

Motion To Table

I hereby move that this project be tabled due to an incomplete application which is deficient in several critical areas. In making this motion, the following must be included in an application before the committee can properly review the application:

1. There must be a current topographic survey, by a Georgia Registered Surveyor, which shows the corridor proposed for the driveway. Review of the corridor at this time shows evidence of significant erosion and sediment accumulation which has occurred in the past several years. A current topographic survey will provide the applicant with the ability to calculate volumes of soil needed for the proposed driveway. These calculations should then be included in a submittal of additional information by the applicant.
2. Evidence on the ground indicates there is significant connectivity between the two sides of the existing pathway through the marsh. Since the hydrologic evaluation by Nutter and Assoc in 2014, there have been changes made by recent hurricanes. The hydrologic survey should be either updated or replaced to address this connectivity, as well as other elements of the evaluation. Ignoring the connectivity between the east and west sides of the pathway, and how they currently operate as a single system, versus two systems, must be addressed.
3. The 172 feet of drive on the north end of the project delineated as coastal marshlands by DNR must be addressed. Currently this is not addressed and traffic through this portion of the project, now and after completion of the proposed driveway, is not a legally permitted activity. This segment of the driveway must be addressed.
4. Future maintenance of the driveway must be addressed. Since portions of the project are on public lands and portions are on private lands, the person or persons responsible for maintenance must be identified. Typically, public forces and assets cannot be utilized to perform work on private property. Further, maintenance must be spelled out clearly.
5. An appropriate alternatives analysis must be completed so the committee can consider whether the proposed driveway is the “only feasible alternative.” It is suggested that an alternatives analysis consider a wooden pile supported bridge for at least portions of the project. The current analysis only looks at a Georgia DOT type concrete bridge as an alternative. This is an extremely expensive alternative, and should not be considered the only alternative, since other obvious alternatives exist. The alternatives analysis must consider “all” alternatives or otherwise it is deficient in the eyes of the Act and Rules.
6. While these are deficiencies in the current application identified by the committee, there may be others. Curing these deficiencies does not in any way indicate the committee may or may not approve this application. However, it will provide the committee a complete application upon which to make a decision.