into account and provide solutions that are appropriate, which is what they've done in this case.

Although this agenda item is not a public hearing item, Chairman Dow stated that it is customary to allow public comments; however, he reminded everyone of the rules of selecting a spokesperson, groups being asked to raise their hands or stand to be recognized, etc. He also asked that they not be repetitive. The floor was then opened for public comments beginning with Ms. Dottie Fielder, spokesperson for approximately 20 residents in attendance. Ms. Fielder, President of Casino Garden Club, stated that they are extremely concerned about this project going in at this rate due to traffic and the amount of people moving in near them. She doesn't understand how the owner of the property can guarantee that 85% of the buyers are going to be permanent residents. Instead, she anticipates that they are going to be tourist. She stated that just because the RR zoning allows a certain density, there is no need to demand the density. In fact, she feels that the Planning Commission should demand that it be less density. Ms. Fielder stated that she and the adjacent residents are opposed to this request and they are asking that it be denied.

Mr. Claude Hollis of Hamilton Landing wanted to know when Mr. Cate purchased the property. Chairman Dow advised that Mr. Cate would respond after the speakers. Mr. Hollis stated that he is opposed to this request due to traffic, which he stated would be a nightmare. He also expressed concerns about the traffic consultants who are not Island residents and therefore don't have to live with this traffic. Mr. Hollis stated that it is not our objective to completely fill up all of the land on St. Simons and Sea Island, and he emphatically asked that this request be denied.

At this time, Chairman Dow clarified that about three years ago there were numerous public hearings and work sessions on amending and rewriting the RR Zoning District but there were no residents in attendance. He personally fought hard to make it more restrictive, but he felt like “it was a one-man battle.” He explained that what’s permitted is what they are governed by, which is why it is so important for residents to attend the public hearings and work sessions.

The next person to speak in opposition representing approximately 35 residents was Mr. Cesar Rodriguez of 4218 2nd Street, East Beach. His primary contention was also the additional traffic that would be generated by this proposal, and he reminded the Planning Commission of the area vision of the Comprehensive Plan, which he feels is not being followed.

Ms. Monica Smith, Island resident, distributed a six page document outlining opposition to this request and asked that the entire document be posted as a matter of record. She then read the first three paragraphs as follows:

“Addressing the deficits in the staff review, as well as the preliminary plat itself, is going to take some time. If the Island Planning Commission insists on imposing the five minute limit for one citizen's comments, I am going to insist that the whole statement be admitted to the official record of this public hearing.

“If, as your planning staff asserts, this preliminary plat being presented on behalf of Gascoigne LLC complies with all ordinance provisions, then the ordinances are woefully deficient. I don't happen to think that's the problem. Which is why I have prepared a handout featuring an enlargement of the notes on the plat, along with commentary as to inaccuracy of the information provided and the information left out, and included a page of illustrations from a similar project, the Reserve at Demere, which has been experiencing problems during the development and building process that we can anticipate being replicated at Mariners Landing, if the process isn't changed and improved.

“My asking that these comments be included in the official record of this public hearing is not a matter of convenience. Rather, if my concerns are not addressed and, at some future point in time, they turn out to have been valid, then, should an aggrieved property owner have reason, he will be able to hold the county liable for the negligent performance of its duties, even as I, a property owner and tax payer, will have to provide some portion of whatever compensation such an injured party is due, and rightly so because we all share in the obligation to provide for the public health and safety.”

Mr. James Holland, former Riverkeeper, was present to speak in opposition and stressed that “this request defies logic and common sense.” He urged the Planning Commission to pay more attention to stormwater and drainage issues.

At this time, Chairman Dow called on Mr. Vassa Cate to answer a question raised by Mr. Claude Hollis who wanted to know when Mr. Cate purchased the property. Mr. Cate replied that he purchased the property two years ago.

There were no other public comments. Chairman Dow stated that the two most significant issues would be 1) who pays for the traffic improvements; and 2) when will the traffic improvements be made. He stated however that this should be incorporated as part of the motion. He then asked Mr. Cate about his commitment to pay \$175,000.00 toward the improvements. Mr. Cate stated that “it is our commitment before this process to hire a traffic engineer, which we did and paid for; it is our commitment to put in his recommended solution to the problem on our nickel.” Chairman Dow asked Mr. Cate if he agrees to have his statement included in the motion, to which he replied yes.

At the end of discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Paul Sanders to approve application **PP2933** subject to meeting all requirements during the development process and contingent upon the implementation of the suggestions proposed in the Traffic Impact Analysis. The motion was seconded by Mr. Robert Ussery. Discussion continued.

Mr. Stan Humphries stated that he does not believe the traffic count in this case; it doesn't make any sense to him, but even more, in accordance with the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan “in-fill development and redevelopment shall preserve the character and scale of existing neighborhoods.” Mr. Humphries stressed that this proposal in no way does that. It is so totally out of scale with everything surrounding it. It doesn't make sense, it is not appropriate for this neighborhood and therefore, he is opposed to this motion.

Mr. Preston Kirkendall stated that he has lived in this area since 1964 and he would love for the Island to be as it was then; however, many of the current residents would not have a house, especially on the north end. He stated that he looked at a 1922 map and he would have loved to live on the Island at that time as well when there was no bridge. If property today was zoned with one acre lots, St. Simons would be a much nicer Island, but it didn't happen that way. Mr. Kirkendall stated that we have people who want to move here; all of us moved here and we love it here, but we can't pull the bridge up and not let others in. The property in question has been zoned RR for a long time and the applicants aren't putting in as many structures as they could. He stressed that we need to come up with solutions to the road issues as opposed to defeating everything. In his opinion and according to the regulations, this request meets all of the requirements of the zoning. He stated that the Planning Commission has to have a reason for denying a request that would stand up in court, and he does not have a reason to deny this request that would stand up in court.

There being no further discussion, the following vote was taken on the motion (to approve application **PP2933**...) Voting Aye: Mr. John Dow, Mr. Preston Kirkendall, Mr. Paul Sanders and Mr. Robert Ussery. Voting Nay: Mr. Stan Humphries and Mr. William Lawrence. The motion carried for approval. Chairman Dow urged the residents to “get ahead of the train” and attend the public hearings when ordinance amendments and regulations are being proposed.

In other business pertaining to staff's presentation, Chairman Dow stated that when the IPC members receive the staff's report, he doesn't want staff to submit a recommendation advising the members to vote for or against an item. Instead, he would prefer that staff advise whether or not the application as submitted satisfies all current zoning requirements and exceptions. Mr. Kirkendall wanted to know if staff is still required to submit a recommendation to the Glynn County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Hainley replied yes. Mr. Kirkendall then asked Mr. Hainley if staff is allowed to disclose its recommendation if asked by a member of the Planning Commission. Mr. Hainley replied yes.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.