

# CHATHAM COUNTY-SAVANNAH METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

## MPC MINUTES

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM  
110 EAST STATE STREET

February 6, 2007

1:30 PM

**Members Present:** Stephen R. Lufburrow, Chairman  
Robert Ray, Vice Chairman  
Jon Todd, Secretary  
Susan Myers, Treasurer  
Russ Abolt  
Michael Brown  
Lacy Manigault  
Timothy Mackey  
Melissa Jest  
Douglas Bean  
Ben Farmer  
Adam Ragsdale

**Members Not Present** Shedrick Coleman  
Lee Meyer

**Staff Present** Thomas L. Thomson, AICP Executive Director  
Harmit Bedi, AICP, Deputy Executive Director  
Jim Hansen, AICP, Director Development Services  
Dennis Hutton, AICP Director Comprehensive Planning  
Gary Plumbley, Development Services Planner  
Debbie Burke, AICP, Development Services Planner  
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner  
Courtland Hyser, AICP, Land Use Planner  
Keia Butts, Land Use Planner  
Jackie Jackson, Water Resource Planner  
Bethany Jewell, Water Resource Planner

### **I. Call to Order and Welcome**

Chairman Lufburrow called the meeting to order and asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation. He explained the agenda for the benefit of those who were attending the meeting for the first time.

### **II. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

#### **A. Notice(s)**

The MPC Finance Committee will meet on Friday, February 16, 2007, at 9:30 A.M., in the J. P. Jones Conference Room at the MPC Offices.

The MPC Personnel Committee Meeting is Friday, February 16, 2007, at 10:00 A.M., in the J. P. Jones Conference Room at the MPC Offices.

The next Regular Scheduled MPC Meeting will be on February 20, 2007 at 1:30 P.M. in the MPC Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room located at 112 East State Street.

### **B. Acknowledge(s)**

Presentation of Office Recycling Program

Ms. Jackie Jackson explained the recycling program that has been initiated at the MPC. Handouts were distributed that listed information on the local areas where recyclable materials are accepted.

### **C. Item(s) Requested to be Removed from the Final Agenda**

None.

## **III. CONSENT AGENDA**

### **A. Approval of the January 16, 2007 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes.**

Mr. Manigault **moved** to approve the January 16, 2007 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes. Mr. Ray seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve the January 16, 2007 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes carried with none opposed.** Voting were Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Bean, Mr. Farmer, Ms. Jest, Mr. Abolt, and Mr. Mackey.

### **B. Zoning Petition - Text Amendments**

1. Text Amendment to Section 8-3112(i)(4) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance  
Re: Signs Painted on Buildings  
Amanda Bunce, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. Z-061229-86575-2

**Issue:** This text amendment proposes to delete that portion of Section 8-3112(i)(4) Signs Painted on Buildings that require approval by the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

**Policy Analysis:** Deleting the requirement that the MPC review and approve painted on signs would eliminate unnecessary time spent by the Metropolitan Planning Commission Staff and Board and would also streamline the sign permit process without compromising the sign standards required for all development. In addition, this text amendment does not amend the requirement for painted signs to receive a permit from the Development Services Department.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** of the deletion Section 8-3112(i)(4) of the City of Savannah Zoning Regulations as follows:

**Sec. 8-3112(i)(4) Signs painted on buildings.**

Principal use fascia signs may be painted directly to the signable area of a building subject to the approval of the MPC provided such painted sign meets the following conditions: a) the sign meets all standards and regulations for fascia signs; b) the sign complements the architectural features of the facade upon which the sign is located in terms of style, color, design, location, etc; and, c) the sign is located and applied to the facade of a building in a manner that permits removal or painting over, without defacing, obscuring or otherwise leaving an unsightly appearance.

Mr. Todd **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Ray seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried.** Voting in favor of the motion were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Todd, Mr. Ray, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Bean, Mr. Abolt, Mr. Brown, Mr. Mackey, and Ms. Myers. Ms. Jest voted against the motion.

2. Text Amendment to Section 7-3(l)(4) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance  
Re: Signs Painted on Buildings  
Amanda Bunce, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. Z-061229-86690-1

**Issue:** This text amendment proposes to delete Section 7-3 (l)(4) Signs Painted on Buildings. This section currently requires that any sign painted on a building be approved by the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

**Policy Analysis:** Deleting this section of the sign ordinance would eliminate unnecessary time spent by the Metropolitan Planning Commission staff and Board and would also streamline the sign permit process without compromising the sign standards required for all development. In addition, this text amendment does not amend the requirement for painted signs to receive a permit from Building Safety and Regulatory Services.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** of the deletion of Section 7-3(l)(4) of the Chatham County Zoning Regulations as follows:

**Sec. 7-3(l)(4) Signs painted on buildings.**

Principal use fascia signs may be painted directly to the signable area of a building subject to the approval of the MPC provided such painted sign meets the following conditions:

a) the sign meets all standards and regulations for fascia signs; b) the sign complements the architectural features of the facade upon which the sign is located in terms of style, color, design, location, etc and c) the sign is located and applied to the facade of a building in a manner that permits removal or painting over, without defacing, obscuring or otherwise leaving an unsightly appearance.

Mr. Todd **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Ray seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried with none opposed.** Voting were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Bean, Mr. Farmer, Ms. Jest, Mr. Abolt, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Mackey.

**C. Specific Development Plan**

Great Ogeechee Lakes Surface Mining Phase 2  
Fort Argyle Road  
PD-R-SM Zoning District  
Great Ogeechee River Preserve, LLC, Owner  
Clay Loyless, Kern-Coleman & Co., Agent/Engineer  
Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. M-070116-36206-1

**Nature of Request:** The petitioner is requesting approval of an Amended Specific Development Plan in order to expand the area to be mined, the expiration date for mining activities, and the future land use plan for the subject site located on the south side of Fort Argyle Road at its intersection with Uncle Sheds Road approximately 3 miles southeast of John Carter Road within a P-D-R (Planned Development – Reclamation) zoning district. The petitioner is also requesting the following variance: A 75 foot variance from the required 75 foot wide perimeter buffer on an 800 foot section along the eastern property line.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** of a 75 foot variance from the required 75 foot wide perimeter buffer on an 800 foot section along the eastern property line and the amended Specific Development Plan subject to the following conditions:

1) revise the specific Development Plan to include the mining data. The mining shall be in accordance with the following criteria: a) the number of work days per year shall be 225; b) the hours of operation shall be limited to sunrise to sunset; c) the days of operation shall be limited to Monday through Saturday; d) the mining operation shall be completed no later than February 6, 2014. The close-out shall be in accordance with the minimum standards required by the State of Georgia and the Chatham County Engineer. 2) the revised Amended Specific Development Plan shall be recorded in accordance with the requirements of the P-D-R requirements; 3) the applicant shall be responsible for maintaining Fort Argyle Road in regards to any impacts associated with the borrow pit or landfill activities; and 4) approval of the County Arborist and County Engineer.

Mr. Todd **moved** to approve the staff recommendation. Mr. Ragsdale seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried with none opposed.** Voting were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Bean, Mr. Farmer, Ms. Jest, Mr. Abolt, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Mackey.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**VII. REGULAR BUSINESS**

Dennis Hutton gave an overview of the redevelopment of the West Savannah area. This neighborhood is viewed as a single unit and not four separate actions happening throughout the neighborhood. He also reviewed the recommendations of the Goody/Clancy and the City of Savannah Economic Development Plan for the Augusta Avenue Corridor Revitalization before addressing the Text Amendment.

**A. Zoning Petition - Text Amendment**

Text Amendment to Section 8-3025(a-b) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance

Re: Amendment to uses in the R-4 and RB-1 Zoning Districts  
Dennis Hutton & Courtland Hyser, MPC Project Planners  
MPC File No. Z-060817-30621-2

**Issue:** At issue are amendments to the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance to implement the Augusta Avenue Corridor Revitalization Report (City of Savannah Economic Development Department Fall 2006) and to protect the residential integrity of existing single-family neighborhoods.

**Policy Analysis:** It is the desire of the City of Savannah to remove impediments in the Zoning Ordinance to the implementation of the West Savannah Redevelopment Plan and to protect the integrity of existing single family neighborhoods.

**Staff Recommendations: Approval** to a) revisions to Use Schedule in B & I Zoning Districts (Section 8-3025) in order to permit a parking lot as a principal use in the RB-1 Zoning District; b) revisions to the R-4 zoning district in order to 1) provide for advertisement, public comment, and review of institutional uses proposed in R-4 zoning districts; 2) remove the requirement for review of uses in households of less than 6 persons that the Zoning Board cannot regulate because of federal law; 3) remove regulation of satellite dishes and certain signs that are no longer relevant. Section 8-3025 Regulation as to uses: Index for B&I Zoning Districts. (55a) automobile parking lot or garage. Not including Gasoline pumps (provided that principal use parking shall occur only within an authorized off-street parking lot or facility.

Mr. Mackey questioned whether or not group care homes for six or fewer people would be permitted and how would it be implemented in the ordinance. Dennis Hutton replied that group care facilities for six or fewer people would no longer appear in the ordinance. However, if someone wanted to open an adult care home for seven or more they would have to come before the Zoning Board of Appeals as they would if he/she were trying to open a child daycare center.

Ms. Jest expressed concerns regarding the recommendations that parking lots become the principle use on Augusta Avenue. She asked whether this would be in the R-B 1 only or the R-4 as well. Mr. Hutton replied this would be allowed in the R-B 1 only.

Mr. Brown added that the City will acquire the inadequate lots on or around Augusta Avenue and create surface lots for residential or commercial parking.

Mr. Manigault questioned whether or not these lots would still be under the same requirements and buffer standards as any other parking lots

Mr. Brown answered the City would take what is available and make it as aesthetically and functionally appropriate for parking.

Mr. Bean **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Todd seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried with none opposed.** Voting were Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Bean, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Abolt, Mr. Brown and Mr. Mackey. Ms. Jest voted against the motion.

## **B. Zoning Petition- Map Amendments**

1. West Savannah Zoning Study  
Dennis Hutton & Courtland Hyser, MPC Project Planners  
MPC File No. Z-060817-30621-2

Staff Study for rezoning properties in the West Savannah Neighborhood to implement the West Savannah Neighborhood Revitalization Plan (Goody-Clancy, Associates, 2005) and the Augusta Avenue Corridor Revitalization Report (Savannah Economic Development Department).

**Issue:** At issue are amendments to the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance to implement the West Savannah Revitalization Plan (Goody Clancy & Associates, 2005)

**Policy Analysis:** It is the desire of the City of Savannah to remove impediments in the Zoning Ordinance to the implementation of the West Savannah Redevelopment Plan. The proposed rezonings are in accordance with the Future Land Use Plan

**Recommendation Approval** of various properties in order to; 1) remove impediments to implementing the West Savannah Revitalization Plan; 2) encourage redevelopment of commercial and residential properties.

Mr. Farmer asked whether these property owners have been informed on what non-conforming really means. If a property is grandfathered in and there is a storm or fire and the property is destroyed the owner may not regain this use without a variance. He stated because there aren't many properties in the area that are being down zoned the owners should be contacted and informed and made sure that they understand what is really going on with their properties.

Mr. Bean added that the residents along the Westside of East Lathrop were not taking advantage of the I-L uses and the increase in value this zoning classification brings to their property. Property owners should be made fully aware of the value this down zoning may have on their property.

**Speaking on the Petition:**

Mr. James Hall, West Savannah business owner and resident, voiced his concerns regarding a down sizing of the businesses in the area.

Pamela Oglesby, Vice President West Savannah Neighborhood Association, stated that she was very satisfied with the proposed zoning in the area. The majority of the residents in that area were also satisfied however; those present today did not understand the proposed changes.

Rebecca Watson, neighborhood resident/business owner, stated that initially she did not understand the zoning changes but the changes were explained to her and she now had no opposition to the proposed changes.

Felix Villarin, property owner, stated he would like to know what his property was going to generate.

Louis Wilson, president High Tech Realty/resident, asked that Mr. Walker's property be removed from today's action in order to give him time to make decisions on his property.

Abraham Walker, property owner, stated he would like to his property to remain zoned for business. He is opposed to any changes to his property at this time.

Mr. Brown **moved** to approve the recommended rezoning and text amendments with the exception of the PDN property on Ferrill Street and the exception of all the properties between Bay Street on the north, Richards Street on the south, Lathrop Avenue on the east and Ferrill Street on the west but provided that staff will continue to do a neighborhood based residential/ commercial analysis for the corridor and come back with a subsequent rezoning for the area. Mr. Farmer seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION:** The motion carried. The motion was to approve the staff recommended rezoning and text amendments with the exception of the PDN property on Ferrill Street and the exception of all the properties between Bay Street on the north, Richards Street on the south, Lathrop Avenue on the east and Ferrill Street on the west but provided that staff will continue to do a neighborhood based residential/ commercial analysis for the corridor and come back with a subsequent rezoning for the area. Voting in favor of the motion were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Bean, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Brown, Mr. Mackey, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, and Ms. Myers. Ms. Jest and Mr. Ragsdale voted against the motion. Mr. Abolt was not in the room when the vote was taken.

2. Sustainable Fellwood  
Melaver, Inc., Agent  
Housing Authority of Savannah, Owner  
Keia Butts, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. Z-060817-30621-2

**Issue:** At issue is the rezoning of Fellwood Homes, a 24.7 acre site that was formerly a public housing development in the West Savannah Neighborhood, in order to accommodate a mixed-use, mixed income development.

**Policy Analysis:** The proposed rezoning is consistent with the City Future Land Use Plan and will establish a development that complements the surrounding neighborhood.

**Staff Recommendation:** **Approval** of the request to rezone the subject property from an R-4 to PUD-MXU.

**AND**

**Master Plan**

Sustainable Fellwood  
1300 West Bay Street  
PUD-MXU Zoning District (proposed)  
24.7 acres  
PIN 2-0019-01-002  
Melaver, Inc., Agent  
Housing Authority of Savannah, Owner  
Keia Butts, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. Z-060817-55878-2



Keia Butts gave a brief presentation on the rezoning of Fellwood Homes from an R4 to a PUD MXU zoning classification and adopting the Conceptual Master Plan for this site.

Forrest Lott of Lott Barber Architect gave a slide presentation to further illustrate the Concept Plan on Sustainable Fellwood.

Mr. Brown **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Manigault seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: the motion to approve staff recommendation carried.** Voting in favor of the motion were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Farmer, Ms. Myers, Mr. Bean, Mr. Brown, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Mackey, Mr. Todd. Ms. Jest voted against the motion. Mr. Abolt was not present for the vote.

3. Little Neck Road  
Jamie Csizmadia, Kern-Coleman & Co., Agent/ Engineer  
Donald Dugger, Owner  
Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. Z-070123-32398-1

**Issue:** The petitioner is requesting rezoning on Little Neck Road from an R-A (Residential-Agriculture) zoning classification to a PUD-M-6 (Planned Unit Development Multifamily, 6 units per acre) classification.

**Policy Analysis:** The proposed rezoning is consistent with Chatham County's Future Land Use Plan. The proposed PUD M-6 classification would provide conventional single family development as well as low to medium density single family attached and semi-attached residential housing opportunities that would be compatible with the zoning pattern in the general area and would not adversely impact properties within the general area.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** to rezone the property from an R-A (residential Agriculture) classification to a PUD-M-6 (Planned Unit Development Multi-Family -6 units per net acre).

Mr. Farmer **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Todd seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried with none opposed.** Voting were Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Bean, Mr. Ragsdale, Ms. Myers, Ms. Jest, Mr. Manigault. Mr. Brown Mr. Mackey and Mr. Abolt were not in the room when the vote was taken.

**C. General Development Plan/ Group Development Plan**

Southside Baptist Church  
5502 Skidaway Road  
R-6 Zoning District  
9.6 Acres  
PIN: 2-0136-06-003  
Michael Johnson, BMW Architects, Architect/Agent  
Southside Baptist Church, Inc., Owner  
Debbie Burke, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. P-060928-54501-2

**Nature of Request:** The petitioner is requesting approval of a General Development Plan for a group development in order to construct a gymnasium at an existing church within an R-6 (One-Family Residential) zoning district. The applicant is requesting a setback and buffer variance where the property abuts an existing single-family dwelling.

**Staff Recommendation:** **Denial** of the General Development Plan as submitted and **Approval** of the General Development Plan subject to the following conditions: 1) the lots must be combined prior to Specific Development Plan approval; 2) remove proposed easternmost curb cut on Brogdon Street; 3) remove proposed curb cut on Harold Street; 4) shift the building west on the property to meet the setback and buffer requirements; 5) locate the majority of the planting requirements in the buffer where the subject property adjoins residential uses.

**Speaking on the Petition:** Michael Johnson, BMW Architects, Agent, presented a signed letter of acknowledgement from the present owner of the adjoining subject property giving his consent to the variances and the General Development Plan.

James Hansen added that this was a two part project. The zoning code requires that the Zoning Board of Appeals grant use approval for a church. This is why this petition went to the Zoning Board of Appeals. As a condition of that approval the Zoning Board of Appeals requested and the representatives of the Church agreed with the provisions to remove the two curb cuts. They were made aware of staff recommendation and agreed to the recommendation. He stated that in his opinion if the petitioner desires to go back to the Board of Appeals this Board can not or should no act on this petition today but rather consider a continuance. He said he could not speak for the actions of the Board of Appeals but if these curb cuts are not removed as agreed the Board's decision could be totally different.

Mr. Farmer **moved** to continue this petition to the March 20, 2007 MPC Meeting. Ms. Jest seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: the motion to continue this petition to the March 20, 2007 MPC Meeting carried with none opposed.** Voting were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Bean, Mr. Ragsdale, Ms. Myers, Ms. Jest, and Mr. Manigault. Mr. Brown, Mr. Mackey, and Mr. Abolt were not in the room when the vote was taken.

**D. Master Plan/ General Development Plan**

1. Little Neck Road Subdivision  
653 Little Neck Road  
PUD-M-6 Zoning District (proposed)  
PIN 1-1028 -01-004  
Kern-Coleman & Co., Engineer  
Jamie Csizmadia, Agent  
Donald Dugger, Owner  
Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. M-070123-32953-1

**Nature of Request:** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Master Plan for a proposed residential development to be located on the west side of Little Neck Road approximately 400 feet west of Henderson Oaks Drive within a PUD-M-6 (Planned Unit Development-Multi-Family-6 units per net acre) zoning district. The petitioner is also requesting the following variances: 1) a 10 foot lot width variance (from the required 60 feet for all single family detached lots; 2) a 10 foot front yard building setback variance (from the required 30 feet) for all single family detached lots; 3) a 10 foot right-of-way width variance (from the required 60 feet) for all lots that varies from 1,500 square feet to 1,700 square feet.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** of a 10 foot lot width variance (from the required 60 feet for all single family detached lots; a 10 foot front yard building setback variance from the required 30 feet) for all single family detached lots; a 10 foot right-of-way width variance (from the required 60 feet) for five proposed street; a lot area variance (from the required 6, 000 square feet) for all lots that varies from 1,500 square feet to 1,700 square feet; and, the proposed Master Plan subject to the following conditions: 1) approval by the County Engineer of a traffic study. The traffic study shall provide the maximum peak hour and daily traffic counts that will be generated by this development at the maximum permitted densities. The primary purpose of the traffic projections is to make sure the intersection of the entrance road at Little Neck Road will function at an acceptable level as determined by the County Engineer at build-out of the development; 2) approval by the Chatham County Health Department and the County Engineer; 3) revise the Master Plan to increase the width of the lots along a cul-de-sac or 90 degree curve to not less than 48 feet at the required front yard building setback line; 4) revise the Master Plan to show a 20 foot front yard setback on all single family detached lots; and 5) approval of the rezoning of this site to a PUD-M-6 by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners.

**Speaking on the Petition**

Jamie Csizmadia, Agent stated it had not been decided whether or not a berm would be provided around the detention area but a 20 foot buffer between the detention and the main entry road will be provided.

Mr. Farmer **moved** to approve staff recommendation. Mr. Ray seconded the motion.

**MPC ACTION: The motion to approve staff recommendation carried with none opposed.** Voting were: Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Ms. Jest, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Ragsdale, Mr. Manigault and Mr. Bean. Mr. Mackey, Mr. Brown and Mr. Abolt were not present when the vote was taken.

2. Waterford at Southbridge (formerly The Village)  
705 Berwick Boulevard  
PUD-C Zoning District  
PIN 1-1008 -02-047  
Ryan Thompson, Thomas & Hutton Engineering, Engineer/Agent  
Southbridge Development Company, Inc., Owner  
Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner  
MPC File No. M-061220-58077-1

**Nature of Request:** The petitioner is requesting approval of an amended Master Plan for a proposed residential development (formerly known as Track K) to be located on the west side of Berwick Boulevard at its intersection with Woodland Creek Road approximately 735 feet north of Woodchuck Hill Road within a PUD-C (Planned Unit Development-Community) zoning district. The petitioner is also requesting approval of the following variances: 1) a five foot front yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet) for 135 conventional single family detached; 2) a five foot rear yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet) for all 147 attached and semi-attached townhouse lots; 3) a 10 foot rear yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet) for all 111 attached and semi-attached townhouse lots; 4) a 10 foot lot width variance (from the required 60 feet) for 104 single family detached lots; 5) a 250 square foot lot area variance (from the required 6,000 square feet) for 104 conventional single family detached lots; 6) a 13 percent maximum lot area coverage variance (from the 40 percent maximum coverage) for 104 conventional single family lots; 7) a 15 percent maximum lot area coverage variance (from the 40 percent maximum coverage) for 37 conventional single family lots; 8) a 10 foot right-of-way width variance (from the required 60 feet) for four proposed streets; and, 9) a variance from the sidewalk requirement to allow the construction of a sidewalk on one side only of the entrance road.

**Staff Recommendation: Approval** of a five foot front yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet ) for 135 conventional single family detached; a five foot rear yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet) for all 147 single family detached lots; a 10 foot rear yard setback variance (from the required 25 feet) for all 111 attached and semi-attached townhouse lots; a 10 foot lot width variance (from the required 60 feet) for 104 single family detached lots; a 250 square foot lot area variance (from the required 6,000 square feet) for 104 conventional single family detached lots; a 1 percent maximum lot area coverage variance (from the 40 percent maximum coverage) for 104 conventional single family lots; a 15 percent maximum lot area coverage variance (from the 40 percent maximum coverage) for 37 conventional single family lots; a 10 foot right-of-way width variance (from the required 60 feet) for four proposed streets; and a variance from the sidewalk requirement to allow the construction of a sidewalk on one side only of the entrance road. Staff further recommends **approval** of the proposed Master Plan subject to the following conditions: 1) the combined front and rear yard setbacks of the detached single family lots shall be not less than 40 feet. The combined front and rear yard setbacks of the attached and semi-attached townhouse lots shall be not be less than 45 feet; and, 2) approval by the County Engineer.

**Speaking on the Petition:** Ryan Thompson, agent, stated that the product will be changed. It is not the neo- traditional project style.

Frank Overlang, developer, stated that sidewalks would be on one side due to the fact that there was very little impact of housing along that side of the road. He feels that it would be safer for children to ride their bikes on this sidewalk to get to the amenities center rather than on a sidewalk lane on the road.

Lloyd Johnson, Southbridge Resident, introduced members of the Concerned Homeowners Association. He stated members of the Association support the new proposal and he urged the Board to adopt the proposal.

Leah Gross, President Southbridge Homeowners Association, asked that the present proposal be approved.

Mr. Farmer **moved** to approve staff recommendation and that the petitioner take a look at the concerns of the Board regarding the sidewalk issue. Mr. Ray seconded the motion

**MPC ACTION: the motion to approve staff recommendation and that the petitioner take a look at the concerns of the Board regarding the sidewalk carried with none opposed.** Voting were; Mr. Lufburrow, Mr. Ray, Mr. Todd, Ms. Myers, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Manigault, Mr. Ragsdale, and Ms. Jest. Mr. Brown, Mr. Abolt and Mr. Mackey were not present for the vote. Mr. Bean abstained from voting. He submitted a conflict of interest form for the record.

## **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Jest encouraged those watching the broadcast and those present to attend the African American Building and Art Exhibit at the Telfair Jepson February 6, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. and Family Day on Saturday February 11, 2007.

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the February 6, 2007, Regular Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson, P.E., AICP  
Executive Director