



CHATHAM COUNTY - SAVANNAH
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Planning the Future - Respecting the Past

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

March 16, 2010 Regular MPC Board Meeting

Members Present: Shedrick Coleman, Chairman
Jon Pannell, Secretary
Lacy Manigault, Treasurer
Russ Abolt
Michael Brown
Ellis Cook
Ben Farmer
Stephen Lufburrow
Timothy Mackey
Tanya Milton
Susan Myers
Jon Todd
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: J. Adam Ragsdale, Vice-Chairman

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [March 16, 2010 MPC Finance Committee Meeting at 11:30 AM in the West Conference Room, 110 East State Street.](#)
2. [April 6, 2010 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 East State Street.](#)

V. PRESENTATIONS

3. [Unified Zoning Ordinance Update - Charlotte Moore](#)

Ms. Charlotte Moore, Special Projects Director, updated the Board regarding the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Moore stated 38 base zoning districts have been identified and some of the names have been changed. The major change would be with the traditional districts, which are close to the downtown area and mixed-use districts. The zoning has been tailored to fit the varying neighborhoods.

There are a number of overlay districts, including the five existing historic districts. No new historic districts are being proposed at this time. Some neighborhoods may qualify for local historic status; they will be provided assistance if they choose to request the status. Properties not in the historic district but meeting the historic designation status would be eligible for the Historic Property Overlay zoning.

The Airport/Air Field Overlay District has been updated with assistance from Hunter Army Airfield and the International Airport officials. They are pleased with the progress made thus far.

The Manufactured Home Overlay District is new. A Planned District is forthcoming, which is the equivalent of the existing PUD. They are typically for large projects where the master plan will eventually serve as the zoning district that would be unique to that area.

The General Development standards will be vastly improved. New outdoor storage and display standards have been included and outdoor lighting has been updated. The signage section is being worked on currently. Supplemental Nonresidential Standards are being worked on currently as well. These regulations will set standards for commercial developments as a way to break up massing.

Most of the Natural Resources standards mirror what is in place currently. The groundwater recharge areas and wetland and marsh buffers will be increased slightly. A

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

new section, the Open and Recreational Space for large residential developments will be added for residential recreation.

The MPC staff has conducted several meetings for the community. Most elected officials from the City and the County have been met with and we have received positive feedback regarding the proposed zoning map. There has been a recent meeting with officials from the airport regarding their master plan. MPC staff also met with the Waters Avenue Revitalization Committee, the committee responsible for preparing a revitalization plan for the corridor from Wheaton Street to Victory Drive. The City Housing Director was also consulted to identify in-fill housing proposals and appropriate zoning for those developments. The SDRA Director will be met with soon to discuss the Downtown Master Plan, the MLK/Montgomery Corridor Planning, as well as downtown expansion area plans. The president of the Homebuilders Association was met with to discuss their needs and we will have their representatives on the Advisory Committee.

The Technical Committee completed its work last month. The next step is to have the Advisory Committee, which will be a larger group that will include some neighborhood associations, to review the UZO draft before it goes public. The beginning date is April 8, 2010. Invitations have been sent to approximately 180 neighborhood associations within the county and city. It is suggested that staff and the Commission meet to discuss the Ordinance before moving forward.

The anticipated completion date of the Ordinance is the end of 2010. The Advisory Committee will be approximately two months, followed by four months of a public comment period. Neighborhood meetings, open houses and focus groups (various stakeholder groups) will be held concurrently with the public comment period. The Planning Commission review will be about one month, to be followed by review by City Council and County Commission.

4. Beth Reiter Retirement

Mr. Coleman formally announced to the public Ms. Reiter's retirement from the MPC, effective April 6, 2010.

Ms. Reiter has worked for the MPC for 24 years as the lead for the Historic Review Department. Mr. Coleman reminded Ms. Reiter of the appreciation and high regard held for her by the community, the MPC, and the Board.

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

Final Minor Subdivision

5. 6210 LaRoche Avenue - Bona Bella 7 Subdivision

Attachment: [TAX MAP_S-100202-88642-1.pdf](#)
Attachment: [ZONING MAP_S-100202-88642-1.pdf](#)
Attachment: [AERIAL MAP_S-100202-88642-1.pdf](#)

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Attachment: [Recorded SD Plat.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Superior Court Order March 21, 2008.pdf](#)

Attachment: [MPC Decision in 1993 - Bona Bella.pdf](#)

Attachment: [03-16-10 STAFF REPORT S-100202-88642-1 Bonna Bella 7](#)

[Subdivision Minor Revision to a Recorded Plat.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Hart Legal Opinion Re; Bonna Bella 7 Subdivision, 6210 LaRoche Avenue, Lot C.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Postpone Item to the April 6, 2010 MPC Meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Ben Farmer

Russ Abolt - Aye

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Aye

Jon Todd - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

6. [131 Hutchinson Island Road SEDA - Hutchinson Island Zoning \(I-H to RIP-B\)](#)

Board Action:

Postpone Item to the April 6, 2010 MPC Meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd

Second: Lacy Manigault

Russ Abolt - Aye

Michael Brown - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Victorian District - Demolition of a Rated Structure

7. 811 W. 37th Street - Demolition

Attachment: [AERIAL_MAP_N-100304-32339-2_.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Application, Applicant's statement and photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Existing condition photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report1.pdf](#)
Attachment: [TAX_MAP_N-100304-32339-2_.pdf](#)
Attachment: [VICINITY_MAP_N-100304-32339-2_.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Postpone Item to the April 6, 2010 MPC Meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd	
Second: Tanya Milton	
Russ Abolt	- Aye
Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

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

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

8. Approval of February 23, 2010 MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

Attachment: [02.23.10 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2.23.10 MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Lacy Manigault

Russ Abolt	- Aye
Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Authorization(s)

9. Adoption of 2010 Work Program

Attachment: [2010 Work Program Memo.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2010 Budget & Work Program.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Staff recommends approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Lacy Manigault

Second: Ellis Cook

Russ Abolt	- Aye
Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

10. 199 E. Lathrop Avenue - Rezoning Request from R-4 to RB-1

Attachment: [Staff Report Lathrop.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Photo.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Photo 2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Zoningmap.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Proposed RB-1 USES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [EXISTING R-4 USES.pdf](#)

199 East Lathrop Avenue

Aldermanic District: 1

County Commission District: 8

Zoning Districts: R-4 to RB-1

Acres: 0.16

PIN(s): 2-0019-09-015, -017, AND -018

A. Fox Construction, Inc., Owner

Wallace Bell, Agent

MPC File No. Z-091217-40110-2

Marcus Lotson, MPC Project Planner. Mr. Lotson stated that the MPC Staff recommends DENIAL of the petition to rezone 199 E. Lathrop from an R-4 zoning classification to an RB-1 zoning classification. The recommendation is based on the adjacency to residential properties, the size of the lot (under one-fifth of an acre), and its inconsistency with the West Savannah Revitalization Plan and the Future Land Use Map. At the last hearing, the Board requested staff to consider other zoning districts and for the petitioner to look into acquiring property across the lane.

Other districts were considered; it was found that RB-1 was the least intensive commercial classification to allow the petitioner to move forward. The petitioner stated acquisition of the property across the lane was in progress; however, MPC staff was not aware of acquisition at the time of this meeting.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Mr. Mackey asked if there was a previous petition where rezoning was requested by a citizen?

Mr. Lotson replied yes; the property in question was on the north side of Richards Street.

Mr. Mackey asked what was the original zoning and the requested, approved zoning?

Mr. Lotson stated that as a part of the West Savannah rezoning, the previously petitioned property, located at 115 Lathrop, was rezoned and the property owner stated she was not aware. It was rezoned as a BG-2 as a compromise to allow her to continue her operation that was already existing.

Mr. Thomson added it was a more intensive commercial or light industrial that was moved to RB-1. After discussion with the property owner, it was moved to BG-2. The goal was to make that corridor RB-1, north of the subject property in this petition. The property owner had a case for BG-2, so we were able to work with them.

Ms. Janice Fox, representing A-Fox Construction, stated door-to-door surveys were conducted of each resident on the street. There was a total of 15 houses and 6 were vacant. Surveys of 7 homes were actually conducted.

Mr. Mackey requested to see copies of the surveys. Ms. Fox provided a copy to the Board.

Ms. Fox stated one of the issues the Board had was whether the petitioner sufficiently contacted each person on the street. She stated they contacted all that were living there. The other issue was whether some were rental. Ms. Fox stated the ones contacted were homeowners, but they were not able to determine the status of the vacant homes. She stated the contacted homeowners strongly recommend the project the petitioner is proposing.

Ms. Fox continued that since the last meeting, the two adjacent properties had been acquired by the petitioner. She stated regarding other zoning opportunities, the petitioner is still requesting RB-1. And they would like to see that happen today and be approved for the other two properties they are acquiring.

Mr. Cook asked if the petitioner has closed on the adjacent properties?

Ms. Fox replied no; they have signed contracts. She stated it is heir property and had a lot of legalities.

Mr. Cook asked when did they anticipate to close on the property?

Ms. Fox replied within the next two months.

Ms. Myers asked if the pending closing would change staff's recommendation?

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Mr. Lotson stated the petition was reviewed as it was presented. The other lots are not a part of the original petition. Without a full review knowing the exact parameters and so forth, that question cannot be answered.

Mr. Thomson informed that much time was spent studying this area. The concern that staff had was that if one of the three lots were rezoned, how the requirements of a site plan could be met for such a small parcel for a commercial use. And, the properties being split by a lane causes an issue for the site planning. If the whole corner of the block down to the next street was obtained, it would create a situation where some of staff's concerns would be alleviated. However, we are returning to the previous zoning where that area was suggested to remain residential.

Mr. Brown stated he believed progress was made and he would not like to simply deny the petition. He stated this is a problem that as we go forward with the Unified Zoning Ordinance, these commercial transitional zones need to be reviewed due to the differing zones on Lathrop. Parts are not a desirable residential situation, yet we don't want to immediately convert that into a comparable heavy commercial use so that it would cause detriment to the people further in. He stated he believes the petitioner is heading in the right direction by expanding the lot size.

Mr. Brown continued he believes a PUD-ISB which would allow for a site plan that allows for the transition to commercial might be appropriate. He stated this has been successful on Stephenson and Waters Avenue, and the houses behind are sufficiently buffered. He suggested that staff work with the petitioner to see what does happen to the lane. If the lane completely abuts the petitioner, we could relinquish it if there are no utilities in the lane. It will continue to be a struggle to get owners or renters to want to front on Lathrop and it may erode. We should not wait until someone can obtain critical mass.

Mr. Pannell asked if this was rezoned knowing the petitioner has the additional properties under contract, but for some reason does not purchase the additional properties under contract, will the petitioner go forward with the commercial development on the corner without those two adjacent lots? Knowing it is not large enough to accommodate the petitioner's goal?

Mr. Aaron Fox, the petitioner, replied he believes they will go forward with it. He reasons that eventually Lathrop will be commercial. Is that what Council is moving towards? He stated he does not see where they are out of line with their request.

Mr. Coleman replied that currently the zoning is as it is. The petitioner is requesting a change of the current zoning. It is not the direction that the Board is looking to take the area; the Board is not looking to change the zoning. We can only review the specifics of your property and your request to rezone at this time. Your argument is being heard during the process.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Ms. Fox asked if we are all moving forward together in revitalization efforts in the target community, why is there such a division? Where is the hardship? Why cannot there be an alliance for future plans?

Mr. Coleman stated the petitioner's request is being taken into consideration and the requirements for development on the property. We do want to see things move forward, but it has to be in context of all information.

Mr. Cook stated he thought the owner of the property would have to petition for rezoning. Though the petitioner has a contract on the property, do they not have to in fact own it in order to request rezoning?

Mr. & Ms. Fox stated they are asking for rezoning only on the property they currently own.

Mr. Mackey asked if the surveys were re-written because they all looked to have the same handwriting.

Ms. Fox stated most of the homeowners surveyed were elderly. She stated the reason their names and phone numbers were provided was in the event verification was necessary. Some were sickly and bedridden and had to have every thing read to them.

Mr. Mackey stated he is very familiar with the neighbors; his office is in the next block. He hopes they will go back and talk with the entire strip because there are names and addresses that he does not see on the survey list.

Ms. Fox stated Mr. Brown said to speak with the residents on the street behind their property and the two houses beside it. There is a business, church and daycare but not a lot of residents further up. They were specifically requested to speak with the residents on the street on the right of their property. We went around the corner because there are properties adjacent to ours from the back.

Mr. Mackey stated there are more residents in the area.

Ms. Myers suggested the petitioner request a continuance until the other properties are actually owned. Then get with staff and return to the Board.

Mr. Lufburrow stated the petitioner does not have to close on the property if they come before the Board with a petition from the property owner of the property they have under contract. It may be that they have a provision that they won't buy the property unless the rezoning can be obtained. As long there is a petition for the adjoining property that is reportedly under contract, it could all be considered together. That would be the proper way to handle it.

Mr. Pannell stated he suggested the same; to return after closing on the property or have the entire parcel including the two under contract rezoned. That may provide a favorable approval by staff. Were there discussions with the MPC staff for a more suitable zoning for the property, as suggested at the last meeting?

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Mr. Fox stated they had not gotten with staff as suggested; we believed parking was the main issue. We believed acquiring the adjacent properties would suffice for parking issues. Now we are being told differently and now we don't know what it is; we aren't being told what it really is.

Mr. Thomson stated it isn't parking as it is the overall size of the parking lot to accommodate whatever use is desired. It isn't a site plan issue right now; it is a zoning issue. He recommended a continuance as well. He stated that staff met at the Board's direction and discussed the options. If there is enough critical mass zoned RB-1, then staff's concerns would be mitigated. If a change was made, what would be the impact isn't much across the street because it's industrial. However, what's next to it is also important, which is residential. You would have residential and non-residential next to each other. He suggested getting with the petitioner and the owners of the other properties and consider rezoning the whole block to RB-1 and have a critical mass. That would open a compatible site.

Mr. Manigault stated the surveys show six with responses and six with none that say vacant. Of the vacant properties, do you have any idea as to who owns the properties?

Ms. Fox stated she pulled up the property owners on the site map the Board of Assessors for the identification of the owners. The next step would be contacting them by mail. That will take additional time. We only had a short period of time before returning to you with some conclusive evidence that we have contacted the residents. Yes, we know who the owners are but we have not contacted all; many of the owners are heirs to the property. It will take time to contact them.

Mr. Farmer stated this is still one-sixth of an acre, as stated at the last meeting. It is totally dependent on getting the other property. This really should not be in discussion until the other owners are here stating they are in favor of rezoning their property the same way. The corner needs to be treated as one parcel; it is too small to address alone.

Ms. Fox stated a signed contract has already been obtained.

Mr. Farmer asked the petitioner to bring them in and that would solve the problem.

Ms. Fox stated because heir property is involved it is not that simple. We are dealing with people in Atlanta; it is not that easy for them to come here.

Mr. Farmer stated they could authorize the petitioner or someone else to petition for them. The owners of the property need to put something before this Board stating they want their properties rezoned.

Ms. Fox stated they are speaking as the property owner's agent.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Mr. Farmer asked if they have power of attorney.

Ms. Fox replied no but they have signed contracts. To be an agent, one does not have to have power of attorney in Georgia. They have given us a verbal agreement and a signed contract stating they know what we are proposing regarding the zoning. We can provide the contact information for them to you. If you need a signed statement in addition to the signed contract, that would have to be our next step. We would just like for the Board to state exactly what is required of the petitioner.

Mr. Farmer stated that information has already been provided.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks the best option for the petitioner is for them to consult with the MPC staff for an outline of what is needed.

Ms. Fox asked if the decision could be exploring rezoning the whole area?

Mr. Fox stated that made more sense to him than anything else.

Mr. Thomson stated that would be a Board decision. If you agree, then let them know that.

Ms. Gloria Edwards, resident of West Savannah, asked if the survey list provided to the Board had her name on it?

Mr. Manigault replied no, unless she owns one of the vacant properties.

Ms. Edwards stated she does not live on Lathrop Avenue or Richards Street but she owns property on Richard Street, which is not vacant. She stated she is not aware of the names on the listing but she is opposed to the rezoning. If the residents on Richard Street were surveyed, there are residents on Lathrop, Love Street, and Cope Street that would be affected by this. All of those people should have been asked. Regarding the vacant houses in that block on Richard Street, there is only one vacant house.

Ms. Pamela Howard-Oglesby, president of the West Savannah Community Organization, stated Ms. Edwards is her vice-president and they have split hairs on this issue. She stated Ms. Edwards may not be aware but directly behind the petitioner's property on Richard Street is a vacant property and another further up the block.

Ms. Howard-Oglesby stated she has had to go door-to-door many times herself and read information to the residents because many of them cannot read. She is certain that was the case with Ms. Fox. She stated she feels Lathrop is in transition and how do long do we have to wait to make a decision. There may be a total of 10 houses fronting Lathrop; two of the houses next to the petitioner's property. She stated she went with the petitioner to speak with the property owner, who did consent to sell his property to the petitioner. But the other property owner is an heir that lives in Atlanta and they are waiting to

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

receive his signed copy.

Ms. Howard-Oglesby stated she is very involved in this project because she wants to see this happen. Lathrop is dying, and the majority of Lathrop is dead. She stated she is willing to take the chance on this project. She said Ms. Edwards stated she has property on Richard Street and that her mother lives there, but Ms. Edwards lives on Chester Street across from Augusta Avenue. Ms. Howard-Oglesby stated she has to speak for the majority of the residents and she's spoken with them. She stated the residents are in favor of the proposed project. No one will want to live on Lathrop; the majority are renters anyway.

Mr. Brown motioned for the MPC staff to work with the petitioner to concur on a land use designation and a general site plan. Also, for staff to look at or address similar situations that may occur in transitional zones.

Mr. Mackey seconded the motion.

Mr. Lufburrow added that he thought it would benefit the petitioner to have some sort of rough site plan to show that if was changed to the requested zoning it could demonstrate usability of the property but not require them to do so.

Mr. Brown affirmed Mr. Lufburrow's statement. He stated he wanted the petitioner to provide an idea of how many parking spaces, how many square feet, what would be in the back; a potential site plan so that it's not rezoned and find only one parking space can fit when 3 may be needed.

Mr. Farmer stated he has no problem with rezoning because the area needs it. He states his problem is rezoning half the corner without knowing that the owner has given authorization. He believes the Board needs to hear from the owner, not for someone to tell them what the owner supposedly stated.

Mr. Brown stated no time frame was set so that whatever needed time would be taken to resolve.

Board Action:

Mr. Brown motioned for staff to work with petitioner and address necessary land used issues, along with possible site plan issues. And for staff to review how the Comprehensive Plan could be strengthened by identifying transitional zones and their land uses and potential site plans. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Michael Brown
Second: Timothy Mackey

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Michael Brown	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

11. 533 East 38th Street (East Broad Lofts - BN and R-4 to PUD)

Attachment: [staff rpt2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [PUD Document.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Master Plan.pdf](#)

533 East 38th Street

East Broad Market, LLC., Owner/Petitioner

Aldermanic District: 2

County Commission District: 2

Zoning Districts: BN and R-4 to PUD

1.60 Acres

PINs: 2-0064-40-013, -014, 2-0064-43-011, -014 thru -017, 2-0075-05-011, 2-0067-39-012, 2-0075-06-002 thru -005, and -017

Robert Isaacson, Agent

MPC File No. Z-091222-62363-2

Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner

Mr. Coleman recused himself from this item. Mr. Pannell chaired the meeting.

Mr. Hansen stated that MPC staff recommended that the zoning request to a PUD classification be approved. The site consists of 14 separate parcels. The intent is to rezone and recombine into single re-developable parcels. The purpose of the PUD will be to allow a mixed use development which consists of multi-family and commercial components. The mixed use areas will allow for commercial uses on the ground floor and an allowance for 10 upper story units to be dispersed at the discretion of the developer. The multi-family site is limited to a total of 36 units. The proposal is consistent with the Future Land Use Map. The petitioner has held neighborhood meetings with the Mid-Town Neighborhood and the Baldwin Park Neighborhood Community; both have expressed support for the project.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Mr. Bob Isaacson, petitioner, stated he would answer any needed questions.

Mr. Farmer motioned to approve staff recommendation.

Mr. Lufburrow seconded the motion.

Board Action:

It is recommended that the zoning request to a PUD classification be approved. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer	
Second: Stephen Lufburrow	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Michael Brown	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Abstain
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

12. Proposed Amendment to MPC Procedural Manual

Attachment: Amendment to Procedural Manual 100316.pdf

Board Action:

It is recommended that the amendment as presented be adopted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Todd	
Second: Jon Pannell	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Michael Brown	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
March 16, 2010 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Not Present
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Jon Todd	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

XII. ADJOURNMENT

13. Submittal

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the March 16, 2010 Regular MPC Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson
Executive Director

/bf

Note: Minutes not official until signed.

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.