



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
April 24, 2012 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

April 24, 2012 Regular MPC Board Meeting

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

Members Not Present: Russ Abolt
Susan Myers
Rochelle Small-Toney

Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director
Melony West, CPA, Director, Finance & Systems
James Hansen, AICP, Director, Development Services
Gary Plumbley, Development Services Planner
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Planner
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant

Advisory Staff Present: Robert Sebek, County Zoning Administrator
Tom Bolton, City Zoning Administrator

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [May 8, 2012 Metropolitan Planning Commission Planning Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)
2. [May 15, 2012 Finance Committee Meeting at 11:30 AM in the West Conference Room](#)
3. [May 15, 2012 MPC Pre-Meeting at 12:30 PM in the Jerry Surrency Room](#)
4. [May 15, 2012 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

Acknowledgement(s)

5. [Receipt of 2011 BRONZE AWARD from the United Way](#)

Attachment: [2011 United Way Award Announcement.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2011 United Way Bronze.pdf](#)

Mr. Thomas Thomson stated he and staff were pleased to be recognized by the United Way. He thanked all staff members for participation and Ellen Harris as campaign chair. He stated this is the fourth year in a row that the MPC goal was met and with 100% participation.

6. [Receipt of 2012 CITYWIDE HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY GRANT](#)

Attachment: [Citywide Historic Resources Survey Grant.pdf](#)

Mr. Thomas Thomson recognized **Ms. Sarah Ward**, who prepared the application submitted by City of Savannah. The City also committed to a local match of the grant through in-kind services.

Information Item(s) for Board Members

7. [Panel Discussion on Archaeology- May 12, 2012 2:00 PM](#)

Attachment: [Archaeology Panel Flyer.pdf](#)

Ms. Ellen Harris stated the panel discussion would be held on May 12, 2012 at 2:00 at Trinity United Methodist Church. She invited all to attend.

V. PRESENTATIONS

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

General Development Plan

8. [Family Dollar 5731 Ogeechee Road General Development Plan](#)

Board Action:	
Postpone Item - May 15, 2012	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Stephen Lufburrow	
Second: Shedrick Coleman	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

General Development Plan / Group Development Plan

9. [Kroger Redevelopment-318 Mall Blvd-General Development Plan / Group Development](#)

Board Action:	
Postpone Item - May 15	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Stephen Lufburrow	
Second: Shedrick Coleman	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye

Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Amended General Development Plan / Group Development Plan

10. [McAlpin Square Kroger Fuel Center](#)

Board Action:

Postpone Item- May 15, 2012 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Not Present

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Not Present

Jon Pannell - Aye

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Not Present

Joseph Welch - Aye

Tower - New Facility/Nonconcealed Freestanding-Monopole

11. [Proposed Southbridge Tower](#)

Attachment: [Southbridge Hearing Continuance Req.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Postpone Item - May 15, 2012 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt - Not Present

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

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

12. 12206, 12208, and 12217 Navajo Road - P-B-C and PUD-B-C classifications to PRM-15 classification

Board Action:	
Postpone Item - May 15, 2012	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Stephen Lufburrow	
Second: Shedrick Coleman	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
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

Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

13. [April 3, 2012 MPC Meeting and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04.03.12 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [04.03.12 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Tanya Milton

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Not Present

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Not Present

Jon Pannell - Aye

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Not Present

Joseph Welch - Aye

Authorization(s)

14. [Supplemental Agreement with Jacobs Engineering Group on SR 204 Corridor Study](#)

Attachment: [Thomson Planning Commission SR 204 Corridor Study Supplemental Agreement for Public Involvement 4-24-2012.pdf](#)

Board Action:

For approval of the resolution of authorization. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

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

15. [Supplemental Agreement with Wilbur Smith Associates on US 80 Bridges Study](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission TThomson Memo Authorization for US 80 Supplemental 1 WSA 4-24-2012.pdf](#)

Board Action:	
For approval of the resolution of authorization.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Ben Farmer	
Second: Shedrick Coleman	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Amended General Development Plan

16. [Georgetown Square Shopping Center](#)

Attachment: [General Development Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Miscellaneous.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report 04-24-12.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The MPC staff recommends **approval** of an Amended General Development Plan. Staff further recommends **approval** of the requested 28 off-street parking variance a 35 foot drive aisle/parking encroachment variance into the 35 foot setback along Abercorn Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell
Second: Shedrick Coleman

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

Final Minor Subdivision

17. [Turners Rock Minor Subdivision](#)

Attachment: [SD Plat.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Miscellaneous.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report 04-24-12.pdf](#)

Board Action:

The MPC staff recommends **approval** of a variance to allow the creation of a new lot on an unpaved substandard access way and the proposed Minor Subdivision. - PASS

Vote Results

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

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

18. [5850 Ogeechee Road - R-A classification to B-C classification](#)

Attachment: [staff rpt 5850 Ogeechee.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Use Comparison.pdf](#)

Mr. Florida Hunt, representing Bethel Missionary Baptist Church, asked what is the business classification trying to be obtained.

Mr. Hansen replied it is to be B-C zoning.

Board Action:

Approval of the request to rezone a portion of the subject property from an R-A zoning classification - PASS to a P-B-C zoning classification.

Vote Results

Motion: Jon Pannell	
Second: Shedrick Coleman	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye

Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Not Present
Jon Pannell	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

Zoning Petition - Text Amendment

19. [Amend Sections 7-3. C\(5\) and 7-3 D\(3\) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance \(allow electronic signs\)](#)

Attachment: [STAFF RPT SIGN AMENDMENT 2012.pdf](#)

Text Amendment to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance
Amend Section 7-3.C(5) and 7-3. D(3) Sign Standards Restricted Signs) and
(Announcement Sign Requirements)
Proposal to Allow Electronic Announcement Signs In Certain Zoning Districts,
Subject to Limitations
MPC File No. Z-120404-62747-1

Mr. Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request. Staff recommends **approval** of the request to amend Sections 7-3 C.(5) and 7-3 D.(3) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance to allow electronic announcement signs subject to limitations. The County does not allow such signs currently except for hotels. This amendment will allow electronic signs in any commercial district and the C-A district, subject to limitations. The size will be limited to 32' to 52', depending upon street classification. It will be allowed to change copy once every 24 hours and the emitting light can be no more 30 foot candles with no animation, revolving or flashing.

Board Action:

Approval of the request to amend Sections 7-3 C.
(5) and 7-3 D.(3) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance to allow electronic announcement signs subject to limitations. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Shedrick Coleman

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

20. [Amend Article K, Section 8-3124 - Traditional Neighborhood - 2 \(TN-2\) of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [STAFF RPT 62503.pdf](#)

Text Amendment - City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance
Amend Article K, Section 8-3124
Principal Uses in the TN-2 District
Clarify Use Conditions on Corner Lots
MPC File No. Z-120404-62503-2

Mr. Jim Hansen, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request. Staff recommendation is to **approve** of the request to amend Article K, Section 8-3124 -Traditional Neighborhood - 2 (TN-2) to clarify the use conditions relating to corner lots. An area resident brought to the attention of the MPC that two of the conditions to be carried forward were inadvertently omitted.

Mr. Mackey asked if that portion of the writing would apply to Russo's.

Mr. Hansen stated it was the genesis of the amendment. This particular amendment will not impact the Russo's property at all. The purpose building and 5,000 square foot minimum was inadvertently admitted by MPC and Council.

Mr. Mackey asked if it was omitted yet part of the original language, what is there to adopt. He stated it sounds like new language to him.

Mr. Hansen stated it is not new language; it existed prior to 2007. We are just restoring the language back.

Mr. Mackey asked where did the omission take place.

Mr. Thomson replied it was by staff draft; the format was changed and the two items were not recognized as omitted. It was then adopted in that format. The omission was then noticed. We are now bringing it back in a new and clearer format to include what should have already been there since 2004/2005.

Mr. Mackey asked if something or someone slipped through since the omission.

Mr. Hansen replied no, to his knowledge. This is preemptive; no problems have yet occurred.

Mr. Marshall stated his concern that someone may have purchased property thinking this was the correct law. Notification should be given and he recommended not voting today.

Mr. Thomson stated the legal requirement has been met.

Mr. Hansen stated it was published in the paper with no opposition received. Text amendments are not required to be mailed because all text amendments apply to all particular zoned properties that the text amendment impacts. This one would potentially impact all T-N-2 properties. The legal requirement was met.

Mr. Marshall stated because it took two and a half years, there must have been more to it. He feels we owe the people that may have thought the 2007 adoption was correct a notification before the vote.

Mr. Farmer stated he agreed; it makes him uncomfortable without notification.

Mr. Hansen stated it did not take two and half years. This is part of the Mid-City Thomas Square Zoning Action; the planning process took that span of time to complete.

Mr. Coleman stated the procedure for text amendments need to be adhered. This action may set a precedent for subsequent others regarding notifications. It needs to be consistent.

Mr. Mackey stated since we are in the midst of considering a document that could possibly change everything, Mr. Marshall's suggestion would be appropriate.

Mr. Coleman stated every text amendment changes everything.

Mr. Pannell asked who would be noticed for this.

Mr. Hansen stated a list could be generated on the corner lots of the four streets zoned T-N-2. He stated he hopes this would not set a precedent, but on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Ragsdale reiterated that this would be specifically for corner structures in T-N-2 that are purpose built non-residential from the south of Victory Drive to the north of Anderson Lane.

Board Action:

Postpone to May 15 to allow time to notify applicable residents. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Timothy Mackey

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

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

21. [Unified Zoning Ordinance Case Studies](#)

Attachment: [UZO Case Studies Memo.pdf](#)

Attachment: [615 Montgomery St Rezoning.pdf](#)

Attachment: [239 Stephenson Avenue Site Plan.pdf](#)

Present: Welch, Lufburrow, Farmer, Cook, Manigault, Ragsdale, Coleman, Pannell, Milton, Marshall

Absent: Small-Toney; Abolt; Myers

Late/Left Early: Mackey (entered hearing room at 2:00 p.m.; left before UZO case studies)

UZO Discussion Time: Began (?); Ended (3:30 p.m.)

Regular Meeting [Case Studies]

615 Montgomery Street Rezoning Case Study [Jim Hansen]

This case study discussion led into a discussion of the UZO review process before the second case study was presented. The UZO draft review discussion was not an agenda item. Discussion on the Montgomery Street case study previous to the UZO comments below is not provided.

Farmer: I was one of the ones who wanted a random selection of comparisons and was pushing for that. I appreciate the fact that you did that. What I did not consider at the time was something that was insignificant, if I can use that word, because there is such an insignificant difference between all three that it's almost that it wouldn't matter anyway. I think our intent...we might have put under a directive that you couldn't follow. Our intent was to ask you to pull some comparisons that might show significant changes or differences or similarities; your attempt to pull something randomly is not much difference at all. It was a cream-puff case essentially. I don't know that we can really benefit, but it's not your fault. I'm just saying it's not what I had in mind.

Thomson: Two things. One: I think you are thinking of a case the chairman mentioned that was down at Gaston or Montgomery or something. The discussion of parking was a different site. The point about BC and BC-1 was all about parking. Your point about randomness...we had that very same discussion with Charlotte, Amanda and Jim and I and Geoff. The item that we pulled up randomly was not relevant to our intent. If you change your direction, we can pick things that are more interesting in terms of the comparison, we'd be free to do that. But right now we picked random stuff that turned out the way it was. And, frankly, given the direction we got I wasn't about to [Farmer begins speaking].

Farmer: You followed the direction to a 'T'. At the time I didn't realize that it would give us a situation that would give us an insignificant case. In other words I don't know that it's worth the time talking about this case. It's much ado about nothing. I wish we could have established some parameters, with staff's recommendation, that would be helpful. For example, situations where you might be doing something like reducing a zoning classification and reducing uses within that classification. I guess we didn't know what we were asking for Mr. Thomson. Maybe we should be the ones asking for recommendations to cover these issues.

Thomson: Trust staff. We'll bring back to you a cross-section. . .some could be hypothetical...we don't do a lot of down-zoning. But we do propose some changes in zoning that may be positive even though they might be viewed as a down-zoning. We can do hypothetical and we can do actual case studies. And we think that we understand enough about your interests that we can come back with the kinds of things that would be more applicable to the kinds of things that you are looking for. If we don't, then you can give us a new direction. That would be my suggestion.

Ragsdale: Mr. Pannell?

Pannell: In staff's defense at the last work session of the UZO, we gave them the direction to pick random cases. There was concern out of several members that they are going to cherry-pick it; that they are going to pick case studies that only show that the UZO is a good thing. In staff's defense they are trying to select random cases. Mr. Hansen qualified it as purely random so maybe we as a Board need to think about that. Do we want to a complete kind of random 'go pick something' for the meeting? Or do we want to have more direction and parameters on these case studies? I think these case studies are good.

Even if it is a cream puff, it shows you that it might be better under the UZO because they wouldn't have to come to this board; the use is already allowed. And when looking at this matrix, if you look at parking, there is really not a whole lot of difference. It's kind of a good thing. I'm open to allowing staff to use their discretion in bringing more relevant case studies to us. Hopefully, they are not going to cherry pick them so that everything looks like it's great under the new ordinance.

Ragsdale: Mr. Lufburrow.

Lufburrow: Perhaps the chairman could appoint a small committee, including Mr. Farmer and a few others who might could...when staff picks the cases...staff could consult with the parameters and give staff a little bit of cover.

Ragsdale: Are you volunteering to lead that group?

Lufburrow: Not at all. Maybe Mr. Farmer would.

Ragsdale: Mr. Coleman.

Coleman: I agree Mr. Pannell. Either we give direction to staff on what we are looking for them to bring to us or...because we directed them—and “we” isn't everybody—there are certain questions that have been raised. If we want to see certain things identified as potential issues, they need that direction or continue to allow them to be random and see what rolls out of it. I think there is good and bad that comes out of a random situation. As petitions come to us they are random. We don't know what a petition will. So I think the random issue is fine. This just happens to be one that turned out the way it is. Or the committee is a good way as an alternative.

Farmer: I would volunteer to be on that committee, but I would like to have at least a couple more members...at least a three person committee where somebody could break a vote.

Ragsdale: I think it's a good idea. I'll get with Mr. Thomson after this meeting and discuss how to do this. Mr. Cook?

Cook: From what I'm hearing, I think Mr. Farmer is asking for cases for properties that would be adversely affected by implementation of UZO instead of properties like this one that really wouldn't make a difference.

Farmer: No, it's not. I might have made it sound that way. I confuse myself sometimes. I'm really not looking ones where there is an adverse affect. However, I know there are some that are going to be adverse to a greater degree whereas in this case, it would have very little effect. I also don't mind finding out if it's going to be beneficial. I'm very concerned about the private property owners and how it will affect the use of the property they bought and the nonconforming use situation that may result. I am concerned about anything that will have a detrimental effect on anybody's property right-just like the text amendment awhile ago. But I think that if we had an opportunity for two or three of us to get together with the staff, I believe that we could come up with parameters that are a little more extensive. We at least could say that here are some in favor of UZO, maybe some that are aren't, we could hear both sides. I know that there are a lot of people on staff who have spent a lot of time on this thing...I just want to make sure that we have oversight. I would be happy to serve on the committee with two other members or however many you want to put on there Mr. Chairman. I think it's a good idea.

Ragsdale: Mr. Manigault?

Manigault: With all the discussion on this item, this is something that should be done at a planning meeting. We should not be discussing this kind of item here, that's why we have planning meetings. That was one of the things we discussed, that the planning meeting would give us the opportunity to take up items like this—especially you, Ben—you mentioned that—and that was one of the items. We had a planning meeting scheduled but no one could attend. So now we're talking about it an open meeting and that does not satisfy the problem. Because we have spent 20 minutes on it and nothing has been decided yet.

Ragsdale: I think we're also to be reminded that planning meetings are for more relaxed and open forum for discussion. But we also wanted to bring to the public meetings case-by-case studies that could be vetted in the public process but limited to the discussion.

Ragsdale: Mr. Marshall?

Marshall: Several months ago I made the request of staff that we take the proposed zoning ordinance and marry it to the existing zoning. All of the rules that we're operating under. We spent a lot of time; we continue to spend a lot of time doing different things, talking about the proposed changes. Is anything being done to give us a text book of 'here's what we have on the books that as law, and here's what we are proposing?', page one through page 5,000, whatever it happens to be.

Ragsdale: My recollection from the last planning meeting we had where that was discussed thoroughly was that at the planning meetings we would chapter-by-chapter, page-by-page analysis of the proposed draft UZO. I don't recall ever saying that we'd do a side-by-side, that we would create a document that was a bullet-by-bullet, strikethrough, redline, whatnot of the existing zoning ordinances.

Marshall: Maybe my brain just dreamed it. Going back early in my tenure here, which I think was initially September, I have three, four maybe five times asked for this, and I am a bit perturbed that we're marching down a path to develop a document that the general public is supposed to be able to read without having to hire lawyers. But we are not spending the time to generate a document that will make it easy for somebody to see 'here's what's on the books and here's what's being proposed,' and I'm not asking for something that's not done with documents all day every day. But it takes time to do it. It will take more time now because we didn't start out that way. But I want to make a motion that staff generate a document that staff takes the law that's on the books now and marry UZO, or whatever is proposed to be changed to that document.

Ragsdale: We have a motion.

Farmer: Second.

Ragsdale: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion. Mr. Pannell?

Pannell: I'd like to ask staff...it's my understanding that in these work sessions that Mr. Marshall's request is really not possible. Am I incorrect, Mr. Thomson?

Thomson: It's very difficult. And what we tried to express at the workshop was we can go down that path and staff would spend all its resources for eight months to a year to produce the document like that. Or, which we believe - my sense of the direction, that we

got at the last workshop is what the chairman said: 'Let's spend our time looking through the document.' As we go through it we'll discuss those things that are brought forward from the old ordinances and those things that are new. Because it really doesn't matter what was, in my opinion, I want to emphasize this. What matters is what's on the page when we get done. So we should focus on what's on the page and make sure it's right and move forward. I strongly urge the Commission to continue on the path that was recommended at the end of the last workshop. Otherwise I think the staff will have a great deal of difficulty functioning.

Pannell: I guess I'm not as concerned as it being difficult for staff because this is a dramatic change. If that's what we need to do, maybe we need to do it. But as a follow up, you guess that it would take 8-12 months to develop something like that? With full-time staff resources? In my opinion that's a waste of staff resources. Again, I know this is a dramatic change but I don't know about spending a year just to have a comparison, if that an effective use of staff time.

Thomson: I think it's more effective to sit down with the Commission and turn the pages and have discussions until done. And we can take that same amount of time but at the end of it we'll have a document whereas the other will be starting again. It's very difficult. Staff would spend all of its resources preparing that document. As we go through it, we'll identify those things that need discussion.

Farmer: To continue our discussion of the motion, one thing that concerns me that we all can't remember what was said. There are 10 different versions, and we record these things. Don't know how good recordings are, but I want to go back to a couple of them because I keep hearing things that "no, we agreed to that, yes, we did..." I thought that I suffer from the same thing. I would like to go back and see if we are doing what we said that we are going to do because we can't agree on what we said we were going to do. Whether we passed that motion or not, I think it's something we should consider. I might want to go back and listen to some of these meetings if I'm going to be looking forward on these committees and see what we agreed to do. And then we can kind of decide what we've already decided because we keep re-deciding and redefining the problem and redefining the issues. [mentioned employee who was late as an analogy...some people in denial about what happens...recording is proof.] So we can go back to what was said and don't have to rely on memories. I would like to listen to what we've been covering since last December. We've decided a lot of this stuff already. If he's remembering that we decided to that...I kind of remember the same thing.

Ragsdale: Are you speaking with regard to a specific meeting?

Farmer: I seconded the motion because I might want to go back to the tapes. We keep redefining the problems. I'd like to go back to hear what we've been covering since last December. That's when we began to get bogged down. At our last big meeting we realized that we're trying to do a lot of things and it's difficult to do without the zoning administrators and attorneys. Then we have one of the attorneys retiring. We're trying to make decisions with pieces of the puzzle that aren't there. Our last meeting we even decided at the point—a directive that we gave you all that didn't work as well as we wanted—but I'm speaking going back to the meeting at the first of December where we were trying to wrap our hands around where to go from here. I could go either way with this motion. I will say that if I vote against this motion it's only because it might be a little premature until we get more information.

Ragsdale: I appreciate your concerns. I think all of us probably have different understandings, maybe the majority, one way or another, of what our direction was from the Board to the staff.

Marshall: I didn't set the agenda for today, but I think it's appropriate to point something out. We delayed earlier today for staff to notify a neighborhood on corner lots on a change that was done that was obviously not done the way I think this change should be done. Because if it had been formatted the way I'm talking about, then the two items or the categories that I'm talking about that were left off the 2007 would have jumped off the page at us, and whoever was sitting here. I deal with this stuff all the time, ya'll, and it just defies reason that you would...that even staff would have started down this road five, six, seven years ago without realizing that unless it's married to what is on the books it is almost impossible—and I'll going ahead and say it's impossible-without millions of dollars in man hours to figure out what the changes are to make sure that you haven't overlooked something. And for that reason—it's right there—we deferred it. It happened. I wasn't here. Some of you were here. It's going to happen unless you do: 'a is changed to b; b is changed to c'...all the way through the document.

Ragsdale: Mr. Coleman.

Coleman: I defer, Mr. Chairman. Nothing to add.

Ragsdale: Any further discussion or questions? Mr. Marshall would you please restate your motion?

Marshall: Motion restated. That staff generate a document that marries the proposal, proposed changes on the UZO to the current ordinances and manual and procedures that are proposed to be changed, page-by-page, item-by-item, line-by-line, strikeout and add-in. I know it's going to be time consuming. But it's going to take...and I'm digressing from the motion...people are individually hiring lawyers right now because they think UZO is moving forward even though UZO is not stopped, it is going through a much deeper evaluation process. The Chamber of Commerce, SEDA, Homebuilder's Association, the Real Estate Board all have attorneys that have spent many, many hours and billed for those hours to those associations to try to figure out what UZO is doing. That is a complete waste. We owe it to the public. We owe it each of those bodies for staff to generate the document so that it's easy.

Ragsdale: Thank you. Murray, do you have what you need? Can we have a motion and second that discussion is complete? You may now vote.

Ragsdale: The motion is defeated.

[VOTE: 3-7. Farmer, Manigault, Marshall voted in favor of the motion.]

Manigault: Mr. Chairman?

Ragsdale: Yes, Mr. Manigault?

Manigault: May I ask a question of the Finance Committee? Did we once discuss that we have to go back to the city and county for more money for the UZO?

Thomson: Yes, is the easy answer. We have not going back for money for production; we've asked for notice money for individual property owners. I think its \$90-100K for

individual notice. County approved through budget amendment. City Manager has passed it along to City Council...gives me an indication that it's not. May have to reevaluate the costs. Mentioned pressure of staff issues...fewer people to do more work...levels to remain for next year or two.

Pannell: To clarify for the public, what we decided at the last Planning Commission meeting, or at least what I or my understanding, what we decided at the last Planning Commission meeting was to schedule future planning commission meetings to go through this document section-by-section to ask staff and to understand it, but then in these planning meetings to have these case studies. The whole idea behind these case studies... since it is a public forum...is to give the public an idea of what would be different. I think that's what we still need to do. My personal feeling is that's what we still need to continue with the planning meeting and go through the document over the next several months, and then during the open meetings do case study. If there is a better idea I'm all for it. It sounds as if there isn't a way for staff to do it...Just for the public's benefit and the commissioners who weren't here. We are not trying to cram a new document down anyone's throat. Do our due diligence and re-evaluate and figure out what we need to do.

Ragsdale: I appreciate Mr. Marshall bringing this forward. That's his prerogative. Wants to move forward with consensus where they want to go.

Farmer: I do get frustrated by people who come in and out of meetings, and who are late. We're trying to make very serious decisions and we have no legal counsel or enforcement present. It's not because they didn't want to be here...there have to be certain people in play at these meetings, or we aren't going to accomplish anything...and then we are going to stall. Need guidelines about who will be there. Somebody needs to say that legal staff, enforcement staff and engineering staff from city and county need to be at the meetings. How can we make decisions about things that we aren't qualified to talk about and can't get input?

Ragsdale: Asked Thomson to talk about legal representation.

Thomson: We are in the process of inviting both attorneys and we've had informal conversations. Hart would be happy to come, but he has a lot going on. Suggested that board accumulate concerns and a list of questions, and every so often he will attend. Will invite other staff as well.

Farmer: Let's have one consensus...let's have them all at one meeting. I think we can wrangle that one way or another. And then let's discuss amongst ourselves with them..and let us decide together how they would like to be involved and we can best use their services. Because I have no idea how Mr. Sebek feels about this process, and he's enforcement. I have no idea about what the city or county engineer feel about this process. But you know what? I'd sure like to hear about it because we're basically running around in circles chasing our tails. If nothing else I would like to challenge you to see if we can't set a time and get as many people as possible to come in here and give us two hours of their time.

Ragsdale: I think it's a legitimate request because we haven't been able to get them to come to any of our meetings. I think they should come to at least one with enough advance notice. I understand their concerns about having questions in front of them, but we don't know how to formulate the questions because we don't represent the people who are going to own the document.

Coleman: Who are we asking two hours attendance? Because there hasn't been a meeting here yet that has been worth two hours of anyone's time.

Farmer: They can block out an afternoon for us.

Cook: Assume that this would include Chamber of Commerce, the Homebuilder's...

Ragsdale: No.

Farmer: No. The City and County.

Thomson: What if we had an Attorney Day, Engineer Day, an Enforcer Day so that each of the groups would not be overwhelmed by the other groups there? They could focus their attention.

Farmer: Are you talking two months down the road?

Thomson: Well, you know, a number of workshops. You said something that is extremely important...my staff and I wanted to bring up the next workshop. It's my opinion that if we don't have 11 of the board members for any workshop, everyone is wasting their time. We can't accomplish anything if we don't have a critical mass. What happens is at the next workshop we revisit the previous workshop's issues. I don't want to be too critical here in public, but that's why I had to cancel the last meeting.

Farmer: I'm asking for a super-committee. I don't think you have a bad idea. I'd like to see everybody in one room. If there is time to have a quick quorum to find out what we need from each other and what they can give to us, and then we might go into these focused meetings after they have an idea what we are looking for. We have to have a starting point..we don't have one. We keep kicking the can down the road. We've got to go forward with this thing one way or the other.

Thomson: Understood. Can we put something on the agenda on May 8 meeting that organizes all of that, then I can work on a date? The next scheduled one is June.

Pannell: At the last planning meeting there was to be a Draft 2. Can we have Draft 2 for May 8? And that can be the agenda. The lawyers, engineers are here...here's what we're doing.

Thomson: Well, we can do that.

Farmer: I think what you're recommending for the May 8 meeting is to decide what we want to ask all of these people. The first thing I'd recommend is getting a hold of all of these players and giving them a couple of dates ahead of time so that they can block out their calendar. We've got to get a commitment from everybody before we come back here because it's very frustrating.

Ragsdale: I think that can go on the heels on issuing Draft 2 to not only the commission but to the governing bodies. "Here's Draft 2 on 'X' date, on 'X' date certain two months from now we will have a meeting, and we expect your attendance to hear your concerns.

Thomson: We don't have the entire Draft 2 ready to release yet. We have, I think chapters one and two that were going to be on the next agenda. We'd like to release Draft 2 on the Internet so that everyone can see it concurrent with what the Board is doing. Uh, but we're

not quite there yet..but we could be soon..another week or so of work, so... I think we have some pretty clear direction to get us to May 8.

Farmer: Do you have this recorded?

Thomson: Yes, we do. We listen to it carefully and follow it. We will send out minutes going back to November...official minutes...and if somebody wants to listen to a tape we can arrange for it to be done. It's really hard to listen to.

Ragsdale: Any other discussion for today's commission meeting?

Thomson: Do you want to hear the other case study?

Ragsdale: I would like to hear it.

Moore: We can do that. The discussion that you just had was not part of a motion. Should it be, so we can make certain that it's absolutely correct what was agreed upon? Or do you feel that the intent was clear enough?

Ragsdale: I think the intent was clear enough. Is anyone not clear on what we just discussed? I think we're fine without a motion. I appreciate you bringing that up. Alright, let's hear the next case.

Farmer: And don't forget your committee appointments.

Ragsdale: It's high on my list.

[Case Study for 239 Stephenson Avenue Site Development Plan began; did not provide that discussion in this document.]

Board Action:

STAFF - Marry the proposed UZO changes to the the current document, for line by line comparisons. - FAIL

Vote Results

Motion: Murray Marshall

Second: Ben Farmer

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Nay

Ellis Cook - Nay

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Not Present

Timothy Mackey - Nay

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Nay

Susan Myers - Not Present

Jon Pannell - Nay

Adam Ragsdale	- Nay
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Nay

XII. ADJOURNMENT

XIII. DEVELOPMENT PLANS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

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

Attachment: [DEVELOPMENT REVIEW CASE LOG 042412.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.