



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
November 22, 2011 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

November 22, 2011 Regular MPC Board Meeting

Members Present: J. Adam Ragsdale, Chairman
Jon Pannell, Vice-Chairman
Ellis Cook, Secretary
Tanya Milton, Treasurer
Shedrick Coleman
Ben Farmer
Timothy Mackey
Lacy Manigault
Murray Marshall
Susan Myers
Rochelle Small-Toney
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: Russ Abolt
Stephen Lufburrow

Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director
Melony West, CPA, Director, Finance & Systems
James Hansen, AICP, Director, Development Services
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant
Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner
Geoff Goins, Development Services Planner
Jackie Teel, Natural Resources Administrator
Shanale Booker, IT/Assistant

Advisory Staff Present: Robert Sebek, County Zoning Administrator
Randolph Scott, City Zoning Administrator

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [December 13, 2011 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

V. PRESENTATIONS

2. ["Data Analysis on Planning for Sea Level Rise" - Dr. Clark Alexander](#)

Ms. Jackie Jackson-Teel, Natural Resources Administrator of the MPC, presented Dr. Clark Alexander of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. Dr. Alexander presented to the Board an analysis of the data, as requested the Resource Protection Commission's Technical Advisory Committee, on sea level on the local coastal environment.

Ms. Jackson-Teel stated this information is pertinent to the development of the strategic plan of the Comprehensive Plan.

VI. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

The Consent Agenda consists of items for which the applicant is in agreement with the staff recommendation and for which no known objections have been identified nor anticipated by staff. Any objections raised at the meeting will result in the item being moved to the Regular Agenda. At a 12:30 briefing, the staff will brief the Commission on Consent Agenda items and, time permitting, Regular Agenda items. No testimony will be taken from applicants, supporters or opponents, and no votes will be taken at the briefing.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

3. [Approval of November 1, 2011 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [11.01.11 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [11.01.11 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Recommend **APPROVAL** of the MPC Meeting and Briefing Minutes as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Tanya Milton	
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Not Present
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

None

4. [UZO Direction - Thomas Thomson](#)

Attachment: [Thomson Planning Commission, Re; UZO Process 112211.pdf](#)

Mr. Thomson, Executive Director of the MPC, stated that moving forward regarding the draft, that we will:

1 - Keep the UZO Draft review period open-ended and take the time necessary to reach consensus. Deadlines were set in the past, he currently suggests to keep it open and not predict its completion. When it is indeed ready, a 60-day notice will be provided regarding moving towards approval.

2 - Continue to work with interest groups and individuals. Feedback received will be provided to the Board and proposed changes will be posted.

3 - Develop an effective way to compare current ordinance with draft UZO.

Mr. Farmer stated that will be the greatest challenge. He stated he does not see how we can move forward until that is developed.

Mr. Thomson replied that several options are being considered. One is to have a comparison by indicating where a section or use has been moved to in the draft.

Mr. Farmer asked if that were done, would the question be asked why was the change needed.

Mr. Thomson stated in many cases, yes.

Mr. Farmer stated he still does not understand how we got here. He stated his original idea was to streamline and simplify the ordinance. What has happened is that the two old ordinances have been tossed out altogether and started over. If the comparison has to be made, why not ask ourselves what was wrong with it and why do we need to fix it and how, rather than just starting over.

Mr. Thomson stated what will be incredibly important for staff is that the Board have a good understanding of zoning. He encouraged going back to the assessment report and reread it; it is a primer in regards to what is wrong with the current code and why we need to make changes.

Mr. Farmer stated that is a fair request. He asked if Mr. Thomson could meet with them in the beginning of 2012 and inform how it was derived from the assessment from 'fixing' the old one to creating a new one and where the mandate came from. He said he cannot find it anywhere.

Mr. Thomson stated he understands the request and he'd have to research it.

Mr. Farmer stated there was a quote in the newspaper that he, Mr. Thomson, said it was his decision to do it this way; to have a completely new document. If that were true, what prompted that decision; what analysis yielded a mandate to start over.

Mr. Ragsdale stated this topic is better suited for a planning meeting.

Mr. Farmer stated that is a question that needs to be answered when we talk. We need to find out how we got here; rather than moving forward possibly in the wrong direction.

Mr. Ragsdale stated that is the point of pushing the deadline back and having the planning meetings. This will give Mr. Thomson and staff time to respond all questions had.

Mr. Farmer stated he has been involved since the beginning. He stated he is not challenging anyone's intent or hard work; he does not want the assumption believed that the only way to go forward is to stay with new document. Another possible way to move forward is to stay with the old document and go backwards.

Mr. Marshall stated staff has done a good job in putting together a very good manual to work from. Time spent by staff to meet with individual interest groups to discuss a document whose format that has not been adopted by the Board is putting things in the wrong perspective. He stated number 3 needs to be number 2. Otherwise, staff's time will be eaten up doing number 3.

Mr. Thomson responded that the information he is presenting is not intended to be chronological. He said they would not be effectively serving the interested parties if they are not spoken to until the completion of number 3. He and staff will need to make a better case that we are in the right place and

hope that the Board will come to the same understanding he and staff have.

Mr. Marshall stated that its unfair to suggest that time needs to be spent now when it possible that the whole format may make it unnecessary for them to spend that time. If a reformatted presentation is developed and reviewed, there may be no questions. Many of the questions now are 'where am I in the process' and 'how am I affected'. They will then try to convince staff to do it differently. If it's formatted correctly, it will not be necessary to spend that time doing so. Time is money.

Mr. Thomson stated they would like to have a dialogue of understanding and some have been asked to wait. They would like to hear the concerns and thoughts of interested ones so that can be taken into account.

Mr. Marshall said that staff will be spending lot of time talking instead of formatting.

Mr. Ragsdale stated there has been public outcry that they have not be engaged enough in the process. We cannot tell the public to stop engaging us.

Mr. Marshall disagreed. He stated they are not receiving information in a format that they should be reviewing. Having staff meet with them does not balance with good economics.

Mr. Farmer stated people were concerned that we were trying to rush to judgment. Since there is no deadline, there is no rush to have people come in to talk about it when we are sure of what we're talking about. He requested that Attorney McCorkle be given an opportunity to opine on the matter since he is looking in from the other side.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he did not deem that request appropriate at this time.

Mr. Farmer stated it is a public hearing.

Mr. Ragsdale stated that was not the intent of this discussion between the Executive Director and the Board.

Mr. Farmer made a motion to ask if Attorney McCorkle cared to offer an opinion as to whether it would be better for us to have more public input at this point since there is no deadline or to wait until there is a better idea of the format.

Mr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Mr. Mackey requested discussion. He stated he was under the impression that the Board agreed to slow the progression of the draft down. Therefore, until we as a group decides how to move, why is there discussion. He stated there has not yet been opportunity to agree amongst ourselves as to the next step. Each time it comes back, we are back into a public debate and it appears we back into it; we are not truly slowing down. We cannot proceed until we decide how we

should proceed.

Mr. Ragsdale stated he agreed with Mr. Mackey. The memo Mr. Thomson provided was a simply informational as to how we will start to move forward. There is no need to attack the Executive Director. There will be a planning meeting and move forward.

Mr. Farmer stated the motion on the table is simple and if we are going to slow down and stop, should we continue interviewing the public before we decide which way we are going.

Mr. Manigault and **Ms. Myers** stated that was not the motion stated earlier.

Mr. Ragsdale stated the motion was to request Mr. McCorkle's thoughts.

Mr. Farmer stated the purpose was to get the other side's idea of whether that is a good idea to keep listening to the public as we figure out where we are going.

Mr. Manigault stated we are at a standstill. He recommended inviting a few participants to the planning meetings to work with the Board.

The motion failed to pass.

Mr. Thomson continued with his presentation, saying:

4 - Re-review the current draft from front to back. It can address format, but it is mainly intended to address content and the extent to which things are added and enhanced.

5 - Sector by sector review as suggested by the Chamber of Commerce. The more we address this format, the better the understanding by staff and others.

6 - Develop more tools to better inform the public.

7 - Have Board workshops to inform and educate Board.

Mr. Mackey asked why can we not put up what is now in existence versus the proposed changes.

Mr. Thomson stated the difficulty is that there is a big difference in the format of the old and the new because of the way things are arranged. Secondly, because it is a complete rewrite, there may not be apparent all the time. We are working on devising a system, such as color-coding of old, new and other areas to be distinguishable.

Mr. Mackey stated the Board dictates to the staff. Whatever the Board says are the orders for staff.

Ms. Small-Toney stated she does not feel the Board has a consensus about the UZO, the process, or its content. She stated she is again requesting input from the city and county attorneys about this. There are layers of processes going on simultaneously and all of this outreach without clear understanding is mixing a lot of things together hoping for something good to come out in the end. Consensus regarding content and process needs to be obtained before staff makes substantial progress. After that, it should be presented to the community for consideration.

Ms. Myers stated she believes understanding is enhanced by talking with different sectors regarding processes. Listening to their concerns encourages us to look at what has been done and has not been done.

Mr. Farmer stated we don't know what we are asking for input on. We don't know what we are dealing with. It is not productive not now.

Mr. Thomson suggested to put into abeyance this list of things until Executive Director and staff can reconstruct the construct so the Board can accept it and its product.

Mr. Farmer and Mr. Marshall agreed to Mr. Thomson's suggestion.

Mr. Pannell motioned for a scheduling of a Board retreat to specifically examine and determine the direction needed to take regarding the UZO draft.

Board Action:

To ask for Mr. McCorkle's opinion about the process of the UZO draft as a voice of the public - FAIL before moving forward.

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Murray Marshall

Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Nay
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Nay
Susan Myers	- Nay
Jon Pannell	- Nay
Adam Ragsdale	- Nay
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Nay
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Board Action:

Schedule a board retreat/workshop regarding the UZO draft within the next 60 days. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell

Second: Rochelle Small-Toney

Shedrick Coleman - Not Present

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Aye

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Map Amendment

5. [Map Amendment - 13 West 57th Street - Res Suburban to Commercial Suburban](#)

Attachment: [General Plan Amendment.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)

13 West 57th Street

57th Street Properties, LLC, Owner/Petitioner

Ryan Thompson, Thomas and Hutton, Agent

Aldermanic District: 5

County Commision District: 5

Zoning District: BG-1 (Pending)

Change from Residential-Suburban to Commercial-Suburban

PIN: 2-0093 -16-003 (Portion)

MPC File No. Z-111103-42758-2

Mr. Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request to amend the Future Land Use Map of the General Plan. Their intention is to expand and add an accessory warehouse of approximately 7,000 square feet. All neighboring owners were notified of the plan, with no opposing feedback received.

Ryan Thompson, agent for Sandpiper Supply, stated he had no additional information to supply.

Board Action:

It is recommended that the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan from a Residential Suburban designation to a Commercial Suburban designation be approved. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell

Second: Joseph Welch

Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

6. [13 West 57th Street - R-4 to BG-1](#)

Attachment: [Staff Rpt - 42758.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Neighborhood Concurrence Letter.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)

13 West 57th Street
57th Street Properties, LLC, Owner
Ryan Thompson (Thomas and Hutton), Agent
Aldermanic District: 5
County Commission District: 5
Zoning District: R-4 to BG-1
0.40 Acres
PIN: 2-0093 -16-013 (Portion)
MPC File No. Z-111103-42758-2

Mr. Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request to

rezone the subject property at 13 West 57th Street from a R-4 classification to a BG-1 classification.

Board Action:

It is recommended that the request to zone property at 13 West 57th Street from a R-4 classification to a BG-1 classification be approved. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell
Second: Joseph Welch
Shedrick Coleman - Not Present
Ellis Cook - Aye
Ben Farmer - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Not Present
Lacy Manigault - Aye
Murray Marshall - Aye
Tanya Milton - Aye
Susan Myers - Aye
Jon Pannell - Aye
Adam Ragsdale - Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye
Joseph Welch - Aye

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

7. [Motion to Adjourn](#)

Board Action:

Motion to adjourn the November 22, 2011 Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer
Second: Lacy Manigault
Shedrick Coleman - Not Present
Ellis Cook - Aye
Ben Farmer - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Not Present
Lacy Manigault - Aye
Murray Marshall - Aye
Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

XII. ADJOURNMENT

XIII. DEVELOPMENT PLANS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

8. [Development Plans Submitted for Review 11-22-11](#)

Attachment: [DEVELOPMENT REVIEW CASE LOG 112211.pdf](#)

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.