



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
April 3, 2012 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

April 3, 2012 Regular MPC Board Meeting

Members Present: J. Adam Ragsdale, Chairman
Tanya Milton, Treasurer
Russ Abolt
Shedrick Coleman
Ben Farmer
Stephen Lufburrow
Timothy Mackey
Lacy Manigault
Murray Marshall
Susan Myers
Rochelle Small-Toney
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: Jon Pannell, Vice-Chairman
Ellis Cook, Secretary
Shedrick Coleman

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
Geoff Goins, Development Services Planner
Christy Adams, Director, Administration
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant
Shanale Booker, IT Assistant
Sarah Ward, Director of Historic Preservation
Mark Wilkes, Director of Transportation
Michael Adams, Transportation Planner
Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner

Advisory Staff Present: Robert Sebek, County Zoning Administrator

Tiras Pitrea, City Zoning Administrator

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notice(s)

1. [April 10, 2012 Metropolitan Planning Commission Planning Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)
2. [April 24, 2012 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

V. PRESENTATIONS

3. [Savannah Under Fire, 1779: Expanding the Boundaries. Archaeology in Savannah by Rita Elliot, The LAMAR Institute](#)

Attachment: [Savannah Under Fire 1779 Expanding the Boundaries.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Thomson Planning Commission Archaeology Presentations 032212.pdf](#)

Mr. Ragsdale introduced Ms. Rita Elliot, Education Coordinator and Research Associate of the LAMAR Institute, prior to her presentation. Ms. Elliot was also Curator of Exhibits and Archaeology at the Coastal Heritage Society, with 25 years of museum exhibit and archaeological experience in 11 states, the Caribbean, and 3 U.S. territories in several countries.

Ms. Rita Elliot presented her visual presentation of archaeology in Savannah.

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

General Development Plan

4. [Kroger Foodstore Redevelopment - 318 Mall Blvd-General Development Plan](#)

Board Action:

WITHDRAW

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Lacy Manigault

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

5. [March 13, 2012 MPC Meeting and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [03.13.12 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [03.13.12 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

Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye

Jon Pannell	- Not Present
Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Russ Abolt	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present

Authorization(s)

6. [SR 204 Corridor Study Supplemental Agreement](#)

Attachment: [Thomson Planning Commission SR 204 Corridor Study Supplemental Agreement for Public Involvement 4-3-2012.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve. - PASS

Vote Results

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

7. [Authorization for Executive Director to execute Supplemental Agreement for US 80 Bridges Replacement Study](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission TThomson Authorization for US 80 Supplemental #4.pdf](#)

Board Action:

For approval of resolution for authorization. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

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

Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Map Amendment

8. [4524 Ogeechee Road - Commercial-Suburban and Res.-Suburban SF to Industry-Light](#)

Attachment: [Comp Plan Amendment.pdf](#)
Attachment: [FUTURE LAND USE_MAP.pdf](#)

Board Action:

It is recommended that the request to amend the Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan Future Development Map for the property located at 4524 Ogeechee Road from the Commercial-Suburban and Residential-Suburban Single-Family classifications to the Industry-Light classification be **approved**. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Lacy Manigault
Second: Stephen Lufburrow

Russ Abolt	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Jon Pannell	- Not Present

Adam Ragsdale	- Aye
Rochelle Small-Toney	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

9. [Zoning 4524 Ogeechee Road - B-G, C-A, PUD-B-R, P-B-C and P-I-L to P-B-C and P-I-L](#)

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

Board Action:

Staff recommends that the request to zone the subject properties from a B-G, C-A, PUD-B-R, P-B-C, and P-I-L classification to a P-B-C and P-I-L classification be **approved**. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow
Second: Tanya Milton

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

Victorian District - New Construction

10. [Petition of Matthew Allen, File No. N-120131-56189-2, New Construction at 505 East Waldburg Street](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
Attachment: [AERIAL_MAP.pdf](#)
Attachment: [VICINITY_MAP.pdf](#)
Attachment: [ZONING_MAP.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for new construction of the two-story single-family dwelling as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Susan Myers

Russ Abolt - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Not Present

Ellis Cook - Not Present

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

11. [Amended Petition of Paul McKeever, File No. N-120131-55786-2, New construction at 306 West Waldburg Street](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Amended Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previously Approved Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for new construction of the two-story single-family residence and one-story garage as amended. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Susan Myers

Russ Abolt - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Not Present

Ellis Cook - Not Present

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Aye

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

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

12. [3311 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard Rezoning R-6 to B-N](#)

Attachment: [Use Tables.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [3311 MLK Photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [3311 MLK Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Currently Allowed Uses.pdf](#)

3311 Martin Luther King JR. Boulevard
Rezoning Request

PIN: 2-0091-04-020
D. Kaufman Construction Group LLC., Owner
Douglas Kaufman, Agent

Aldermanic District: 5
County Commission District: 5
Zoning District: R-6
Acres: Approximately 0.09

The petitioner is requesting to rezone the subject property from R-6 to B-N

MPC File No. Z-120228-37176-2

Mr. Marcus Lotson, MPC Project Planner stated this item was continued from the March 13, 2012 MPC hearing. This was to allow time for staff to study alternate business zoning classifications requested by the applicant for the subject property. Staff was also directed to study the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and Montgomery Street Corridor Redevelopment Plan to ascertain any relevant references to the subject property and adjacent neighborhood. The zoning ordinance was also to be re-reviewed, particularly the R-B-1 (residential business zoning) and make a determination on the viability of that district for the subject property.

Staff review indicates the intensity of uses allowed in R-B-1 is less than the allowance under the B-N classification. However, the site at approximately 4,000 square feet with an existing building of approximately 2,600 does not meet several other development standards typically required of a commercial

use. Maintaining the current non-conforming status and its allowed uses is the most appropriate way to manage the potential impacts of expanded commercial use. The subject property has contained a commercial structure since the early 1950's and was developed prior to zoning. The property was subsequently zoned R-6.

The intent of the non-conforming status is to allow the use to continue operating legally with by-right uses, and allow opportunity for redevelopment to a conforming status, should the non-conforming uses cease to exist. The property may continue to be used legally with commercial uses by-right; if the property ceases to be used for one year, the approval of the City Zoning Board of Appeals will be required. The Board of Appeals has reviewed previous non-conformities and determining appropriateness for reinstatement on a case-by-case basis.

The site is currently unable to meet a number of development standards. The property owner has attempted to establish off-street parking on an adjacent lot, but the property owner does not own the lot nor does it meet the minimum standards associated with off-street parking. Based on these findings, staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of **denial** to the Mayor and Aldermen for their consideration on the requested action to rezone the subject property from an R-6 classification to a B-N classification as it has been for the past 50 years.

Mr. Farmer asked what part of the building did the City pay \$2,000 for improvements.

Mr. Lotson replied to his understanding it was for facade improvement.

Ms. Small-Toney asked if that was through SDRA.

Mr. Lotson confirmed.

Mr. Farmer asked if that was in 2002.

Mr. Lotson it was when the MLK Corridor plan was adopted by the City.

Mr. Farmer asked if the building was being used for commercial purposes.

Mr. Lotson stated it has been for many years, at least since 1950, prior to zoning.

Mr. Farmer asked if the area was likely to lean towards residential or commercial development.

Mr. Lotson replied some properties along MLK, if redeveloped, are more likely to become commercial. However, as it exists today, there are quite a number of homes in vicinity of the subject property.

Mr. Farmer mentioned the Neal Blun portion of SCAD, the Dollar Store, and

proposal on West Victory. One sees a lot of commercial and light industrial in that area.

Mr. Lotson agreed. He stated also that everything on the block of the subject property is a home, with the exception of one vacant building, and everything behind the subject property is zoned residential. There is a B-C property currently under development across the street.

Mr. Farmer asked if the SCAD property is within walking distance of the subject property.

Mr. Lotson replied yes.

Mr. Farmer asked if a lot of the non-conforming uses include walk-up type services.

Mr. Lotson stated a lot of the uses under the non-conforming status currently allowed includes things like personal services.

Mr. Farmer asked what would happen to the building if it were destroyed while under the non-conforming use status.

Mr. Lotson replied it would not be allowed to be rebuilt as a commercial structure under the current zoning.

Mr. Farmer asked if the property was large enough for a residential structure.

Mr. Lotson replied it would more than likely require additional property pending on the housing type. It would be difficult.

Mr. Farmer asked if he tried to expand for parking using an adjacent lot, would that be allowed.

Mr. Lotson replied no.

Mr. Farmer stated it appears to him that a non-conforming use is not feasible for the petitioner since it has not posed any type of threat to the neighborhood in the past 60 years nor currently. It is not fair to him to have no security in the zoning of the subject property and continue to operate in a non-conforming use though used for many years as a commercial property. The City gave the petitioner funds to improve the structure as a commercial property. He feels the petitioner should have the B-N zoning so the petitioner can move forward because he does not foresee the area going residential.

Mr. Lotson agreed that the property has historically existed as a commercial use without causing a problem. The aspect that staff has concerns with, is if the commercial use is given, what potentially may occur. If it were to become a restaurant, would it be able to supply off-street parking. Under the current use, it would not be.

Mr. Farmer stated that would not change if it was rezoned B-N or if it remained as it is.

Mr. Lotson replied no, but currently the Zoning Board of Appeals has the ability to look at a case and determine if the proposed use is appropriate considering there is adjacent residential.

Mr. Farmer stated it is almost impossible to use that property as residential. This property is basically an island. It is not fair to him. He stated he believes the City had to have some sort of conversation with the petitioner regarding the funds for the facade for the commercial use. The evidence indicates it is heading toward commercial or industrial.

Mr. Lotson stated he spoke with the petitioner and stated he understood the intensity of the B-N zoning. He believes the petitioner will request R-B-1.

Mr. Ragsdale asked if the intent of the SDRA Facade Improvement Program is solely for commercial or residential or any use?

Mr. Lotson replied it was for uses within the redevelopment area as identified by the Plan.

Ms. Small-Toney stated the Facade Improvement Program is a grant. There is no affirmation on the part of the City in terms of it's usage. After an application is submitted, it would be approved according to the guidelines. It is indicative of the City's approval. Additionally, she stated she supports staff recommendation because some of the uses under the B-N zoning some would not appropriate because there is a residential area around the property. In various areas, the imposition of commercial in residential areas causes problems and to grant the reclassification of this property will continue the trend.

Mr. Marshall stated from 45th Street to 52nd Street there is one structure that is being used as a house. The rest of what is zoned R-4 is used as business, along with a church, nightclub, car repair shop. Further along in the P-R-I-P is an air conditioning facility, trucks, storage, etc. up to Victory Drive. Maybe north of Victory Drive on the east side of MLK is also commercial. From a planning standpoint, we need to be sensitive as to what is already happening in the neighborhood; the frontage is not residential anymore. The subject property should be zoned as it is has been used for the past 60 years.

Ms. Myers stated as a former member of SDRA, she stated the grant was only provided for commercial buildings. The view of that corridor was mixed use, with residential uses as well. She asked for explanation of R-B-1 zoning.

Mr. Lotson stated it is a residential business district. It allows residential uses along with low-impact commercial uses. It is one of the least intense zoning districts.

Ms. Milton asked if there are parking regulations for the current and proposed zonings.

Mr. Lotson replied the property owner is non-conforming under the current zoning. He can continue on as he is now with the allowed uses. If he redevelops the property, he would then be subject to coming into conformity with development standards.

Mr. Farmer stated he thought staff was directed to look for an alternative zoning. There is no difference in the current presentation and the previous at the first hearing.

Mr. Thomson responded that the presentation is different; the actual report contains more detail than what Mr. Lotson has presented. What is being said is that R-B-1 was reviewed and staff's recommendation is still the same, to not rezone the property and deny the request. The Board's request was addressed and we are saying we don't recommend that. If staff's recommendation is not acceptable, that can be addressed in a separate motion.

Mr. Farmer stated at the pre-meeting there was no presentation to substantiate why staff did think R-B-1 would be okay; there was no mention of it at the pre-meeting, as if it went away.

Mr. Thomson stated at the pre-meeting, it was stated that staff looked at the uses allowed in R-B-1 and they contained additional uses we do not think to be appropriate for that location.

Ms. Small-Toney also referenced the uses in R-B-1 and B-N as not being appropriate. The facade grant only gave money to maintain the outside of the building.

Mr. Farmer asked what in the R-B-1 district concerned staff.

Mr. Lotson responded it is not only regarding uses from staff's point of view. It is also the fact that the lot is too small to properly establish a conforming commercial use.

Mr. Farmer stated it is too small for a residential structure. It's too small for anything.

Mr. Lotson replied that is why we feel it should not be changed and allow it to go through the process for each turn of business. He then showed the listing of concerned uses, such as boarding and rooming houses.

Mr. Ragsdale asked if the building is destroyed, what can it be rebuilt as. It sounds as if it is condemned by zoning.

Mr. Lotson disagreed. The opportunity for a residential use is there, not just on the existing lot, but with the residential around it. The opportunity exists for it to become conforming.

Mr. Marshall stated the neighborhood we are trying to protect has had commercial intrusions for years. Mr. Marshall presented an improper motion.

Ms. Myers asked what was envisioned by the corridor study which had a lot of input from people around the area.

Mr. Lotson stated, according to what he's read from the Plan, is that the people did want neighborhood commercial. The subject property building has the opportunity to provide that. On the Future Development Map, it designated as single-family residential. That is part of the reason we recommend it remains such.

Mr. Douglas Kaufman, petitioner, stated his original reason for coming was so that he would not have to have potential tenants re-apply for approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The area is part of the progress of the expansion of the City. He stated he not desiring to bring in anything that would be abusive to the neighborhood; he wants to bring in jobs si that those in the neighborhood can to walk to work and provide neighborhood services. It's good for people outside the neighborhood as well.

Behind the property, it should be kept residential. Facing the street is conducive to being commercial.

He stated he would like to withdraw his petition to rezone B-N and reapply for R-B-1, which is less intensive. He hopes the neighborhood will come back.

Mr. Farmer asked if R-B-1 would be acceptable to him.

Mr. Kaufman stated yes.

Ms. Small-Toney asked if the petitioner has a particular business or use planned at present.

Mr. Kaufman stated anything in the R-B-1 that would be conducive to the area. A used car lot would not be; his hope was an insurance or dentist office or something of that nature. Previously barber and beauty shops has been its use for the past three years.

Ms. Small-Toney stated she believed that was the point Mr. Lotson is making; those uses would be permitted now by right. She then asked Mr. Lotson what exactly would be permitted uses for R-B-1.

Mr. Lotson showed the listing and explained B-N zoning district is a business zoning. The R-B-1 is the least intensive that allows both residential and business. In terms of use, all of the alcohol related uses associated with the B-N district are not permitted in the R-B-1 district.

Mr. Abolt stated when the applicant makes a case for everything along the corridor, that's where he is in effect explaining why staff recommended its recommendation. If it goes forward, there will no residential opportunities at all along major streets, that is a major change. A lot of the non-residential things has occurred by neglect. The Plan promotes compatibility between residential development and proximity to arterials, that is the value we put forward. We have not surrendered ourselves to every arterial collector in this County is going to have commercial in some part but heavy, dense development. He believes the petitioner is looking at his project as a transition, not just the ability to rent. Regardless of the limitations of the site, staff is reminding them that there is a place for residential next to major streets.

Mr. Marshall stated 'R' stands for residential and 'B' stands for business. He believes it is appropriate for it to be a residential business zone on this property, not a business neighborhood.

Mr. Farmer stated he believes they agree. He said R-B-1 would do both; it allows both uses without establishing a precedent that everything along the corridor is commercial. It gives with more flexibility. He stated B-N was probably not the appropriate zoning to start with in this case.

Mr. Marshall motioned to recommend rezoning to R-B-1.

Board Action:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of denial to the Mayor and Alderman for their consideration on the requested action to rezone the subject property from an R-6 classification to a B-N classification. - PASS

AMENDMENT: BOARD RECOMMENDS REZONING PROPERTY TO R-B-1. - motion by Murray Marshall.

Vote Results

Motion:

Second: Ben Farmer

Russ Abolt	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye

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

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

General Development Plan

13. [Berwick Family Dollar Store - 5731 Ogeechee Road - General Development Plan](#)

Attachment: [Family Dollar Site Plan.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Family Dollar Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report Family Dollar.pdf](#)

5731 Ogeechee Road
Berwick Family Dollar Store

PIN: 1-0991-08-011
Twin Rivers Capital LLC., Owner
Tom Cetti, Agent

Aldermanic District: NA
County Commission District: 7
Zoning District: P-B
Acres: .65

The petitioner is seeking approval of a General Development Plan in order to construct an approximately 8,000 square foot retail store.

1. A variance to allow required parking within the setback.
2. A 3.08% variance to the 20% open space requirement.

Chairman Ragsdale recused himself from this item.

Mr. Abolt moved to continue to this item.

Board Action:

Motion Postpone Item to the APRIL 24,
2012 MPC meeting by Russ Abolt. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion:

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

Amended General Development Plan / Group Development Plan

14. McAlpin Square - Kroger Fuel Center

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [6x1 Split Color Fascia No Roof Painted Columns & Kiosk.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Traffic Study Summary.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report - 04-03-12.pdf](#)

McAlpin Square - Kroger Fuel Center
1900 East Victory Drive
PIN 2-0078-09-011, 012, and 013
Agent: Harold Schraibman
Engineer: Paulson Mitchell, Incorporated
Developer: The Kroger Company
Owner: Equity One, Incorporated
Aldermanic District: 4
County Commission District: 3
Zoning District: B-C
MPC File Number: P-120222-33439-2
MPC Project Planner: Gary Plumbley

Mr. Gary Plumbley, MPC Planner presented the petitioner's request of a 19 space off-street parking variance from the required 892 spaces. There is approximately 170,000 square feet of leasable space with an of 4,262 square currently utilized as a bank. The petitioner would like to remove 91 of 964 existing parking spaces for the purpose of developing a Kroger Fuel Center. This will leave 873 off-street parking spaces of the required 892. However, based on a recommendation by the MPC staff to install a vegetative buffer along Wallin Street, the off-street parking variance will increase to a maximum of 39 spaces. This recommendation was based on a parking analysis demand study. The proposed development does require a traffic analysis report

submission because the 100 peak hour trips has been exceeded. It will produce a total 166 peak hour trips.

The MPC staff recommends **approval** of the requested Amended General Development Plan/Group Development to include a 39 space off-street parking variance subject to conditions.

Mr. Ragsdale asked what the parking requirement would be with UZO.

Mr. Plumbley replied it will exceed the requirements; there would not be a variance under UZO.

Ms. Myers asked what would make the intersection an F.

Mr. Plumbley stated that can't be answered until the actual number of trips is applied to the study.

Mr. Farmer asked if this would need to be approved by the traffic engineer.

Mr. Plumbley replied yes. The City would examine getting in and out of the center. There will be revisions to the existing curbs cuts because of the fuel trucks servicing the site. We recognize it is a bad intersection, however current study indicates it will not cause a problem.

Mr. Farmer asked what is the Board's authority to approve in this petition; is there something they could use without variances without the Board's approval.

Mr. Plumbley replied Board approval is required.

Mr. Farmer stated a visual barrier along Wallin Street is a good idea.

Mr. Plumbley stated some property owners along the east side of Wallin Street did complain, thus the reasoning behind the buffer which will increase the requested parking variance.

Mr. Abolt asked about the traffic study. It does not seem to be a reasonable expectation because of the proximity to Victory Drive, Truman Parkway, the Backus Developments, and the existing problem we already know exists. We cannot get the Georgia Department of Transportation to agree to an improvement project on Victory Drive that would extend that turn pocket. It is appropriate for both sides to present their traffic testimony, but the real problem is the need for a project on Victory Drive to Lincoln, for that turn pocket to take that queue off of Truman Parkway and eliminate a serious safety problem.

Mr. Marshall stated it would be beneficial to the neighbors across the street if trees that will grow to a height of 18 to 25 feet be designated.

Mr. Plumbley agreed, stating it would impacted by utilities that would have to be located in the area. The vegetation has yet to be determined; it will be

recommended that it provide the most coverage in concert with the existing utilities.

Mr. Mackey asked how many streets lead into Wallin.

Mr. Plumbley replied 36th to 42nd.

Mr. Mackey stated that is six streets. He asked will the customers using the fuel facility only be Kroger customers.

Mr. Plumbley replied no. Ninety-six will be the estimated new trip generated per day by non-Kroger customers.

Mr. Mackey stated his concern is the increase of traffic of 36th through 42nd Streets.

Mr. Plumbley stated you would have to assume that people are traveling east or west on Skidaway Road and take one of those streets.

Mr. Mackey asked what would the access routes of the fuel trucks be.

Mr. Plumbley stated they would use Wallin Street and Victory Drive.

Ms. Small-Toney stated her concern is regarding the canopy and its height, along with the signage. The residents across street will be affected with the illumination of them.

Mr. Plumbley stated the fixtures will not be allowed to extend below the lower plane of the canopy itself. The bulbs would not be able to be seen.

Mr. Ragsdale asked how could they have full cut-off fixtures when you are looking up into the canopy; all the residents are twenty feet below the parking lot.

Mr. Plumbley stated we cannot control the elevation difference.

Ms. Small-Toney state the residents will have to contend with the lighting and the existing parking lot. This will magnify that considerably.

Mr. Plumbley stated it will increase but we don't know if the impact will be more or less when the buffer has matured. None of the houses on Wallin Street face Wallin Street.

Ms. Small-Toney responded that the use of the residence is the concern.

Mr. Ragsdale asked if an illumination study was done.

Mr. Plumbley stated it can be done in conjunction with the Specific Development Plan.

Mr. Ron Hawkins, petitioner, stated Kroger is sensitive to the way the fuel centers appear to the residences around the fuel center. They do not feel the lighting level will be significantly increased in relation to the existing lighting. They do try to keep a visibility corridor so passers-by can see the fuel center.

Mr. Richard Brown, area resident, stated he feels the project will further diminish the value of his property. Though it is a rental property for him, the increase in noise, traffic, and light will decrease its rental attraction.

Mr. John Binder, representative of the Parker Company, stated concern with the increased traffic study. He stated he was surprised the traffic study was considered acceptable. He presented pictures of traffic at various times of the day and intersection locations in the area to support his concern. He was particularly concerned with the Wallin and Victory intersection, which is in front of his company's store.

Mr. Farmer asked Mr. Binder if he worked for Parker's.

Mr. Binder replied yes.

Mr. Farmer asked if his concern was regarding traffic where his store is.

Mr. Binder replied yes, it would be backed up traffic.

Mr. Farmer asked if traffic would be detrimental to his store.

Mr. Binder stated moving traffic is a good thing but backed up traffic is not; we need moving traffic.

Mr. Farmer stated he wanted to clarify that Mr. Binder is a competitor.

Mr. Binder confirmed.

Mr. Farmer stated any approval they make is subject to the traffic engineer.

Mr. Thomson agreed. The purpose of traffic studies for new development is to determine what impact it has on the roadway and determine if it should mitigate any impacts it may cause. We are aware its a congested corridor and it is listed to be studied. Some is congestion is not the responsibility of a single business owner to correct for everyone.

Mr. Farmer stated there are some things out of our purview. We have no control over the traffic; that is left up to the traffic engineer.

Mr. Ragsdale state he disagrees; we have to look at the overall burden and circumstances generated by the fuel center.

Mr. Farmer asked if we should be hearing from our traffic engineer.

Mr. Thomson stated MPC traffic staff has reviewed the applicants traffic study at a pre-application meeting and agreed to the assumptions. We are satisfied with the results and the traffic engineer has been on board with the meetings. If there was an improvement identified by this review, it would be the City's decision who should pay for it and how it should be done.

Mr. Abolt stated he agreed with Mr. Farmer. The issue is larger than any applicant in regard to the traffic.

Ms. Small-Toney stated she agreed with Mr. Farmer also. There will be number of fueling trucks that will have to travel Wallin Street that are not currently. She asked if that had been considered in the traffic analysis.

Mr. Thomson stated the applicant will have to inform of the delivery schedule.

Mr. Hawkins stated it will depend on the volume of the fuel center. Typically once per day at varying times.

Ms. Small-Toney stated that we can't correct it, but to add to it concerns her.

Ms. Myers stated she agrees with Ms. Small-Toney.

Mr. Kevin Smith, representative of Thomas and Hutton, stated his company was hired by Parker's to review A & R's report (petitioner's traffic consultant). Their review found that the process was done correctly. The guidelines, however, are off in this situation. Stacking in the queues are larger than what is projected in the future. Their issue is that because of the Kroger's rewards program, more trips may be generated because of the time frame to use the rewards.

The Parker's Company took a traffic count in late March through an independent agency, whereas A & R's count was done in early February. There was 10% more of a delay at Wallin Street and Highway 80 intersection, which bring the intersection close to being qualified as 'failing'.

Mr. Lufburrow stated this is an important decision. He stated he doesn't feel he can vote on this without the City Traffic Engineer's input.

Mr. Farmer agreed. He added only so much gas will be sold; he does not believe it will generate more traffic. He stated it will generate competition. It concerns him that restrictions are being placed on the developers.

Mr. Lufburrow motioned to postpone until GDOT and the City Engineer can attend and provide guidance to the Board. This will allow the Board to make an informed decision from unbiased sources.

Mr. Thomson stated the purpose of the traffic study is to mitigate if the traffic impacts the intersection. Stopping this development from approval from a traffic condition is equivalent to pulling business licenses in the corridor because of too much traffic.

Mr. Ragsdale recommended having lighting pictures to address Ms. Small-Toney's concerns.

Mr. Mackey stated we have to do a better job in anticipating these types of discussions on matters and petitions that may be controversial. We need to be proactive in determining when we need to get these other departments together to help make informed decisions.

Board Action:

Postpone Item - to first meeting date GDOT and City Traffic Engineer are scheduled to be in attendance. Notify of date on April 24. - PASS

Vote Results

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

Amended General Development Plan

15. [One West Victory Drive](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Approved General Development Plan P-070215-34479-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Amended General Development Plan P-120222-32609-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [GDP Staff Report P-120222-32609-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Public Comment - Opposed Concerned.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Public Comment - Support.pdf](#)

1 & 109 West Victory Drive
Site Area: 1.74 Acres

PIN: 2-0074 -26-004 & 2-0074 -26-005
Agent: Amy Swick
Attorney: Phillip McCorkle
Aldermanic District: 5
County Commission District: 5
Zoning District: P-RIP-B*
MPC File Number: P-120222-32609-2
MPC Reference File Numbers: P-070215-34479-2 & Z-070220-43024-2

Mr. Geoff Goins, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request to amend an approved General Development Plan, in order to construct a mixed use development consisting of 121 residential units and 10,341 square feet of commercial space. The petitioner is requesting a 48% building coverage variance to the 25% building coverage maximum required pursuant to Sec. 8-3053.

Whereas a General Development Plan, submitted under the auspices of Zoning Ordinance Section 8-3031 was approved in conjunction with the property zoning in 2007, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of **APPROVAL** to the Mayor and Alderman for their consideration on the requested action to amend the General Development Plan for One West Victory Drive including a 48% building coverage variance, subject to the following condition:

Approval of the Traffic Impact Analysis Report by the City of Savannah and Metropolitan Planning Commission and all on-site and off-site traffic improvements (if any) as deemed necessary to maintain an acceptable level of service, based upon the findings of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis Report, by the City of Savannah, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Georgia Department of Transportation if applicable

Mr. Goins presented a visual presentation to the Board as he explained the differences in the proposed plan from the original approved plan.

Mr. Farmer asked where is the entrance to the parking lot for the proposed plan.

Mr. Goins responded it would be off of 44th Street.

Mr. Farmer asked was that on the original plan.

Mr. Goins replied no; there were two access points off of Barnard and 44th Streets, as well as Victory. The traffic study has not yet been received; that may impact those decisions.

Mr. Farmer asked where is it in relation to Guerry Lumber.

Mr. Goins showed the location on the map.

Ms. Myers asked if the dirt lane (44th Street) is proposed to be paved in this development.

Mr. Goins stated that would have to be left up to the traffic engineer, but he assumes with the level of traffic that it would be.

Mr. Lufburrow asked what kind of buffer would be required if the multi-family was there before the commercial (Guerry Lumber).

Mr. Goins replied about a 30 to 40 foot wide buffer.

Mr. Lufburrow stated it is to create a separation between uses that are generally not considered compatible.

Mr. Goins agreed.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he is concerned with it increasing the density and changing the traffic plan considerably. A street will now be a main corridor for a business and residential parking.

Mr. Farmer stated he is concerned with 216 parking spaces for residential and business traffic. He has no problem with the development, he does with the new traffic plan. He does not want to do anything to impact Guerry Lumber's business. He is not sure why there is a need to change from the original plan; he asked if there was another alternative.

Ms. Amy Swick, petitioner, presented their business and project history. The project are for luxury apartment rentals. This is a \$24 million project with the goal of being LEED certified. We will bring 44th Street up to City code through the Specific Development Plan, to which the garage will be entered. Victory Drive will be a right in, at a minimum, which is still up for further discussion.

Mr. Ragsdale summarized that the difference will be 16 more units, less commercial space, a shorter building, more open space, more green space, and slightly more overall square footage.

Mr. Manigault asked what does the rental have to do with the noise level.

Ms. Myers asked if Guerry Lumber was consulted as to how they receive their deliveries.

Ms. Swick replied yes; there were no concerns and they spoke with them twice. The traffic and garaging will be addressed in the Specific Development Plan.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he is concerned how development impacts local people and businesses. He suspects the majority of the petitioner's market will be SCAD students. He is also concerned about Guerry Lumber. The local obligation is not to do something that will benefit one and jeopardizes another. There will be a lot of additional vehicles, regardless of whom they belong to. There is no surface street parking in the vicinity which makes the situation critical. Guerry Lumber is already impacted by the nearby SCAD dormitories; delivery trucks are often stalled because parked cars. There is no parking on Victory Drive, so Barnard is the only other option.

Mr. Lufburrow also expressed concerns regarding the residential across from the commercial. Even though the residential project will have renters, that will put pressure on the owner(s) regarding the noise from the commercial neighbor.

Ms. Swick stated it is zoned for this use.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he voted for it originally but not under its present plan.

Ms. Swick stated high-end condos would have as many or more cars versus student renters that often use bikes or walk. There will be hiccups with change. Her company believes this plan with renters is much better than condo owners, based on location and surroundings.

Mr. Lufburrow asked what is the plan for residential guest and commercial guest parking.

Ms. Swick replied it will be expressed in the Specific Development Plan. At a minimum, the parking garage will be a five-access system. The bedroom to parking ratio has not yet been determined.

Mr. Farmer stated the reality is that you will have parking problems. People will always do more than what is allowed. Overflow parking will go down Barnard Street and affect Guerry Lumber's business and parking. Forty-fourth Street is a dead-end into a rail road. He does not believe there is enough parking nor sufficient egress and ingress.

Ms. Milton stated there is a private nightclub situated on the railroad. Many of their events draw big crowds and there is nowhere to park. That area is a tight fit.

Ms. Myers asked if they were preserving all of the historic structures.

Ms. Swick confirmed. Their goal is to encourage more walking and less car use.

Mr. Lufburrow stated he doesn't know what kind of assurance can be given to have what they want to happen to actually happen. There is no guarantee these people will use public transportation or walk. Once it's approved but it doesn't work, then others suffer and apologies won't help.

Ms. Swick stated because of the 24-hour on-site management, these things won't happen because it will not be allowed.

Mr. Marshall stated the current approved plan has four access points; two on Victory Drive, one on Barnard Street and one on 44th Street. The proposed plan eliminates one from Victory and the one on 44th Street. That aggravates the impact tremendously on the business there. He suggested re-opening differently to not have greater impact on 44th Street; have no access on 44th Street.

Ms. Myers asked if we could paint a yellow line on the side of the street (44th) so no one can park on it.

Ms. Swick replied their parking requirement is does not include on-street parking on 44th Street; that would not be a problem.

Mr. Mackey stated it has been determined that 44th Street is city-owned. Therefore, the city dictates its use. It is not for us to determine. He asked about the density of the proposed building. He said it is not appropriate to assume the majority renters will be SCAD students and there will be dorm-like atmosphere. They may not be in the area forever. In the event this does not go as planned, what happens next; tax credit housing may become an option though it is not planned right now.

Mr. Ragsdale said that we do not have the right to ask that question.

Mr. Thomson stated the Commission's charge is to recommend to City Council to amend the Site Development Plan to the proposed submitted development.

Mr. Lufburrow stated many SCAD student still own cars but just not drive. He stated he has concerns about that.

Mr. Mackey stated that is the same question he was asking regarding density.

Mr. Farmer stated he wanted to understand that there are 344 projected occupants plus retail space use with 216 parking spaces.

Ms. Swick responded there may be up to 340 people and up to 10,000 square feet of , with 216 parking spaces.

Mr. Robert McCorkle added that the density number is not part of the requirements for the original or currently proposed general development plan. The approved 105 units are not tied to a number of people per unit. The number of units is requested for increase, while not necessarily increasing or decreasing the number of people on site. The ordinance deals with units. The parking is being increased and the retail decreased by 50%.

Mr. Farmer stated this area is landlocked; there is no overflow for parking even though the standards are met.

Mr. McCorkle responded that this is currently approved with less parking spaces than what is being requested.

Mr. Farmer stated things have currently come to the table that merit concern. Things change.

Mr. Martin Smith, Executive Director of Design and New Construction for SCAD, observed that SCAD has been brought up several times in this discussion. He wanted it to be clearly understood that SCAD is in no way affiliated with this project. Therefore, no transportation, security, parking, or resident housing services will be provided as with their living quarters.

Ms. Lisa Moore, resident of Ardsley Park stated she has concerns regarding parking, residents, the parking garage by the railroad tracks and the retail.

Ms. Julia Sullivan, resident of Ardsley Park, stated she has concerns

regarding the parking garage and density. She requested that the Specific Development Plan come back to the MPC so that the residents can weigh in. She state she has lived in areas in which some projects had a negative impact on the area, and we should not learn from hindsight.

Mr. Kevin and Mrs. Lucy Thompson, stated they own all of the property on the northwest corner of Barnard and Victory. He stated if he is called, they will make it all a parking lot. They are in favor of the project; it will be the revitalization of the area.

Ms. Beth Van Tosh, area resident, supports the project and currently manages it. As a property owner, she believes it will beautify the area while mixing residential and business use. She bases her support on the examples she's seen of the petitioner's projects in Atlanta.

Mr. Patrick Shay, architect of the proposed project, stated the proposed change is better. As a member of the Chatham Area Transit Authority, he stated Barnard is one of the main north/south transit corridors. It is well served by CAT. Three student shuttles will be serving the area soon. If acceptable choices are not allowed through development, it will never happen. The windows will be impact resistant glass and more sound resistant than previous code windows. He stated he is suprised the building still remains, based on the vagrant activity. This will allow the saving of a historic building.

Mr. Ramsey Khalidi, area resident, stated they have rental property in the area. He stated his tentants have never more than three cars at a time for six renters. Their renters are students and professionals.

Mr. Austin Hill, representative of Cora Bett Thomas, disagreed with Mr. Farmer's statement regarding parking overflow. He stated he and his generation have no problem walking, therefore they do not have to park at the front door of their residence. A walking path may be a good idea.

Ms. Denise Grabowski, area resident, stated that if 44th Street is a public street, it should be open to the public, not just for Guerry Lumber. Barnard Street traffic is not that bad; she travels on scooter in the area. She believes the project will not negatively impact the area.

Ms. Sheila Edward, area resident, supports the project.

Ms. Barbara Victor, area resident, originally opposed the project. She now supports the project after research. She stated many residents in Ardsley Park support the project as well.

Mr. Steve Chick, representative of Guerry Lumber, stated they have concerns regarding parking and density that may affect their business. He stated 44th Street will have a lot of traffic and it is not that wide; he fears overflow parking will block their gates.

Mr. Farmer asked him what will make him feel better.

Mr. Chick stated he just wants assurance that his business will not be impacted because of the density and parking of the retail customers. He doesn't think

44th Street is a good area to enter the garage.

Mr. Manigault asked if it would help if Guerry Lumber addresses their concerns with the petitioner.

Mr. Chick said yes. They could not answer his question before, that is why he is here. They want to be able to access of 44th Street. He is not opposed to the plan.

Ms. Small-Toney stated the use of 44th Street is public. If it has been used previously for private business use, that will change.

Mr. McCorkle stated some things cannot be predicted. They are proposing to improve 44th Street. The petitioner has met with Mr. Chick twice and will continue to meet with the neighbors. Many of the concerns will be addressed in the Specific Development Plan.

Board Action:

Whereas a General Development Plan, submitted under the auspices of Zoning Ordinance Section 8-3031 was approved in conjunction with the property zoning in 2007, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of **APPROVAL** to the Mayor and Alderman for their consideration on the requested action to amend the General Development Plan for One West Victory Drive including a 48 percent building coverage variance, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the Traffic Impact Analysis Report by the City of Savannah and Metropolitan Planning Commission and all on-site and off-site traffic improvements (if any) as deemed necessary to maintain an acceptable level of service, based upon the findings of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis Report, by the City of Savannah, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Georgia Department of Transportation if applicable. - PASS
2. **AMENDMENT: SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO RETURN TO MPC.**

Vote Results

Motion: Timothy Mackey

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

Wireless Telecommunications Facility - New Facility/Nonconcealed Freestanding-Monopole

16. [Proposed Southbridge Tower](#)

Attachment: [ATT Need-410-362.pdf](#)
Attachment: [CityScape Report-Southbridge.pdf](#)
Attachment: [FAA Southbridge 01-19-11.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Letter of Support.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report 4-3-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Southbridge Coverage.pdf](#)

This petition was continued from the March 13, 2012 MPC agenda.

Mr. Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner, presented the petitioner's request. The petitioner is requesting approval for 150-foot monopole Wireless Telecommunications Facility on the Southbridge golf course. Staff recommends **approval** with certain conditions. The petitioner is also requesting a variance from the required landscaping around the fenced ground enclosure. Because of the deciduous nature of the surrounding foliage and the proximity of residential parcels, staff recommends **denial** of the requested variance.

Ms. Small-Toney asked what impact will the tower site have on the valuation of adjacent properties.

Mr. Butler responded he is not aware.

Mr. Farmer stated it is not an amenity but he does not think it will negatively affect its valuation. He asked if it was zoned for it.

Mr. Butler stated cell towers are allowed in all districts, provided they meet the Boards approval and the conditions of the Ordinance. This one meets the

Ordinance; requires landscaping and lighting, which the petitioner is willing to provide.

Mr. Jonathan Yates, telecommunications analyst, stated this was the best area for the tower for optimum use for the residents. There will be no obtrusions or disturbances in the area for the residents. The generators can run only at certain times of day, behind a 16-foot fence with a muffler.

Mr. Terry Thomas, site coordinator for the project, explained the photo simulations to the Board.

Mr. Wesley Meadows, area resident and with Southside Fire EMS and Security, offered the use of the upcoming 119-foot tower on Dean Forrest Road, about three acres from the petitioned tower site.

Mr. Yates stated they have spoken with Mr. Meadows. It has been tested but not effective. The distance will affect the cellular quality.

Mr. Greg Knight, petitioner, confirmed Mr. Yates statement. It is too close to Dean Forest Road and the customers they already have.

Mr. Jim Battin, President of Villas on the Green, stated he represents 48 homes under the shadow of the tower. He presented what the view will be from their vantage point.

Ms. Judy Sturgess stated she and her husband are in opposition of this tower.

Board Action:

Postpone Item - April 24, 2012 MPC Meeting to have quorum. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Rochelle Small-Toney

Second: Timothy Mackey

Murray Marshall - Not Present

Tanya Milton - Not Present

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Not Present
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

XII. ADJOURNMENT

18. [Adjourn](#)

Mr. Farmer motioned to adjourn the April 3, 2012 MPC meeting at 7:29 P.M.

Board Action:

Adjourn April 13, 2012 MPC Meeting. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ben Farmer

Second: Susan Myers

Russ Abolt - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Not Present

Ellis Cook - Not Present

Ben Farmer - Aye

Stephen Lufburrow - Not Present

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Not Present

Tanya Milton - Not Present

Susan Myers - Aye

Jon Pannell - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Rochelle Small-Toney - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

XIII. DEVELOPMENT PLANS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

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.