

**MINUTES**  
**GLYNN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**SEPTEMBER 7, 1999 9:00 A.M.**

-----

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Altman, Chairman  
Lamar Cole, Vice Chairman  
Pat Browning  
Hal Hart  
Iris Touw  
Jonathan Williams  
Perry Fields (arrived late)

STAFF PRESENT: Chuck Taylor, Director  
Cindy Olness, Planning Official  
Lee Thomasson, Planner II  
Ellis Carter, Building Official  
Jim Bruner, County Engineer  
Janet Loving, Administrative Secretary

-----

Chairman Richard Altman 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.

-----

In order to avoid a conflict of interest, Chairman Richard Altman stepped down and turn the following item over to Vice Chairman Lamar Cole

**GC-19-99**

**Request to rezone from R-9 One-Family Residential and R-20 One-Family Residential to R-12 One-Family Residential, 7.1387 acres known as the proposed Doerflinger's Creek Subdivision located on the south side of Blythe Island Highway across from Ellis Point Subdivision.**

**Property owned by Danny Highsmith and Roy McRorie**

Mr. Danny Highsmith was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

A portion of the subject property was rezoned from Limited Industrial to R-20 One-Family Residential in 1998. The subject property is currently being developed as Doerflinger's Creek Subdivision. The Planning Commission granted preliminary plat to the residential subdivision for the development of 23 single-family residential lots. A portion of the subdivision is currently zoned R-20, having lots platted with a minimum lot width of 100 ft. and a minimum of 20,000 sq. ft. The remainder of the subdivision is zoned R-9 and platted with minimum lot widths of 90 ft. and a minimum of 12,000 sq. ft. lots.

Since obtaining preliminary plat approval, the applicant has received approval from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources to construct a 6 inch Miocene Well to serve the development. According to the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations, if a central water system can be provided, lots can have a minimum lot width of 90 ft. and a minimum lot area of 12,000 sq. ft. if the zoning is permissive. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a rezoning of the entire subdivision to R-12 One-Family Residential, which would allow for the development to meet the standards.

If the rezoning request is approved, the proposed subdivision could consist of 27 residential lots, which would be an additional three residential lots from the currently approved preliminary plat.

In conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- ◆ Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Yes, the property is already zoned to allow residential. The zoning change would allow for the development of an additional three residential lots.

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

No, the adjacent properties are zoned residential with the exception of a tract of land zoned industrial that is located immediately to the east.

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

Yes, could be developed as residential in accordance with the preliminary plat that has been approved with 23 lots.

- ◆ 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;

No, three additional residential lots/residential homes would have a minor impact.

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

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan map indicates this property as low-density residential.

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

Yes, the approval from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources for the Miocene Well to serve 27 residential lots.

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Mr. M. W. Hatfield, property owner, requested that Watson Circle be removed from the tract in that most of the five residents on that circle are senior citizens. He stated that if a storm or disaster were to occur there would be no way to get relief or aid into Watson Circle.

Ms. Olness pointed out that if the application is approved and the applicant decides to increase the number of lots to 27, the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Commission for preliminary plat approval again. At that time, staff could demand that an access be put in place or that it be dedicated to the right-of-way. Whichever seems more appropriate.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Pat Browning to recommend approval of this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw. However, Mr. Hart asked that the motion be amended to include a stipulation that Watson Circle is to remain open. The amendment was accepted and the motion was unanimously adopted as follows: Voting Aye: Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

-----

**Chairman Richard Altman reclaimed his seat.**

**GC-24-99**

**Request to amend Planned Development 17-97 Zoning Text for Brampton Commercial Park, subject property consists of 7.77 acres located on the south side of Highway 17, beginning approximately 490 ft. west of Royal Oaks Subdivision entrance.**

**Property owned by Robert C. Bryant**

Mr. John Hunkele, Jr., agent, and Mr. Bryant were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

This request is to amend 17-97 Planned Development Zoning Text for Brampton Commercial Park. On June 5, 1997 when the subject property was rezoned and the Planned Development Zoning Text was approved, the Commission placed three (3) special conditions on the approval. The condition under consideration to be changed today is condition #1, which states that the Planned Development Zoning Text be amended to state that the frontage road will be constructed to meet the county requirements, but not be dedicated to the county. Ms. Olness pointed out that the Planned Development amendment being requested today is to eliminate that condition. The PD Zoning Text is proposed to be changed by amending dedication to the public as follows:

“Frontage road will be constructed to meet **or exceed** the county requirements, and will ~~but not~~ be dedicated to the county. All interior roads and circulation will be private with access easements given to the county for sanitation, police and fire protection.”

On March 2, 1999, the Planning Commission approved a preliminary plat for Brampton Commercial Park. The plat showed two rights-of-way; one being a frontage road parallel with U. S, Highway 17 and two driveways from said highway.

It was stated at the meeting that the roads would be private as outlined in the PD Zoning Text. The owner, Robert Bryant, asked what is the standard practice for commercial roads being dedicated to the county. Jim Bruner, County Engineer, explained that the taxpayers of Glynn County should not be strapped with maintaining commercial development roads, which would be his recommendation if a request goes back to the County Commission to request the roads be accepted.

The subject frontage road is located within the Planned Development-General Zoning District and on the adjacent property also owned by the applicant, which is zoned Freeway Commercial.

Mr. John Hunkele, agent for the owner, has talked with Jim Bruner since the March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting to discuss this matter. Mr. Bruner has expressed that he could possibly make a recommendation of support of the request if the frontage road is

constructed to additional standards and supporting documentation regarding the construction is submitted. Staff has also discussed this matter with Mr. Bruner and he has confirmed the statement that was made by Mr. Hunkele.

Ms. Olness stated that originally, staff made a recommendation of denial; however, staff has received new information from Mr. Bruner and at this time, would like to change the recommendation to approval of changing the condition that was placed on the zoning text to the following:

“The frontage road may be dedicated to the county if the design and construction of the rights-of-way are approved by the County Engineer and accepted by the Board of Commissioners.”

Mr. Hunkele gave a brief presentation. He stated that the property owner has already committed to an additional expenditure to design a pavement section that far exceeds the county standards, which would provide acceptable service to last over 20 years for the anticipated traffic on the road. He stated that all of those designs are incorporated in the construction plans along with a copy of the geo-technical report.

Mr. Robert Bryant stated that the consistency in roads is very important for commercial and residential developments, and there is no better entity to control the consistency than the county. If the roads are private, there won't be any consistency. Mr. Bryant stated that they have increased the base in all manners to create a strong road that would need very little maintenance.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Pat Browning to recommend approval of this request subject to the road design meeting the county engineer's approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

-----

**GC-25-99**

**Request to rezone from Highway Commercial to General Commercial parcel of land consisting of 28,832 sq. ft. fronting 97 ft. on the south side of Walker Road, beginning 52.85 ft. east of Spur 25/F009 Spur.  
Property owned by Walter Dykes.**

Mr. Dykes was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

This subject property was rezoned from R-9 One-Family Residential to Highway Commercial in 1974. The property is currently being developed with a commercial establishment to be known as D & D Decorators. The applicant desires to utilize the commercial structure and provide a residential dwelling on the top portion of the building. Access to the subject property is via shared access drive with the adjacent commercial establishment from Walker Road.

Under the current zoning of Highway Commercial, residential is not a permitted use. The requested zoning classification (General Commercial) allows for a combination residential and commercial use on separate levels as a conditional use, provided that all dwelling units have direct access to the street or parking area. For the purposes of the Ordinance, a combination residential and commercial use on separate levels shall be defined as one in which at least 50% of the floor space in a building is designed for and occupied for commercial use(s).

In reviewing the intent of the zoning districts, the subject property meets the intent of the current zoning Highway Commercial. However, staff's professional opinion is that the property does not meet the intent of the requested General Commercial District. The Ordinance outlines the intent of General Commercial as:

"To be developed and reserved for general business purposes. The regulations which apply within the district are designed to encourage the formation and continuance of a compatible and economically healthy environment for regionally oriented business, financial, service and professional uses which benefit from being located in close proximity to each other; and to discourage any encroachment by industrial, residential or other uses considered capable of adversely affecting the commercial character of the district."

Another factor to be considered is there are no setback requirements within a General Commercial District. The building being constructed on the site at this time meets the setbacks as currently zoned, Highway Commercial. The minimum setbacks for Highway Commercial are the following - Front Yard, 25 ft.; Rear Yard, 7 ft.; and Side Yard, 7ft.

In conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation -

- ◆ Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

Yes, some of the uses allowed in the General Commercial District could be compatible. However, the intent of General Commercial would not be compatible with the surrounding area. Also, the standards related to setbacks not compatible.

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

Yes, could have a negative impact. The requested General Commercial does not require any building setbacks.

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

Yes, the subject property is being developed as zoned at this time.

- ◆ 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;

No, access to the site has already been established by having a shared access drive from Walker Road with the adjacent commercial tract of land.

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

Yes, shown as commercial.

- ◆ 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 that staff is aware of.

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending denial of this request because it does not meet the intent of General Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Dykes gave a brief presentation. He explained that he is requesting the rezoning so that he can have an apartment upstairs for security purposes and to spend more time with his family. (He currently lives in Brantly County.)

Mr. Dykes pointed out that staff has stated that there are commercial businesses surrounding this property; however, there is a house on one side and several houses behind the property. Located across the road is an RV Campground with permanent residences. He stated that the only commercial business is a Karate School.

Referring to the setbacks, Mr. Dykes stated that he is not planning to move the building and he would be willing to get an attorney to draw up papers agreeing to always abide by the setback requirements.

Mrs. Touw wanted to know if there were any alternative zoning districts that the applicant could have considered. Ms. Olness stated that according to the Zoning Administrator, there weren't any alternatives.

Mr. Chuck Taylor explained that conditions could be placed on the zoning that would restrict setbacks. Ms. Olness stated that she would be more comfortable if the setbacks were adjusted.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to recommend approval of this request subject to retaining setbacks and height requirements outlined in Highway Commercial Zoning as follows: 25 ft. front yard; 7 ft. side yard; 7 ft. rear yard; building height 35 ft. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (Mr. Perry Fields was not in attendance at this time.)

-----  
**GC-27-99**

**Request to rezone from General Residential to Medium Residential, 5.04 acres located on the southeast corner of Altama Avenue (664.19 ft. of frontage) and Baybridge Drive (339.21 ft. of frontage).**

Property owned by McGarvey Properties, Inc.

Mr. David Newton, agent, was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Ms. Olness as follows:

When the Official Zoning Maps were adopted in 1966, the subject property was zoned General Residential. In 1975, the property owner obtained a rezoning to Local Commercial, which was granted subject to conditions and deed restrictions for any commercial development.

On May 6, 1999, the property was rezoned from Local Commercial to General Residential, subject to the retention of a 20 ft. wide undisturbed buffer and the installation of an opaque fence adjacent to the single family subdivision.

The General Residential zoning classification allows for the development of multi-family residential at 10 units. The request at this time is to rezone to Medium Residential to allow 16 units per acre.

The subject property is located immediately across Altama Avenue (east) from a 44 acre tract zoned Medium Residential of which approximately 11 acres has been developed as multi-family. Approximately 400 ft. to the south is a large tract of land zoned Planned Development-Residential that has been developed as multi-family residential and duplexes.

To the east of the subject property is a single-family residential subdivision which has only one access road, Baybridge Drive, located immediately north of the property.

According to the concept plan submitted, the subject property would only have access from Altama Avenue. Baybridge Drive would not be utilized. Access to the property would be subject to the approval of Glynn County Engineer and Traffic Safety Engineer.

As stated in the rezoning request for the General Residential, staff's professional opinion was that 10 units per acre would be compatible with the surrounding area. However, the request for Medium Residential to allow 16 units per acre would not be compatible with the adjacent properties.

If the subject property is rezoned to Medium Residential, the maximum density, according to the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, would allow for 16 units per acre and a 20% open space, including landscaped areas, would be required. This would be reviewed during site plan approval by the Planning Commission as a requirement of the Ordinance.

In conformance with Section 1103. Glynn County Zoning Ordinance, the following findings of fact were considered in making the recommendation:

- Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property;

No, not with a density of 16 units per acre. Low-density multi-family development, as currently zoned, should be compatible with the surrounding area with an adequate landscaped buffer adjacent to the single-family subdivision.

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

The requested Medium Residential zoning would have more impact on the adjacent property than the existing General Residential.

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

Yes, can be developed as multi-family with 10 units per acre.

- 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 use will have an impact on the surrounding area. Under the current zoning of General Residential, allowing a maximum of 50 units, the traffic generated is estimated to be 331.5 trips per day. Medium Residential zoning, allowing a maximum of 80 units is estimated at 530.4 trips per day.

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

No, subject property shown as commercial.

- 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 that staff is aware of.

Ms. Olness stated that staff is recommending denial of this request. Allowing a density of 16 units per acre would have a negative impact on the surrounding residential area and traffic. Further, if the Planning Commission recommends that the rezoning be approved, staff recommends that the previous condition placed on the property be included, as follows: Subject to the retention of a 20 ft. wide undisturbed buffer and the installation of an opaque fence adjacent to the single family subdivision.

Mr. Newton gave a brief presentation. He explained that the applicants intend to build one-bedroom efficiency units. He stated that he doesn't understand the consistency of staff's recommendation for denial based on increased traffic. This is an 80 unit apartment complex on a four-lane road compared to Barnes Plantation which is on a two lane road. Barnes Plantation is located in a heavily traffic area and staff recommended approval of the zoning change to MR for 16 units per acre. Mr. Newton stated that according to concept plan, he has exceeded the 20 ft. setback by a considerable amount. The concept plan was presented for the Planning Commission's review.

For clarification, Mrs. Touw stated that this request is for a rezoning, not a site plan approval. A concept plan is great and usually works well, but what we are actually doing is rezoning a piece of property. Mr. Newton stated that he understands; however, according to staff, if the rezoning is approved a 20 ft. setback would be imposed, which is what he would expect.

Mr. Hart stated that staff is concerned with the increase of density. Mr. Newton stated that 16 units per acre for two-story buildings is a very modest density. The obvious intent is to improve the economics for the developer because of what's been paid for the property. Building the small efficiencies with one-bedroom would make the land cost disproportionately high and makes a marginal development. Mr. Newton stressed that they are not trying to do anything more than 16 units per acre, which is what the code allows.

Mr. Browning asked that if the Planning Commission were to approve the rezoning, would the developer have to come back with a site plan for approval. Mr. Taylor replied no. A site plan is required for Planned Developments. It was noted that the developer couldn't do more than 16 units per acre. Mr. Newton stated that he would be willing to accept that as a condition.

Mr. Hart asked Mr. Newton if he would consider a deferral at this time and perhaps work with staff on finding a solution. Mr. Newton replied yes. Thereupon, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to defer this item until the October 5<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting to enable the applicant and staff to work together on a zoning change that would be compatible with the area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart, Mrs. Iris Touw and Mr. Jonathan Williams. (It was noted that Mr. Perry Fields arrived but not in time to participate in the discussion. He therefore abstained from voting.)

-----

**414 Butler Avenue/SVPD**  
**Addition of an accessory building, located on the corner of**  
**Butler Avenue and Georgia Street; 12,400 sq. ft., zoned R-6**  
**One-Family Residential**  
**Lawrence and Sybil D'Amico, Property Owners**

Mr. Larry Bryson, agent, was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:



The applicant proposes to build a new outbuilding structure housing exercise and hobby rooms on the lot. This new structure will be a single-story addition, comprising 600 sq. ft. of space.

Staff has determined that the current site coverage of the proposed development is 4,995 sq. ft. while the lot size is 12,400 sq. ft. for a coverage of 40%. With the new structure, the site coverage meets the 50% requirement.

The average footprint of the side lots is 3,811 sq. ft. and the footprint of the project is 3,528 sq. ft. (283 sq. ft. under the limit. The height requirement is met by the fact that the height of the new structure is less than the existing structures on the lot. No trees will be removed for this project.

Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pat Browning and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Site Plan**  
**Ocean Cottages, Phase IV**  
**Located in Ocean Forest, north end of Sea Island**  
**1.16 acres, zoned Resort Residential**  
**Sea Island Company, Property Owner/Developer**

Mr. Bill Edenfield, agent, was present for discussion

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of one (1) tract comprising 1.16 acres to be developed into townhouse residences. There are three units in this Phase with the average square feet of space being 17,170 per unit. The parking required for this development calls for 6 total off-street spaces and is met by this site plan. The site coverage will be slightly more than 48.28% of the total tract. All common areas are to be maintained by Sea Island Company or by a homeowners association.

Sea Island Company will be the water source supplier and the Glynn County Environmental Quality Department will provide the sanitary sewage treatment. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit has been issued.

Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, Fire Department, GIS, and Engineering have all favorably reviewed this project. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Mrs. Touw stated that when the other three phases of this development were done, the property was rezoned for ROW houses and residential, using the Resort Residential (RR) criteria. She stated that the site plan for this phase mentions attached single-family residences, but they are ROW houses. Mrs. Touw commented that the more consistency we have with terminology the less confusion we'll have in the future. Mr. Thomasson agreed. Mrs. Touw also asked for future reference, that the site plan include all pertinent information being reviewed by the Planning Commission, i.e., parking, buffers, etc. (as opposed to having the Planning Commission refer to the Site Development Plan.)

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Pat Browning to approve this request with the understanding that the development is for ROW houses and not Townhouses. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole and unanimously adopted.

-----

**Preliminary Plat  
Bridgeway  
Located on the corner of Carteret Road and  
Emanuel Farm Road, zoned R-9 One-Family  
Residential; 23.938 acres, 54 single-family residential lots  
Driggers Construction Co., Inc., Property Owner/Developer**

Harry and Terry Driggers were present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of 23.938 total acres to be subdivided into 54 lots comprising 21.23 acre with an average lot area of 17,125.53 sq. ft. and the smallest lot being 11,407 sq. ft. Also proposed are two rights-of-way encompassing an area of 2.708 acres. One is a 50 ft. right-of-way loop entitled Bridgeway Circle which narrows to 40 ft. as it circles back to Emanuel Farm Road. The other street is a 40 ft. right-of-way cul-de-sac named Bridgeway Court. These new streets are to be improved to county standards and then a request for dedication made to Glynn County.

The City of Brunswick Water/Waste Water Department will provide the water source and the sewerage treatment service. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit will be required prior to any soil disturbance.

Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, Fire Department, GIS, and Engineering have all favorably reviewed this project. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Pat Browning to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry Fields. Discussion continued. Mrs. Touw asked if the 40 ft. entrance would have curb and guttering. Mr. Driggers replied yes, they would all have curb and guttering. After discussion, the motion for approval was unanimously adopted.

-----

**Preliminary Plat  
Henrietta Brown  
Located on Pennick Road, zoned Forest Agricultural;  
6.86 acres, 10 single-family residential lots  
Stephen R. Lagasse, Property Owner/Developer  
Property Owner/Developer: Stephen R. Lagasse**

Mr. Lagasse was present for discussion.

The staff's report was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Thomasson as follows:

This project consists of 6.86 total acres to be subdivided into 10 lots comprising 5.76 acres with an average lot area of 25,091 sq. ft. and the smallest lot being 20,114 sq. ft. Also proposed is a 60 ft. right-of-way cul-de-sac encompassing an area of 1.1 acres entitled Ben Houston Place. This street will be unpaved and graded to county standards, but will remain a private road.

The water source will be individual wells with the sanitary sewage treatment by septic tanks. A Sedimentation and Soil Erosion Control Permit will be required prior to any soil disturbance.

Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, Fire Department, GIS, Engineering and Environmental Health Department have all favorably reviewed this project. Mr. Thomasson stated that staff is recommending approval of this request.

Following review, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to approve this request. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

-----  
The Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess. The meeting resumed at 10:40 a.m.

-----  
**GC-2-99 G**

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance  
Section 302: Definitions, Variance  
Section 709: St. Simons Village Preservation District  
Article X: Appeals  
Subsection 1005.3: Powers & Duties

Chairman Altman suggested that this item be deferred until after review/approval of the Sign Ordinance. The Planning Commission concurred.

-----  
**GC-2-99 J**

Article VIII - Sign Ordinance  
Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance  
Delete Article VIII in its entirety and adopt a new  
Article VIII Sign Ordinance

A draft copy of the amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review. During the course of discussion, it was noted that several recommended changes were not included in the draft. The members were reluctant to vote on the amendment without seeing all of the changes, which prompted a deferral until all changes are incorporated into the draft.

Mr. Bill Raulerson, representing Lewis Oil Company and Friendly Express Stores voiced concerns about how the proposed changes would affect his business. He stated that two months ago, the company purchased the "Happy Stores" and in the process, they inherited billboards on these sites. Most of the billboards have been approved but they would like to lease them to Lamar Sign Company. Mr. Raulerson is concerned about the section of the Ordinance dealing with billboards, which prohibits billboards from being within 1000 ft. of each other. He then discussed a specific billboard and stated he would like to be able to leave the billboard on his property and be allowed to lease it to Lamar Sign Company. Mr. Raulerson was advised that in this case, he would have to apply for a variance.

Staff was advised to incorporate the changes and bring the draft back for review at the October 5<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

**GC-2-99 K**

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance  
Section 302. Definitions, Yard

The amendment was included in the packages for review and was presented by Mr. Taylor as follows:

**Yard:** A required open space located on the same lot as the principal building, and which is unoccupied and unobstructed from ground to sky except for tree or shrub growth, fences or walls, driveways, patios, on grade subject to height limitations as indicated, except where encroachment of utilities and accessories are expressly permitted. Said exception shall also include the encroachment of eaves, up to 24 inches into the required yard.

Mr. Kevin Hilderbrand, St. Simons Island resident, was present to express opposition to allowing encroachments. He specifically pointed out a construction violation at 319 Kings Way which he stated stems from the proposed amendment. Mr. Taylor explained that the change is being sought to bring what has been routinely allowed in the county into compliance. He elaborated on the amendment.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Williams. Voting Aye: Messrs. Altman, Browning, Cole, Fields, Hart and Williams. Voting Nay: Mrs. Iris Touw (opposed to the 24 inch encroachment.)

-----

**GC-2-99 L**

Consider Amending the Glynn County Zoning Ordinance  
Article V, Application of Regulations/Create New Section  
Section 509: Exemption of Public Utilities

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

Following a brief discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Lamar Cole to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

-----

**SR-3-99**

Consider Amending the Glynn County Subdivision Regulations  
Amend Article IX Variances & Exemptions/Create New Section  
Section 903: Exemption of Public & Private Utilities

The amendment was included in the packages for the Planning Commission's review.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Perry Fields to recommend approval of this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pat Browning and unanimously adopted.

-----

**MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to approve the Minutes of the August 3, 1999 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lamar Cole. Voting Aye: Mr. Richard Altman, Mr. Lamar Cole, Mr. Hal Hart and Mr. Jonathan Williams. The following members were not present for the August meeting and therefore abstained from voting: Mr. Pat Browning, Mr. Perry Fields and Mrs. Iris Touw.

-----

**Proposed Amendment - St. Simons Village Preservation District  
Building Coverage/Lot Coverage/Site Coverage**

Ms. Olness presented two options: Option A-Building Coverage; Option B-Site Coverage and a general discussion followed. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to table this item until after time has been allowed to review the Island Ordinance Review Committee's proposal.

-----

**Proposed Amendment - Tree Protection & Landscape Ordinance**

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to review this amendment at a scheduled work session or public meeting.

-----

**1999 Planning Initiatives**

The 1999-2000 Planning Initiatives for Community Development Department was presented by Mr. Taylor ranking from highest to lowest priority as follows:

- Update and Rewrite the Glynn County Comprehensive Plan
- Update and Rewrite the Transportation Plan
- Create a Growth Management Plan for Glynn County
- Historic Preservation Planning Program
- Urban Design/Land Use Strategy

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Hal Hart to endorse and send the proposal to the Board of Commissioners. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Iris Touw and unanimously adopted.

-----

A public meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, September 28<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. in Room 234 of the Office Park Building.

-----

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.