



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
February 19, 2013 1:30 P.M.  
MINUTES

**February 19, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting**

**Members Present:** W. Shedrick Coleman, Vice-Chairman  
Ellis Cook, Secretary  
Tanya Milton, Treasurer  
Stephanie Cutter  
Ben Farmer  
Stephen Lufburrow  
Lacy Manigault  
Murray Marshall  
Susan Myers  
Joseph Welch

**Members Not Present:** J. Adam Ragsdale  
Russ Abolt  
Timothy Mackey

**Staff Present:** Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director  
Melony West, CPA, Director, Finance & Systems  
Gary Plumbley, Acting Development Director  
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Planner  
Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner  
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner  
Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects  
Christy Adams, Director, Administration  
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant

**Advisory Staff Present:** Geoff Goins, City Zoning Administrator  
Robert Sebek, County Zoning Administrator

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

**II. INVOCATION**

### III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### IV. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### Notice(s)

1. [February 26, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting at 1:00 PM in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Room, 110 East State Street](#)
2. [March 12, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

#### Information Item(s) for Board Members

3. [Reading of Development Plans Submitted for Review](#)

Attachment: [Development Review Case Log February 19.pdf](#)

### V. PRESENTATIONS

4. [Presentation of the Community Indicators Web Portal](#)

Attachment: [Commission Thomson Community Indicators Portal Intro 021913.pdf](#)

**Ms. Jackie Teel**, Comprehensive Planning Director, introduced Terra Jennings of the United Way of the Coastal Empire. Ms. Teel explained the collaboration of the MPC, SaGIS, the City of Savannah, Chatham County, local hospitals, the health department and other entities throughout the county which form the Chatham County Community Indicators Coalition.

The partners in the Coalition were requested to provide services or funding for the program. The MPC and SaGIS provided in-kind services, such as mapping assistance and available data. The information in the portal can be used by local residents for many projects.

**Ms. Jennings** provided an overview of the Portal website which is under the United Way website ([www.uwce.org/ourwork/communityindicators](http://www.uwce.org/ourwork/communityindicators)), within the 'Our Work' section. It is not currently public, but will be soon. The Coalition project actually started in 2009, with only 20 indicators measured. The current portal allows over 100 data indicator sets and they are still working on uploading local surveying information as well.

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

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

**VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

**Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes**

5. [January 29, 2013 MPC Meeting and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [01.29.13 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [01.29.13 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

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

**Vote Results**

Motion: Susan Myers  
Second: Tanya Milton  
James Blackburn - Aye  
Shedrick Coleman - Aye  
Ellis Cook - Aye  
Stephanie Cutter - Aye  
Ben Farmer - Aye  
Stephen Lufburrow - Aye  
Timothy Mackey - Not Present  
Lacy Manigault - Aye  
Murray Marshall - Aye  
Tanya Milton - Aye  
Susan Myers - Aye  
Adam Ragsdale - Not Present  
Joseph Welch - Aye  
Russ Abolt - Not Present

**Authorization(s)**

6. [Authorization for the Chairman to sign the authorizing resolution to submit the 2013 5303 \(Transit Planning\) grant application to the Georgia Department of Transportation.](#)

Attachment: [TThomson TPC Resolution for FY 2014 5303 Application 2-14-2013.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Authorize Chairman to sign resolution authorizing submission of 2013 5303 (Transit Planning) Grant Application to the Georgia Department of Transportation. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Susan Myers

Second: Tanya Milton	
Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

## VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

## IX. OLD BUSINESS

### Zoning Petition - Text Amendment

7. [Text Amendment to the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance to Amend Sections 8-3002 and 8-3025 \(a\) and \(b\) to Refer to Animal Control Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report 021913.pdf](#)

It is proposed that an amendment to the definitions section and the use tables of the City Zoning Ordinance be made to refer to the City of Savannah Animal Control Ordinance for the non-commercial keeping of animals and to provide clarity and distinction between commercial and personal agriculture.

**Mr. Blackburn** moved to continue the zoning ordinance revisions until Animal Control Ordinance is ready for submission to City Council.

### Board Action:

Table Item - resume date to be determined. - PASS

### Vote Results

Motion: James Blackburn

Second: Ben Farmer

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye

Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

### Zoning Petition - Staff Text Amendment

8. [Text Amendment to the Savannah Zoning Ordinance to modify how announcement signs are permitted; Sec. 8-3112\(c\)\(5\)c, 8-3112\(d\)\(3\) and 8-3112\(q\)](#)

Attachment: [Street Class Map for Announcement Signs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2-19-13 Presentation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [12-000277-ZA Announcement Signs text amendment - staff report 2-19-13.pdf](#)

#### Text Amendment

Staff is requesting an amendment to Sections 8-3112(c)(5)c, 8-3112(d)(3) and 8-3112(q) of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance for the purpose of expanding the zoning districts which permit the use of announcement signs, modifying the permitted sign area of such signs and combining the standards for manual changeable copy and electronically controlled announcement signs into one section. In addition, a map is proposed designating Class 1 and Class 2 streets for the purpose of regulating the size of such signs. This proposal would not amend the standards regarding electronically controlled billboards within the jurisdiction of the city of Savannah.

MPC File Number: 12-0000277-ZA

MPC Project Planner: Amanda Bunce

**Ms. Amanda Bunce** presented the proposed text amendment compared the proposed standards compared to the existing standards. She then reviewed the proposed street classification map. She stated staff is proposing to expand the ability to use announcement signs or changeable copy signs, manual or electronic. Standards proposed not to change is that these types of signs must still be located on collector or arterial roadway. Electronic signs must still be prohibited in national register district and the level of lighting must still be controlled. Only public uses, schools, colleges, and places of worship that are on an arterial or collector be permitted to have this type of signage. Propose reduction in sign area in residential areas and maximum lighting for manual changeable copy signs. She stated Abercorn to DeRenne to Gateway would be an example of Class 1 street, allowing the most signage. DeRenne from

Abercorn to Truman Parkway would be an example of a Class 2 street.

**Ms. Myers** stated she is still worried about the residential. On Montgomery Street, it looks as if it's from 52nd Street to DeRenne.

**Ms. Bunce** replied it's actually from Victory Drive, south.

**Ms. Myers** stated Sylvan Terrace, on the east side of Montgomery is included. That area is heavily residential; she suggested applicability on the western side, but not the eastern side.

**Ms. Bunce** stated there may be a possibility of doing that as a footnote to the table. There has to be a school, church, public use or a college to obtain the sign. Since it is a residential district, the size would have to be small.

**Ms. Myers** stated SCAD is over there.

**Mr. Farmer** asked how many streets are involved in the arterial and collector streets.

**Ms. Bunce** stated she has not counted them but it is very limited and is much more limited than what we have currently in the sign section for Class 1 and Class 2 streets.

**Mr. Farmer** stated one of the concerns is the broad definition of 'residential'. He asked if R-I-P is considered residential. He stated he thinks that is causing some of the confusion: what the category of 'residential' entails. He stated he knows it has arterial and collector streets which helps limit it some, but the Savannah Cardiology sign used as an example is in an R-I-P zone received variance because it provides public service notices. It really is a non-conforming use because it was a variance. He stated his business is in the same district a block away and can't have a reader sign unless he agreed to do public service announcements. He asked again if R-I-P is classified as a residential district.

**Ms. Bunce** stated she does not consider it as R-I-P, but she would have to look to the City's Zoning Administrator and see if it considered as a residential zoning district. It is listed in the C & R's use schedule, but it's a mixed-use zoning district that allows non-residential uses.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he hears Ms. Myers concerns, but it may be a over-concern about something not applicable. He stated he does not understand how a sign could be on one side of a street and not on the other.

**Mr. Geoff Goins**, City Zoning Administrator, stated for the purposes of how to identify the individual districts by the uses that apply to it; if the question is permitted square footage, it is considered a residential district because it is in the C & R use table.

**Ms. Bunce** stated that was not intended. Currently in the R-I-P, you are allowed the same sign area that's grouped in with the commercial districts. That was something that was not picked up in our previous reviews.

**Mr. Farmer** stated it could not be used electronically; he could only use his manually.

**Ms. Bunce** replied, currently that is correct.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he is only trying to bring this thing into the 21st century. If the guy two blocks down the street can change his with a computer and he has to change his with a stick and their the same size and the rest of the restrictions apply; let him be able to change his electronically if it's not going to have any other negative impact. Some of the sizes of the electronic can be smaller to be more aesthetically pleasing. He thinks we've gotten off-track with the residential classifications to think we will be going through someone's cul-de-sac street or something, which he does not think is the case.

**Ms. Bunce** suggested including in staff's recommendation, if the Board chooses to recommend approval of staff's recommendation, the modification that the permitted sign area be revised to apply to non-residential zoning districts and the R-I-P district. She stated that is the only one that would really need to be moved in with the commercial zoning districts.

**Mr. Farmer** asked would not the street location be the thing that solves it. With the exception of by Sylvan Terrace, there are two criteria: a zoning and a street classification. One may be more restrictive to the other.

**Ms. Bunce** replied the intent is for zoning and street classification to work together. We would need the modification unless you want the R-I-P to have less signage than they are permitted today. Then in the sign area table would read: non-residential and R-I-P zoning districts.

**Mr. Marshall** stated he thinks that there is a street that separates Montgomery Street and the Sylvan Terrace houses. He stated he doesn't believe that to be an issue. Also, when we make a motion, it was pointed out in the pre-meeting that there are several classifications that aren't listed here; they need to be listed and they didn't have the 'B'.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the error was in her powerpoint presentation; in the staff report it is correct.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked what districts allow changeable signs.

**Ms. Bunce** replied currently for the manual changeable copy, they are allowed in all 'B' zoned districts and R-B-C, R-B-C-1, R-B, R-B-1, I-P, R-I-P, R-I-P-B, R-I-B-1, I-L, I-L-B, and I-H and C-A.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated he could read that. What he meant was what districts are being proposed that the changeable signs be allowed.

**Ms. Bunce** stated they are proposing they be allowed in all districts with the exception, that in the districts listed, basically single-family and multi-family zoning districts in addition to a few of the R-I-P districts, it would be limited to uses that are public uses, public and private schools, colleges and universities, and places of worship. It is limited to those institutional type uses in single or multi-family neighborhoods, with conditions.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked would this let Mr. Farmer do a changeable sign now.

**Ms. Bunce** stated this would allow on Abercorn, where the zoning is R-I-P, to have electronic changeable copy signs.

**Mr. Coleman** stated his understanding is if you take that R-I-P limitation out of what's on there now, it will allow that. Now it says it will only allow if he is a public use.

**Ms. Bunce** replied R-I-P alone is not listed. R-I-P-A, A-1, C, and D would be those.

**Ms. Myers** asked if this cannot happen in the Historic District.

**Ms. Bunce** replied that is correct for an electronic sign. It is prohibited.

**Ms. Myers** asked will this part of Abercorn be changed from R-I-P in the UZO because there is no residential in there.

**Ms. Bunce** replied the proposed UZO zoning in that part of Abercorn is B-C; it is a more appropriate zoning district for the area than R-I-P.

**Mr. Farmer** asked how would that affect Chatham Parkway.

**Ms. Bunce** replied it will be permitted.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed text amendment  
recommended by staff WITH THE AMENDMENT  
OF: FOR THE CALCULATION OF SIGN AREA, - PASS  
IT READ NON-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND  
THE R-I-P DISTRICT.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ben Farmer  
Second: Joseph Welch  
Russ Abolt - Not Present  
James Blackburn - Aye  
Shedrick Coleman - Aye



Ellis Cook	- Aye
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

## X. REGULAR BUSINESS

### Zoning Petition - Text Amendment

#### 9. [An amendment to Article F \(Nonconforming Uses\), Section 8-3134\(g\)\(1\) \(Changes in Nonconforming Uses\) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [13-000478-ZA Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Ms. Charlotte Moore** presented the petitioner's request for an amendment to Article F (Nonconforming Uses), Section 8-3134(g)(1) (Changes in Nonconforming Uses) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance to amend the provisions regarding the sale of wine by the drink for a nonconforming sit-down restaurant use in the RIP-A1 (Residential Urban) district.

The amendment is sought to allow for the following: 1) to repeal the provision that requires wine to be "served or dispensed from a preparation area or service station not available to patrons" and, 2) to change the hour at which wine service can begin from noon to 11:00 a.m. The reason for the requested amendments is to allow waitstaff to pour a glass of wine at tables, and to allow wine service to be available at lunch when the restaurant opens at 11:00 a.m. The 11:00 a.m. condition request cannot apply on Sunday's; there is a state Sunday sales law, which does not allow sales to begin until 12:30 p.m.

The text was shown on the screen and that each existing condition was reviewed. Some of the other conditions that currently exist suggest they were created for what seems to be the creation of a new restaurant use in the R-I-P-A-1 district. Staff is proposing some of these conditions be eliminated, such as "the restaurant front onto a street classified as an arterial or collector street." The restaurant is on Habersham, a collector street, which makes it an unnecessary condition. Second, "as part of a full-service meal only"; the second sentence states "alcohol beverages shall be prohibited." Wine an alcoholic beverage; it is contradictory. Also, "no display or advertisement for the sale of wine"; we regulate the type of signs, not the content. The city regulates what happens on public property, there is no need to have a condition regarding loudspeakers on public property. The condition indicating 'bar area' or 'serving area' shall not be

permitted; wine has to be sold with a meal, it is not possible to come off of the street and go the bar area and request wine, therefore the condition is redundant. And the provision that states applies only to non-conforming uses; the restaurant is the only one in the R-I-P-A-1 district, it is non-conforming; another therefore, this is another redundancy. There is a condition that the restaurant building shall not be greater than 2,500 square feet; we are proposing that move forward but referencing the restaurant, not the building itself. The restaurant is on the first floor of a mixed-use building and it shall not have more than 50 chairs.

Staff is making an alternate recommendation that any restaurant in the R-I-P-A-1 district will have to comply with the following: sales are restricted to wine only and only when served with a full-service meal between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., except Sunday sales that will begin at 12:30 p.m. The restaurant will be restricted to 2,500 square feet in size and 50 chairs. Live music, karaoke, and amusement games shall not be permitted. Ms. Moore stated she contacted the Downtown Neighborhood Association, they are aware of this and have sent notification to all of their members.

**Mr. Lufburrow** asked if the Downtown Neighborhood Association has had time to review changes recommended by staff.

**Ms. Moore** replied she believes so, though she has received no calls or e-mails. She has been in direct contact with the president.

**Ms. Myers** stated we all received an e-mail on it. She asked if Troup Square is the only place that is R-I-P-A-1, but it will be changed eventually.

**Ms. Moore** replied that is correct.

**Mr. Cook** stated dumpsters were not originally allowed in the area simply because is it residential. He asked where would the dumpster be put.

**Ms. Moore** stated in the alley where the receptacles are located currently.

**Mr. Cook** stated he does not see why they cannot use receptacles.

**Ms. Moore** stated that provision could be pulled forward.

**Ms. Myers** stated she thinks that would be a good idea.

**Mr. Farmer** asked if we need to make our ordinance match state law regarding the Sunday alcohol sales in restaurants.

**Ms. Moore** replied yes.

**Mr. Marshall** asked shouldn't the immediate neighbors be consulted about the garbage facilities before considering a change.

**Ms. Myers** stated the Unitarian Church on Macon Street has a commercial

dumpster.

**Ms. Cutter** stated she is concerned about removing conditions that were previously approved by City Council. She does not want to slow down the process and would like to propose an alternate amendment as requested by the petitioner.

**Mr. Farmer** motioned to approve staff's recommendation with needed changes to comply with state law.

**Mr. Thomson** stated he thought he heard the City Manager say she wanted to go back to what the applicant requested.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked Ms. Cutter to restate her request.

**Ms. Cutter** replied she would like time to meet with Zoning Administrator and compare the conditions to be sure they are not duplicating. She stated she is not prepared to vote on the amendment without the conditions.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked Ms. Cutter if it were voted here on this day, would she have time needed before she would need to make a recommendation to City Council.

**Ms. Cutter** replied yes.

**Mr. Blackburn** clarified that she was not suggesting postponing the vote today.

**Ms. Cutter** stated she is recommending the petitioner's request.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he is getting concerned what he is hearing now. The Board is being asked to act based on waiting for the City Manager to talk to the Zoning Administrator. He stated he understands that if she recommends something here and the Board does not agree with it, it will not be good for us. He stated he does not understand why they have to wait to go to City Council in order to go back to the Zoning Administrator, whom they could have talked to along the way any time they wanted to. If this is going to be a new procedure on everything we do, he requested to be notified ahead of time because we really would need to wait to do that before we bring something here.

**Mr. Coleman** stated the comments of the City Manager are informational for us to take into account any decision we, as a Board, makes. We decide whether what she brings is important enough for us to consider. He stated he understood her to say that right now the petitioner has asked for some specific things, and in the process of creating the staff recommendation, additional items were amended; she would like to see only what the petitioner asked for be what is acted upon and the rest be left as is. He asked Ms. Cutter if that was the correct interpretation.

**Ms. Cutter** replied that is correct.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he just wanted to make sure he understood that we are not changing the way we are doing things.

**Mr. Cook** stated he is still concerned about dumpsters in residential neighborhoods. He believes that should stand as is. It will create eyesores.

**Mr. Manigault** stated the reason we should be cautious regarding the City Manager's recommendations is that she has to talk to her people and to the Council. For us to approve something we may have an idea they will say no to, is a waste of time and may as well delay it. It makes sense and we've done it before. It's nothing new. It's just a matter of getting the City Council and City Manager's opinion first.

**Ms. Myers** stated she would like to to amend the motion to state that what we are approving is only what the applicant applied for. She stated this includes the hours of operation to begin 11:00 a.m., except on Sundays, which would be 12:30; and to allow serving wine at the table.

**Ms. Moore** stated that is not what was requested by the applicant.

**Mr. Coleman** stated they are concerned about those beyond these two items.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated he wanted to point out to the Commission that no matter what we recommend, the City Manager gets to recommend to Council.

**Mr. Farmer** asked for Ms. Moore's input.

**Ms. Moore** stated the conditions currently state "Sunday sales provisions shall apply everyday including Sunday." That's really at odds with condition four. Sunday sales provisions start at 12:30 p.m. That issue will need to be addressed.

**Ms. Cutter** commented the basis for calling things to the attention of the Board is because she is a member of the Board and currently the Acting City Manager. If she has identified there is a problem or issues of concern, she feels this is the proper way to do it. Often times when we let things pass on to City Council, it poses delays for the petitioner. She stated she is merely trying to circumvent that.

**Ms. Milton** asked regarding the Sunday hours: is that the time they want to open or serve wine.

**Ms. Moore** stated Monday through Saturday it can be 11:00 a.m. by state law, but cannot serve wine until 12:30 p.m. on Sunday.

**Mr. Farmer** amended the amended motion to say what the petitioner asked for with the exception that on Sunday wine service cannot start until 12:30 p.m.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked Ms. Moore if that solves the problem.

**Ms. Moore** replied yes.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the petitioner's text amendment to amend Article F (Nonconforming Uses), Section 8-3134(g)(1) (Changes in Nonconforming Uses) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance subject to a modification to require that wine not be sold before 12:30 p.m. on Sunday. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Susan Myers

Second: Ben Farmer

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

**Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Map Amendment**

10. Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment for 12815 White Bluff Road. Residential Single Family to Civic Institutional.

Attachment: [ELU\\_MAP.pdf](#)

Attachment: [FLU\\_MAP.pdf](#)

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

Proposed Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment.

12815 White Bluff Road

Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment

Aldermanic District: 6

County Commission District: 6  
PIN:2-0653-03-006  
Pruitt Properties, LLC.  
Phillip McCorkle, Agent  
Zoning District R-6 to PUD-IS

**Mr. Marcus Lotson**, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request for amendment to allow modifications to existing health care facility. The development pattern of the immediate community consists of primarily single-family homes. The proposed civic use designation matches the health care facility.

Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Development Map to change the property designation from Single Family Residential to Civic / Institutional.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked if it is civic institutional.

**Mr. Lotson** replied correct.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked if the adjoining property is PUD-IS.

**Mr. Lotson** replied that is correct.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked why would that not be appropriate for the balance.

**Mr. Lotson** replied they are recommending the zoning be PUD-IS for the property, the land use classification would be civic.

**Mr. Phillip McCorkle**, representative of the petitioner, stated they appreciated staff's recommendation. He stated it is a good use for the property and good for the neighborhood. The reason for the expansion is for more room for the residents; two per room rather than three.

**Ms. Cutter** asked if there had been any outreach to the neighborhood associations.

**Mr. McCorkle** stated there is no neighborhood association; confirmed by Councilman Tony Thomas. Notices went out to neighbors, and no negative responses have been received. There was discussion about trees coming down, but that is pursuant to approved plans. When the construction is over, the landscaping will return. They look forward to continuing to be good neighbors.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked where would access be.

**Mr. McCorkle** stated it is only on White Bluff Road.

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Development Map to change the property designation from Single Family Residential to Civic / Institutional. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow  
Second: Joseph Welch

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

**Zoning Petition - Map Amendment**

11. [Rezoning Request 12815 White Bluff Road R-6 to PUD-IS](#)

Attachment: [Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [EXISTING R6 USE TABLE.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [PUD-IS.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [0219Staff Report.pdf](#)

12815 White Bluff Road  
Rezoning Request R-6 to PUD-IS  
Aldermanic District: 6  
County Commission District: 6  
PIN: 2-0653-03-007B  
Pruitt Properties Incorporated, Owner  
Phillip R. McCorkle, Agent  
Zoning District: R-6 to PUD-IS  
Acres: 1.63

1. The petitioner is requesting rezoning of property located at 12815 White Bluff Road from an R-6 (Single family residential) classification to a PUD-IS (Planned Unit Development-Institutional) Classification. Same as preceding agenda item.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Mayor and Aldermen, for their consideration on the requested action to rezone the subject property from the R-6 (Single Family Residential) zoning classification, to a PUD-IS (Planned Unit Development - Institutional) classification with the following condition:

The approval of a recombination subdivision of PIN 2-0653-03-007B and PIN 2-0653-03-006 prior to the adoption by the Mayor and Aldermen of the requested zoning change. This is due to the three acre minimum lot size required for parcels within PUD-IS zoning districts.

*Discussed in conjunction with preceding agenda item.*

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Mayor and Aldermen, for their consideration on the requested action to rezone the subject property from the R-6 (Single Family Residential) zoning classification, to a PUD-IS (Planned Unit Development - Institutional) classification with the following condition:

- PASS

The approval of a recombination subdivision of PIN 2-0653-03-007B and PIN 2-0653-03-006 prior to the adoption by the Mayor and Aldermen of the requested zoning change. This is due to the three acre minimum lot size required for parcels within PUD-IS zoning districts.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Tanya Milton

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Nay
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye



Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

12. Zoning 1800 East 63rd Street - R-6 to P-RM-6

Attachment: [Conceptual Site Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report 021913.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maps 021913.pdf](#)

1800 East 63rd Street (Reuben Clark Drive)

Richard Mica, Petitioner/Owner

Harold Yellin, Attorney, Agent

PIN 2-0104-30-014

14.86 Acres

Aldermanic District: 2

County Commission District: 2

MPC File Number: 13-000506-ZA

**Mr. Gary Plumbley**, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request for consideration of a zoning map amendment for a vacant site located at 1800 East 63rd Street (Reuben Clark Drive). The request is to zone the site from an R-6 classification to a P-RM-6 classification. The use of the property is for an acute care center to house patients too sick to go home, but need to be out of the hospital. It has been determined that there is a need for this type of facility in this area. A Certificate of Need was obtained from Georgia for up to 60 beds; the proposed facility will be for 50 beds.

The MPC staff recommends **approval** of the petitioner's request to rezone the subject property from an R-6 classification to a P-RM-6 classification.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked if there have been transportation studies as to how it will affect the area.

**Mr. Plumbley** replied no, although there has been discussion with transportation planners. According to the Eighth Edition of the ITE Manual, the proposed zoning or use will not adversely impact the neighborhood. The proposed use will yield less traffic than if it were zoned R-6 and developed with single family houses.

**Mr. Harold Yellin**, representative of the petitioner, Landmark Hospitals. The subject property has a street address of 1800 East 63<sup>rd</sup> Street; it is bounded on the west by the Truman Parkway. It is bounded on the south by Rueben Clark Drive, also known as the Memorial Hospital Access Road. The properties located west and south are zoned as P-U-D-I-S, or P-U-D-I-S-B, which could be developed for medical related purposes, making it an ideal area for the project. The petitioner is requesting rezoning from R-6 to P-RM-6 for the property to be used as a long term acute care facility. It was previously zoned for the zoning requested, but reverted to R-6. A meeting was scheduled with

the neighborhood, and most concerns have been addressed. Most of the concerns were related to how the property will be used and how it will affect the neighborhood. It was explained that they treat seriously ill patients without emergency rooms or ambulances. Other issues regarding the site plan include:

- Access: using southern most road and not 63<sup>rd</sup>, to which the petitioner has agreed.
- Adequate buffers: that has been addressed.
- Lighting: down-cast lighting has been requested and it is required by code.
- Trees: footprint of building has been modified to accommodate larger oak trees

**Dr. Bill Kapp**, practicing physician and owner of several acute care centers, stated the company started in 2006. It helps critically ill patients that have exhausted their Medicare benefits. He stated they have good support from Memorial Medical Center. Part of the project planning process includes finding a physical site in the medical block because of medical staff of 120 and additional critical care physicians. The expected length of stay is 25 to 30 days. There about 400 nationwide; approximately 10 to 13 in Georgia. The patients are stable but require acute care and would have to meet the same hospital requirements. He stated they are a low-impact traffic facility.

**Mr. Manigault** asked if they are connected to Memorial Hospital for medical support.

**Dr. Kapp** replied yes. There is a transfer agreement for non-emergent ambulance support; coordinated transfer during daylight hours.

**Mr. Farmer** asked if Memorial being a trauma center was part of their reason for selecting Savannah for this project.

**Dr. Kapp** replied they may be the destination for some trauma patients and Savannah is under served for this type of service. The closest facilities are located in Charleston and Macon.

**Mr. Farmer** asked how they are funded.

**Dr. Kapp** stated Medicare has separate funding for this type of hospital. They also have contracts with different insurance companies. The other options would be in Augusta. There is a need for this type of care for the required additional time that is not allowed in short-term acute care hospitals. This project will assist critically ill patients, such as multi-system organ failure, severe wounds, or patients that will not be accepted into nursing facilities or rehabilitation facilities.

**Ms. Myers** asked about noise and light disturbance in the neighborhood.

**Dr. Kapp** replied they are low-volume and low-light facility. Most of the staff will be coming from the Memorial side of the access road. The 63<sup>rd</sup> Street

access would be for emergencies such as evacuation.

**Mr. Terry Coleman**, of Kern-Coleman, stated the state regulation indicates the project must have unencumbered flood plane access. The only time 63<sup>rd</sup> Street would be utilized is there if is obstruction; otherwise it will be locked, with coded-access only in an emergency. All of the other access will be on Reuben Clark Drive, which is a private road. Other site plan issues have been resolved such as flood plane, drainage, etc.

**Mr. Marshall** stated that regarding legal access agreements, the Board's decision should be subject to that finalization.

**Mr. Farmer** stated it would shorter to access site from hospital; it would be out of the way to use 63<sup>rd</sup> Street.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated this is a zoning request at this time, not site plan request.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked why is an institutional designation not more appropriate than multi-family.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated it could be, but it was thought it was be more appropriate to zone to a classification more compatible with the surrounding properties if the project should go away.

**Mr. Yellin** stated they tried to utilize the least intrusive zoning district.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated this designation prevents it from coming back to the MPC for site plan approval.

**Mr. Yellin** replied it will return to the MPC; it is a "P" district.

**Mr. Lufburrow** asked if the property was developed residentially with present or prior zoning, is it likely the access would have been from one of the other streets.

**Mr. Plumbley** responded that is correct.

**Mr. Robert Penix**, area resident and citizen, stated he is not opposed to the project. He stated he has access problems stemming from the Truman Parkway Expansion coming through the neighborhood. He stated his house was one of the last houses to survive that project. The drawings indicate a lane behind his house; there is no lane. He stated he has a driveway, but also a 17-foot base, 100-foot tall oak tree that blocks him from going to his back yard. This is his last opportunity to get an easement to get in his backyard. He stated he's requested the City to look into it. He needs a way to get into his backyard; he's requesting an easement.

He asked why is it necessary to rezone, why can they not zone it for institutional. If it is rezoned to multi-family residential and it does not come

through, then it's zoned for the residential, which he stated he really does not want.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he is understanding Mr. Penix to say he would be more negatively impacted by a residential development than by this proposed facility.

**Mr. Penix** replied if it zoned for residential and they don't do it, then the step has already been made for the people he doesn't want.

**Mr. Farmer** stated he knows there were some yards cut off by the Truman Parkway. He asked Mr. Penix if anything proposed in this development will land-lock him anymore than he is already.

**Mr. Penix** replied, yes. Right now there is bare ground. In his opinion, he could cut those trees and go by the side of his house and come through there. If they put a fence up in that location, then he'd never be able to get a boat or anything between his house and their proposed fence.

**Mr. Farmer** asked if the trees Mr. Penix is interested in cutting, are they on his property or the petitioner's.

**Mr. Penix** stated they would be on the dividing line; five trees would have to come down.

**Mr. Farmer** stated regardless of who owns the property, the problem is the same.

**Mr. Penix** stated if the property is going to change hands and the petitioner is going to own the property the rest of his and his family's life, he seeks relief that the lane be restored or give an easement on the left side so he can get into his backyard.

**Mr. Coleman** explained to Mr. Penix that his issues are not the responsibility of the petitioner. It was recommended that he contact the City again; Ms. Cutter is in attendance and has surely taken note of this.

**Ms. Cutter** stated she has noted Mr. Penix's concern regarding access to his backyard.

**Mr. Penix** stated his only other concern was regarding the proposed zoning being a stepping stone for something else if this project falls through. He would rather see this project than additional housing.

**Mr. Mark Fountain**, area resident and citizen, stated he has lived in the area since 1984 and he is not aware of a lane being there since he's been there. He is representing some of the other neighboring residents and their concerns, which include:

- To separate the project from current residential area: if the Board allows non-residential use, it is important that it be separated with appropriate

buffering and landscaping.

- A solid eight-foot maintenance-free privacy fence between project and neighborhood made of brick, architectural block, vinyl or PVC composite material (no wood or tin), should be installed before construction begins.
- Solid gate on 63rd Street that is locked for emergency access only: they are requesting that 63rd Street not be used by construction crews or anyone else, except flood or fire emergency.
- Lighting should be shielded to minimize light pollution and directed towards project and not the neighborhood.
- The zoning should apply only to this particular project. If this project does not go through or is not developed by Mr. Kapp and his crew, it will revert back to the R-6 zoning.
- They would like a guarantee to neighborhood by bond or some other mechanism, that what is proposed is what is ultimately done.
- Modify the structure to two stories:
- P-M-R-6 allows for 40 feet and they are proposing a higher structure. There is nothing on the eastside of the Truman Parkway that is greater than two stories. More than two stories would be an intrusion on a residential neighborhood.

**Mr. Fountain** concluded that some neighbors believe the notification posting was not done properly.

**Mr. Farmer** stated today is only about zoning. The other issues are relative to the site plan, which is not the issue today. Regarding zoning, the requested zoning is probably the best protection for the residents because it is least intrusive.

**Ms. Milton** asked why was the zoning changed throughout the years.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated it was based on different needs/requests.

**Mr. Lufburrow** stated it is hard to deal with zoning recommendation; which must stand on their own. Conditional zoning cannot be done; they must decide if this particular zoning is appropriate for the use the petitioner is intending or some other use that could ultimately come in under this type of zoning. We don't have the option to implement some of the safeguards that are being requested.

**Mr. Yellin** thanked the Board for reemphasizing this is for a zoning, not a site plan approval. He stated they will not stop talking with the neighborhood. He stated he is comfortable they can resolve the neighborhood's issues amicably.

**Mr. Farmer** motioned to approve staff's recommendation; seconded by Ms. Myers.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked what uses are allowed in the P-RM6 as opposed to P-U-D-I-S.

**Mr. Plumbley** replied P-U-D-I-S is more intensive in terms of number of uses that are allowed.

**Mr. Blackburn** asked what uses would be allowed in the P-UD-I-S that would be inappropriate for this area.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated he is not indicating inappropriateness; they are just more intensive. The medical use that is proposed now is allowed outright as a permitted use in a P-U-D-I-S.

Keep in mind other uses such offices, will be using Reuben Clark Drive. Memorial will not allow. Reuben Clark Drive to be used by this facility only because it allows Memorial a service it does not have. With other uses, traffic will use one of those residential streets; that's the only place it can go.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated it is important to remember its the Hospital Authority that owns the land and roadway, not Memorial. The Hospital Authority is a public body and they may have to look at the public's need a little differently than Memorial does. He stated he thinks rezoning it is appropriate, based on what and where it is. The problem is that everything to the west and south are zoned P-U-D-I-S-B. That may be appropriate for the entire area of the complex. He asked which zoning classification will allow staff and the Commission the most influence upon the site plan.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated he does not know the answer to that. He thinks Mr. Blackburn in favor of P-U-D-I-S.

**Mr. Blackburn** stated one of the things he noticed when he went to the site was a big electrical line running through it. There is a proposal to move that line, and it appears it will be moved next to the residences. He stated he is trying to find out what will allow the most influence on how the site is developed and how the residential sections immediately adjacent are protected.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated under the P-R-M-6, the scrutiny occurs two times after rezoning. Under the P-U-D-I-S, it doesn't have to go anywhere but to staff. P-R-M-6 does offer height restrictions.

**Mr. Lufburrow** asked if we voted in favor of staff's recommendation, then City Council approves it, what would happen if the petitioner is not able to gain access agreement. Would they or someone else be able to go forward with a similar project or would it be a matter of right at that time with a general development plan to go forward even if access ended up being on another street.

**Mr. Plumbley** replied they do have the right to develop their property, however, it would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for use approval. Since this is viewed as a promise to the neighborhood from the petitioner to not access the residential streets, staff would recommend that the use not be approved by Board of Appeals.

**Mr. Marshall** stated that isolated without the site plan that connects it to

Reuben Clark Drive, it is not an appropriate use of the property. That zone opens the property to uses that are not otherwise permitted.

**Mr. Thomson** stated the property has a right to access through public roads.

**Mr. Marshall** stated in this case, we are not only approving a use, but also a zoning. If it is not done with Reuben Clark Drive in perpetuity, a very large building could be converted to something that is not compatible within its single-family detached neighborhood.

**Mr. Lufburrow** asked the petitioner how long would it take to complete the negotiation for the easement so that he can make an amendment to the motion to postpone or continue.

**Mr. Yellin** stated if he and his client do not get the permanent right to access that road, we're not building. Prior to this meeting, one of the neighbors asked if we are not under construction in one year, would we go back to R-6. He stated they agreed to that. That is the safety net we would like to provide to the Commission. He stated they can go to City Council with a recommendation and agree to a sunset. We are aware of Mr. Marshall's concern. But we would like to proceed.

**Mr. Farmer** asked if this property previously had access somewhere else prior to being accessed by Truman Parkway. What zoning would best serve that area, without Reuben Clark Drive, if access was only from 63rd Street.

**Mr. Marshall** stated the property had access to 62nd, 63rd, and Costa Rica Streets.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the petitioner's request to rezone the subject property from an R-6 classification to a P-RM-6 classification. RECOMMEND FURTHER THAT CITY COUNCIL NOT APPROVE ZONING UNTIL ENTITY/OWNER AND DEVELOPER ENSURE ACCESS TO REUBEN CLARK DRIVE IN PERPETUITY CONNECTING IT AND ACCESS IS NOT THROUGH THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD OF THE SITE. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ben Farmer  
Second: Murray Marshall  
Russ Abolt - Not Present  
James Blackburn - Aye  
Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Murray Marshall	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

### General Development Plan

#### 13. [Automotive Stereo and Accessory Center - 223 West Montgomery Cross Road](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maps \(PLAN\) 021913.pdf](#)

Automobile Stereo and Accessory Center

223 West Montgomery Cross Road

PIN 2-0644-01-004

Agent: Mark Boswell

Owner: Samuel Fair Marshall, Fr. Family Living Trust

Engineer: Boswell Design

Aldermanic District: 5

County Commission District: 5

Zoning District: B-C

MPC File Number: 13-000102-PLAN

**Mr. Gary Plumbley**, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request for consideration of a General Development Plan for a site located on the south side of West Montgomery Cross Road approximately 1,575 feet west of Abercorn Street. The proposed development will consist of a one story structure approximately 4,300 square feet in size and will be used as an automotive stereo and accessory center.

The petitioner is also requesting **approval** of the following variances:

- A 10 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the eastern property line;
- An 18 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the western property line; and,
- A variance from the requirement that a privacy fence be located not less than 5 feet from the eastern and western property lines.

The MPC staff recommends **denial** of an 18 foot buffer width variance from



the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the western property line based on the findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **approval** of a 13 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the western property line, a 10 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the eastern property line, a variance from the requirement that a privacy fence be located not less than five feet from the eastern and western property lines, and a revised General Development Plan subject to conditions identified in the staff report.

The petitioner has agreed to increase the buffer. He would like to address the Commission regarding a four foot buffer to keep the four parking spaces in the front.

**Mr. Marshall** asked if this was the last B-C tract that was part the Morekis tract. It is not an intrusion of a business into a residential neighborhood; it was B-C first, then residential.

**Mr. SomNeuk Rasamee**, petitioner, stated he is used to having residential neighbors. He stated the majority of work is for dealers.

**Mr. Farmer** asked if cars will be stored outside overnight.

**Mr. Rasamee** stated they do accessorizing, not repair.

**Mr. Welch** asked if he will have a showroom.

**Mr. Rasamee** replied yes. Work will be done in the back.

**Mr. Marshall** reminded this is a commercial property. The petitioner should not be held to a standard that is not applicable to him because he has residential on each side.

**Mr. Charles Hogue**, of Signature Bank of America, adjacent property owner, thanked staff for notification of this petition. He stated the presentation was helpful; it raises questions regarding the buffering requirements and setbacks of his company's property. He also inquired what would happen to the rest of the petitioner's property that is not being developed. He stated it is relevant because as a bank, they are looking to sell the property as soon as possible.

**Mr. Plumbley** stated the business has to buffer against the bank's property. No changes will be expected of him because of the petitioner's request. UZO may make changes, but not because of the petitioner's plans. The petitioner has no plan to develop his remaining property in the future.

**Mr. Farmer** stated the area around the petitioner's property was originally B-C. He stated when he got his site plan, his buffering was increased substantially because the property was downzoned on each side. It's like he's an island. He asked that be given consideration regarding the petitioner's request.

**Board Action:**

The MPC staff recommends **denial** of an 18 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the western property line based on the findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **approval** of a 13 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the western property line, a 10 foot buffer width variance from the required 20 foot Type B buffer along the eastern property line, a variance from the requirement that a privacy fence be located not less than five feet from the eastern and western property lines, and a revised General Development Plan subject to conditions identified in the staff report. BOARD AMENDMENT TO MODIFY STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO HAVE THE EASTERNMOST BUFFER, THE AREA BETWEEN MONTGOMERY CROSSROADS, AND THE SOUTHERNMOST OF THE PARKING BE REDUCED FROM A TEN-FOOT VEGETATIVE BUFFER TO A FOUR-FOOT VEGETATIVE BUFFER. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ben Farmer  
Second: Tanya Milton  
Russ Abolt - Not Present  
James Blackburn - Aye  
Shedrick Coleman - Aye  
Ellis Cook - Not Present  
Stephanie Cutter - Aye  
Ben Farmer - Aye  
Stephen Lufburrow - Aye  
Timothy Mackey - Not Present  
Lacy Manigault - Not Present  
Murray Marshall - Aye  
Tanya Milton - Aye  
Susan Myers - Aye  
Adam Ragsdale - Not Present  
Joseph Welch - Aye

**Tower - New Facility/Collocation**

14. [Candler Hospital Parking Garage Rooftop Wireless Facility](#)

Attachment: [CityScape GA MPC ATT Roof Candler 1 18 13.pdf](#)

Attachment: [410-384 CDs.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Variance Request Support.pdf](#)

Attachment: [WTF Report to MPC 12-002102-PLAN.pdf](#)

In accordance with Article J (Wireless Telecommunication Facilities) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance, the applicant is seeking approval to erect a rooftop Wireless Telecommunications Facility ("WTF") on the elevator equipment penthouse of the north parking garage of Candler Hospital.

It is recommended that the MPC **approve** the development of a rooftop wireless telecommunications facility with the following conditions: 1) that the emergency generator shall be tested only between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.; 2) that the equipment enclosure fencing match the concrete color of the penthouse walls; and 3) all equipment be concealed by the enclosure fencing.

Further, the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance requires that all facilities wireless telecommunications facilities be concealed as a preferred design. The applicant has requested a variance and proposes to paint the exposed antennae a sky-blue color. Staff recommends **approval** of the requested variance.

The applicant is requesting a variance from the concealment standards in the Hierarchy of Design.

**Mr. Jack Butler**, MPC Comprehensive Planner, presented the petitioner's request. The proof of need is primarily for capacity, not coverage; hospitals are heavy users of cellular communications. The data commands of the area have outstripped the capability of the area. It is to be located on top of the garage.

**Mr. Jonathan Yates**, petitioner representing AT&T Mobility, thanked all for their help and participation of cellular provisions.

**Mr. Thomson** thanked Jack Butler and Rick Edwards for their help in proposed state legislation regarding cellular zoning standards. A copy of comments regarding this will sent to the Board.

**Board Action:**

It is recommended that the MPC **approve** the development of a rooftop wireless telecommunications facility with the following conditions: 1) that the emergency generator shall be tested only between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.; 2) that the equipment enclosure fencing match the concrete color of the penthouse walls; and 3) all equipment be concealed by the enclosure fencing. - PASS

Further, the Wireless Telecommunications

Facilities Ordinance requires that all facilities wireless telecommunications facilities be concealed as a preferred design. The applicant has requested a variance and proposes to paint the exposed antennae a sky-blue color. Staff recommends **approval** of the requested variance.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: James Blackburn

Russ Abolt	- Not Present
James Blackburn	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Ellis Cook	- Not Present
Stephanie Cutter	- Aye
Ben Farmer	- Aye
Stephen Lufburrow	- Aye
Timothy Mackey	- Not Present
Lacy Manigault	- Not Present
Murray Marshall	- Not Present
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Susan Myers	- Aye
Adam Ragsdale	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Aye

**XI. UNIFIED ZONING ORDINANCE (UZO)**

15. [Special Uses: Memo to City & County Attorneys, Including Zoning Procedures Law](#)

Attachment: [City & County Attorneys Thomson Special Uses 130212.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Zoning Procedures Law 2012-Special Use Highlighted.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission Special Uses 130219.pdf](#)

Vice - Chairman Coleman determined to forego UZO discussion, based on prior agreement by this Board to adhere to time restraints for the MPC meetings.

**Board Action:**

-

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

16. [UZO Review Meetings: Memo](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission Thomson UZO Review Meetings 130219.pdf](#)

17. [UZO Review: Sec. 5.4 Principal Use Table and Article 8.0 Use Standards](#)

Attachment: [5.4 Principal Use Table.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Article 8.0 Use Standards.pdf](#)

**XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

18. [Adjournment of February 19, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Vice Chairman Coleman entertained a motion to adjourn the February 19, 2013 MPC Meeting at 4:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson  
Executive Director

TLT/bf

**Note: Minutes not official until signed.**

**XIV. 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.*