



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
MINUTES

June 25, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting

Members Present: J. Adam Ragsdale, Chairman
W. Shedrick Coleman, Vice-Chairman
Ellis Cook, Secretary
Stephen Lufburrow
Timothy Mackey
Lacy Manigault
Murray Marshall
Joseph Welch

Members Not Present: Tanya Milton, Treasurer
Russ Abolt
Stephanie Cutter
Ben Farmer
Susan Myers

Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director
Melony West, CPA, Director, Finance & Systems
Gary Plumbley, Development Services Director
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Planner
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant
Amanda Bunce, Development Services Planner
Shanale Booker, IT Assistant
Constance Morgan, Administrative Assistant

Advisory Staff Present: 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. [July 9, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting at 1:00 PM in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Room, 112 East State Street](#)
2. [July 16, 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 Log 062513.pdf](#)

4. [MPC Pre-Meeting Attendance Memorandum](#)

Attachment: [Ragsdale - Pre-Meeting Memorandum.pdf](#)

Mr. Ragsdale read the memorandum concerning MPC pre-meeting attendance.

5. [Rooming Houses - Zoning Study and Moratorium](#)

Attachment: [City and County Rooming Houses - Zoning Study and Moratorium.pdf](#)

Attachment: [County Attorney Rooming House Response.pdf](#)

Mr. Thomson stated the inquiry was sent to the City and the County. Mr. Hart, the County attorney, replied moratorium could possibly be applied for 90 to 120 days. He stated staff requests an amendment to address that issue in 90 day, or a study if necessary. He suggested permitting the staff to start and present to Board when complete.

V. PRESENTATIONS

6. [Resolution of Appreciation for Stephen Lufburrow](#)

Mr. Ragsdale presented the Resolution of Appreciation to Mr. Lufburrow. Mr. Lufburrow served from 2004 until June 2013 for Chatham County.

Mr. Lufburrow thanked the Board for the acknowledgement.

7. [Resolution of Appreciation for Sarah Ward](#)

Mr. Ragsdale presented the Resolution of Appreciation to Ms. Ward. Ms. Ward worked with the MPC from November 2005 until June 2013, resigning as Director of Historic Preservation.

Ms. Ward thanked the Board for the acknowledgement.

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

Zoning Petition - Staff Text Amendment

8. [Text amendment to modify public notification standards | Savannah Zoning Ordinance, various sections | 13-003067-ZA](#)

Attachment: [13-003067-ZA Public Notification Staff Report.pdf](#)

MPC Staff is proposing text amendments to various sections of the Zoning Ordinance to:

- 1) codify a requirement for mailed notification for site plans and special uses reviewed by the Planning Commission;
- 2) add a sign posting requirement for site plans reviewed by the Planning Commission;
- 3) add a sign posting requirement for special uses reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Mayor and Aldermen; and,
- 4) increase the mailed notification radius from 200 feet to 300 feet.

Board Action:

Postpone Item - - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Shedrick Coleman

Second: James Blackburn Jr.

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

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

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

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of MPC Meeting Minutes and Briefing Minutes

9. [June 4, 2013 MPC Meeting and Briefing Minutes](#)

Attachment: [06.04.13 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Attachment: [06.04.13 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt - Not Present

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Stephanie Cutter - Not Present

Ben Farmer - Not Present

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Not Present

Susan Myers - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Authorization(s)

10. [Additional Planning Meetings to review the Unified Zoning Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission Thomson Planning Meetings-](#)

[additional.pdf](#)

Mr. Blackburn, Jr. stated since the City and County have both said this should be seen as separate ordinances, additional time to review something that will not be a unified document is not necessary.

Mr. Ragsdale stated the unified moniker will be removed.

Mr. Thomson stated the City draft will be completed first, then the County.

Mr. Manigault stated what's good for city may not be best for County. We've spent a lot of time on this and it doesn't matter how we're going to present, but let's keep on and finish. We should get it over with. The City would like to see something from us soon.

Board Action:

Approve. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Lacy Manigault

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Russ Abolt - Not Present

James Blackburn Jr. - Nay

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Ellis Cook - Aye

Stephanie Cutter - Not Present

Ben Farmer - Not Present

Stephen Lufburrow - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Lacy Manigault - Aye

Murray Marshall - Aye

Tanya Milton - Not Present

Susan Myers - Not Present

Adam Ragsdale - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Zoning Petition - Staff Text Amendment

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

Attachment: [Staff Report 062503.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.

Staff recommends approval of the request to amend the definition section to include a definition for “agriculture general” which clarifies that it applies to commercial activities, add a definition for “agriculture restricted” which applies to the commercial raising of crops without the commercial raising of animals, add a definition for “personal agriculture” which specifically refers to the Animal Control Ordinance for the keeping of animals, and expand the definition of “home occupation;” and replace the use “raising of commercial and noncommercial livestock and poultry” with “agriculture general” in the index and use tables for the C&R and B&I districts; replace the uses “growing of crops, gardens” with “agriculture restricted” and “raising of non-commercial poultry” with “agriculture personal” and allow in all zoning districts, of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Bunce stated this is a follow up to the amendments to the County's definition of agriculture. This is a similar amendment for the City.

Mr. Thomson stated it does not amend the Animal Control Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance, it simply points to it. The language will be similar to what the County passed.

Board Action:

APPROVAL of the request to amend the definition section to include a definition for “agriculture general” which clarifies that it applies to commercial activities, add a definition for “agriculture restricted” which applies to the commercial raising of crops without the commercial raising of animals, add a definition for “personal agriculture” which specifically refers to the Animal Control Ordinance for the keeping of animals, and expand the definition of “home occupation;” and replace the use “raising of commercial and noncommercial livestock and poultry” with “agriculture general” in the index and use tables for the C&R and B&I districts; replace the uses “growing of crops, gardens” with “agriculture restricted” and “raising of non-commercial poultry” with “agriculture personal” and allow in all zoning districts, of the City Zoning Ordinance - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ellis Cook
Second: James Blackburn Jr.
Russ Abolt - Not Present
James Blackburn Jr. - Aye
Shedrick Coleman - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Aye
Ellis Cook - Aye
Stephanie Cutter - Not Present

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

VIII. ITEMS MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. REGULAR BUSINESS

Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Map Amendment

12. [Future Land Use Map Amendment from Civic/Institutional to Commercial-Neighborhood for properties located at 2225 Norwood Avenue and 2123 Ridgewood Avenue](#)

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

Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment
2225 Norwood Avenue and 2123 Ridgewood Avenue
PIN 1-0377-11-002B and 1-0377-12-002
Acreage: 1.63 Acres
County Commission District: 1
MPC File Number: Z-130610-00043-1
Petitioner: Shoshanna Walker
Owner: Southside Fire Department

Mr. Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request for consideration of an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. The future land use designation on both properties is Civic/Institutional and the requested future land use designation for both properties is Commercial Neighborhood.

Staff recommends **denial** of the request to change the future land use designation of the property identified as 2123 Ridgewood Avenue from Civic/Institutional to Commercial Neighborhood. Recommends **approval** of an alternate classification of Residential - Suburban Single Family Residential. Staff further recommends **approval** of the request to change the future land use designation of the property identified as 2225 Norwood Avenue from Civic/Institutional to Commercial Neighborhood without adverse impact.

Board Action:

DENIAL of the request to change the future land use designation of the property identified as 2123 Ridgewood Avenue from Civic/Institutional to Commercial Neighborhood and **approval** of an alternate classification of Residential - Suburban Single Family Residential. Staff further recommends **approval** of the request to change the future land use designation of the property identified as 2225 Norwood Avenue from Civic/Institutional to Commercial Neighborhood. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow
Second: Ellis Cook

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

Zoning Petition - Map Amendment

13. [Zoning Map Amendment - 2225 Norwood Avenue and 2123 Ridgewood Avenue - R-1/EO \(Single Family Residential/Environmental Overlay\) to B-N/EO \(Neighborhood Business/Environmental Overlay\)](#)

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

Zoning Map Amendment
2225 Norwood Avenue and 2123 Ridgewood Avenue
PIN: 1-0377-11-002B and 1-0377-12-002
Acreage: 1.63 Acres
County Commission District: 1
MPC File Number: Z-130605-00042-1
Petitioner: Shoshanna Walker
Owner: Southside Fire Department

Mr. Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's requesting consideration of a zoning map amendment for the properties located at 2225 Norwood Avenue and 2123 Ridgewood Avenue. The subject properties are presently zoned R-1/EO (Single Family Residential/Environmental Overlay) and the petitioner is requesting that both properties be rezoned to a B-N/EO (Neighborhood Business/Environmental Overlay) classification for the purpose of establishing a small retail outlet, office space including training facility, and soap making.

Staff recommends **denial** of the request to rezone the property identified as 2123 Ridgewood Avenue (PIN 1-0377-12-002) from R-1/EO to B-N/EO due to abutting on all sides except one by residential structures, which the petitioner is aware. Staff further recommends **approval** of the request to rezone the property identified as 2225 Norwood Avenue (PIN 1-0377-11-002B) from R-1/EO to B-N/EO.

Board Action:

DENIAL of the request to rezone the property identified as 2123 Ridgewood Avenue (PIN 1-0377-12-002) from R-1/EO to B-N/EO. Staff further recommends **approval** of the request to rezone the property identified as 2225 Norwood Avenue (PIN 1-0377-11-002B) from R-1/EO to B-N/EO. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Shedrick Coleman

Second: Joseph Welch

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

14. [Zoning Map Amendment - 6705 Abercorn Street - P-RIP-B-1 \(Planned Residential - Medium Density\) classification to a B-C \(Community Business\) classification.](#)

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

Zoning Map Amendment
6605 Abercorn Street
PIN 2-0144-02-003A
Acreage: 1.6 Acres
Aldermanic District: 4
County Commission District: 2
Zoning District: P-RIP-B-1
MPC File Number: 13-002597-ZA
Petitioner/Owner: June S. Adams
Agent: Robin Flanders

Mr. Gary Plumbley, MPC Project Planner, presented the petitioner's request for consideration of a zoning map amendment for the property located at 6705 Abercorn Street (PIN 2-0144-02-003A). The subject site is presently zoned P-RIP-B1 (Planned Residential Medium Density) and the petitioner is requesting that the site be rezoned to a B-C (Community Business) classification for the purpose of more diverse range of commercial uses at the site.

Staff recommends **approval** of the petitioner's request to rezone the site located at 6705 Abercorn Street from a P-RIP-B-1 classification to a B-C classification.

Board Action:

APPROVAL of the petitioner's request to rezone the site located at 6705 Abercorn Street from a P- - PASS RIP-B-1 classification to a B-C classification.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Lufburrow
Second: Joseph Welch

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

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

XI. UNIFIED ZONING ORDINANCE (UZO)

15. [UZO Review: Sec. 5.4, Principal Use Table and Article 8, Use Standards](#)

Attachment: [5 4 Principal Use Table.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Article 8 0 Use Standards.pdf](#)

Staff continued with the review of Draft 2 of the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

Outdoor Amusement

Ms. Bunce: This is located in the commercial section of the use table. It is proposed to be very similar to the amendment adopted in 2010 for the County. Would include any outdoor facility: batting cages, paint ball, bumper cars, outdoor archery, mini golf, etc. The City has one similar with three uses: mini golf, driving ranges, outdoor recreation. The districts and use conditions are similar to the County. The City has no use conditions currently.

Outdoor Firearm Range

Similar to the use called Outdoor Shooting Range in the City and County. The use conditions are comparable to what is currently written. Allowed in R-M-H by-right and with ZBA approval Conversation Marsh in the City. It is allowed in the County with ZBA approval in the R-A, restricted only to non-profits; that restriction is proposed to be removed and allowed only in A-1.

Racetrack/Drag Strip/Motocross

Ms. Bunce: This use currently does not exist in the City. It exists in the County as carnival, horsetrack, racetrack, rodeo, etc. Proposed in the A-1 district as a special use with use restrictions regarding setback.

Mr. Marshall: What is the setback?

Ms. Bunce: 200 ft from the property line.

Mr. Marshall: What kinds of races?

Ms. Bunce: Vehicle, dragstrip, motocross for bikes.

Mr. Marshall: Why have any; 200 feet is not enough.

Ms. Bunce: The County currently requires only 100 feet; we've proposed to increase it.

Mr. Blackburn, Jr.: Is there a track in the City limits? Hutchinson site?

Ms. Bunce: Not sure. The municipal boundaries on Hutchinson are complex.

Mr. Mackey: In the City, with this language, is this specific to any type of racetrack? What about the Fun Park in Pooler that has go-karts that are not loud. Does this regulate that type?

Ms. Bunce: The site in Pooler would fall under the Outdoor Amusement use. This use (Racetrack/Drag Strip/Motocross) is for racing.

Mr. Mackey: Does this cover skateboards ramps, etc?

Ms. Bunce: That would be Outdoor Amusement.

Mr. Mackey: Any limits that regulate size?

Ms. Bunce: None.

Mr. Mackey: Does this regulate anything indoors?

Ms. Bunce: No.

Riding Academy; Equestrian Center; Horse Stable (Commercial)

Ms. Bunce: Not clear how use is permitted in the County. Summarized how allowed in City. Proposed to be allowed by-right, rely on Animal Control ordinance for separation standards.

Ms. Marshall: How is the stable on Norwood Ave affected by the draft UZO?

Ms. Bunce: I can't recall the proposed zoning. We can follow up. I believe that site was considered.

Mr. Marshall: Is the site on Norwood illegal? How was it permitted?

Ms. Bunce: I'm not aware.

Mr. Marshall: It may be a mistake to rely on Animal Control ordinance. Since this is a business, not personal horses. I'd like to see more discussion and to understand the Animal Control ordinances better.

Ms. Bunce: Reviewed City use conditions and pointed out those that conflict with animal control ordinance. There shouldn't be duplication.

Mr. Ragsdale: If someone wanted a commercial riding academy, how would we review that as a general development plan without use conditions?

Ms. Bunce: City would check to see if standards were met and it would be reviewed as any other site plan. No need for any use conditions.

Ragsdale: Would it follow the general development plan process?

Ms. Bunce: Yes. Just as for any other use.

Mr. Mackey: There was an issue on Louisville Rd. A lady had horses in a residential area, an equestrian center...years ago. She felt it was allowed by matter of right; it was tough to get that out of the area. Now in the Coffee Bluff area, one has been set up and it's tough to deal with. Relying on the Animal Control ordinance is tough, because it's silent on many things. If we're not going to address it in zoning, then it's open to interpretation or judgement.

Ms. Bunce: I'm not certain that the locations referenced even allow the use, so zoning enforcement follows in either circumstance. If they are not meeting Animal Control

ordinance, that's a different matter. Staff will follow up with Ellen to determine what the proposed revisions to the City's Animal Control ordinance include for horses.

Mr. Mackey: If we're not knowledgeable of Animal Control ordinance, then we need to know more.

Ms. Bunce: Let staff review current and proposed Animal Control ordinances for City and County and come back and explain. That way we can add any standards that the Animal Control ordinance doesn't address.

Mr. Manigault: That site in Coffee Bluff...he didn't have enough land and it was only for family.

Mr. Mackey: He's doing it again. Same guy.

Ms. Bunce: Near Felt Dr.?

Mr. Mackey: Yes.

Stadium or Outdoor Arena; Amphitheater; Outdoor Sports Facility or Complex

Ms. Bunce: This use does not exist in the City or County ordinances; only allowed as a public use now. It is proposed for government or private owner in the Conservation Park, Downtown Expansion, Community Business, and I-L-T zoning districts. The only use condition is that if it is more that 250 seats are proposed, the use will be subject to review by the governing body.

Mr. Mackey: How does this affect arena placement by City? With this language, there may be a desire to place it close to residential.

Mr. Ragsdale: Have you analyzed the sites the City is looking at?

Ms. Bunce: If the City identifies a site that doesn't work according to the draft, then staff can amend either the map or draft to accommodate.

Mr. Ragsdale: What is the western boundary of the D-X district?

Ms. Bunce: West Boundary Street.

Mr. Ragsdale: I thought D-X was at Savannah River Landing.

Ms. Bunce: The district is to the west, east and north sides of downtown.

Mr. Ragsdale: What is the western boundary of the eastern district?

Ms. Bunce: East Broad St generally speaking. That's different north of President.

Mr. Ragsdale: Can we look at the map?

Mr. Mackey: Does this knock some sites out?

Ms. Bunce: The City can go where they want.

Mr. Manigault: Correct. City can go where they want.

Ms. Bunce: Showed UZOOM tool. Looked at zoning. E. Broad, north of President. Shows

D-C. Hitch Village is only D-X area east of E. Broad for now.

Mr. Ragsdale: Has that D-C always been there? Wasn't it D-X at one time?

Ms. Bunce: I don't recall all previous versions of the map.

Mr. Ragsdale: That needs to be D-X. There is a significant project in the works that would require the D-X district.

Ms. Bunce: As always, we are happy to meet with property owners to discuss the draft.

Mr. Ragsdale: We have five times. With MPC staff. With Sarah.

Ms. Bunce: To discuss the UZO?

Mr. Ragsdale: To discuss the use with regard to the UZO. I'll follow up with you later.

*The discussion transitioned to **Service Uses**.*

Service, General

Ms. Bunce: This use is much like the office general use, and includes uses like interior decorating or photography studio. It is comparable to the City and County ordinances. It is proposed in all mixed use zonings, office, and commercial zoning classifications.

Mr. Ragsdale: So this doesn't have a corresponding chapter?

Ms. Bunce: This use has no use conditions. The only reason you would need to use Article 8 is if a use has use conditions.

Animal Service, Indoor

Ms. Bunce: Animal grooming, vet, etc., where service is provided indoors. Keeping use condition, that a building must be designed to have STC rate of at least 52.

Mr. Ragsdale: Shouldn't Architectural Graphics Standards be underlined or somehow indicated to be a title of a publication/book?

Ms. Bunce: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: Is that number 52 based on a study? How was that number chosen?

Ms. Bunce: It's in the current ordinances. This standard ensures only a certain amount of noise can be heard outside of the building.

Mr. Marshall: Is that sufficient?

Mr. Coleman: I've used that criteria and it definitely works. It's not based on use. You design a wall to ensure that it meets that coefficient.

Animal Services, Outdoor

Ms. Bunce: Proposed to be allowed in the A-1, B-C, and I-L-T districts. Proposed condition is for outdoor runs/play areas, to be 200 feet from residential. Current is 100 feet.

Mr. Ragsdale: What determined the increase to 200 feet?

Ms. Bunce: A bit more separation was drafted to deal with the noise issue.

Mr. Ragsdale: So there's no science behind that number?

Ms. Bunce: No. In an outdoor area, there's no real way to attenuate the sound. If it is adjacent to residential then there will also be a use buffer required of 20 feet of plantings and a 6 ft high opaque fence.

Mr. Ragsdale: I'm not comfortable, unless there's some real science behind it.

Ms. Bunce: I guess the increase is from anecdotal evidence. Shared example. When there's no science to base it on, you just have to go by everyday life.

Mr. Ragsdale: Does the rest of commission agree with the increase?

Mr. Manigault: People love dogs here. Be careful about increase.

Mr. Ragsdale: Wouldn't the dog park off of Drayton become nonconforming?

Ms. Bunce: This would not regulate a dog park. That would be the "park, general" use.

Mr. Ragsdale: "outdoor runs and play areas."

Ms. Bunce: That's not a night time use, it's a during the day, park type of use. It's a park, like for kids and different than kennel, vet, boarding. Dog park would be park, general.

Mr. Ragsdale: Are there separation requirements from residential or buffering required for that use?

Ms. Bunce: I would have to check buffer section. I don't recall that there is. We'll review that in Article 9.

Mr. Marshall: I don't think 200 ft is enough for a commercial operation. We need to determine distance correctly, especially with groups of dogs.

Ms. Bunce: We were trying not to be overly restrictive while recognizing that the current standard was insufficient. The more distance from residential, the larger the property will need to be.

Mr. Marshall: We shouldn't be concerned about a business that's not there. We should be concerned about the neighbor who was there first. Why can't we impose a 52 dB limit for outdoors? If you have to build a berm or concrete wall, then so be it. Distance may not do it.

Ms. Bunce: We can attempt to find the science behind the distance. I don't recall finding it previously, but we can attempt.

Mr. Manigault: Should we add that to our next planning meeting?

Ms. Bunce: We have a list of these types of comments that we will add this to and come back to deal with it.

Mr. Welch: Can we go back to the indoor animal use? There's a place near Forsyth Park where dogs are kept during day, not overnight. Historically, that was an animal clinic. Would they be able to do that?

Ms. Bunce: On the west side of the park there is a place. That use is allowed in most of the proposed Downtown districts.

Mr. Coleman: Going back to outdoor sound. It's too complicated to establish outdoor sound controls due to number of dogs, unless we want to regulate number of dogs. Dogs vary in pitch, etc. so an established sound ratio is difficult Mr. Marshall for these reasons. We may have to go with distance and adjust in the future if it's a problem.

Mr. Marshall: If we're going to go with a distance, fences and trees help. A 200 foot planted buffer would help.

Mr. Coleman: That would help. The use should adhere to the buffer requirement.

Ms. Bunce: We can follow up on depth of plantings. I believe it's 20 feet with a fence.

Mr. Marshall: Isn't that the case for any commercial.

Ms. Bunce: Correct.

Mr. Marshall: But this is a special type of use.

Mr. Ragsdale: Science proves trees don't reduce sound, it's a psychological effect. Don't add trees to try and absorb sound.

Ms. Bunce: We don't commonly get complaints for this use.

Bank

Ms. Bunce: Proposed in similar zoning districts as currently allowed in City and County.

Body Art Services

Ms. Bunce: This use doesn't exist in the County, though requested in the past. No one has followed through with a text amendment in County. Proposed to be allowed with no use conditions and in more districts than currently allowed in the City.

Mr. Marshall: Why is this not allowed more in industrial zones?

Ms. Bunce: It is proposed in IL-T. That's where we've tried to keep these type of uses. We've attempted to keep IL and IH areas reserved for industrial uses and not have service, retail uses frequented mostly by the general public.

Business Support Services

Ms. Bunce: Examples are Kinko's, FedEx. It is proposed in districts similar to those in the City and County. There are no use conditions. It is allowed in all mixed use, office, commercial zoning, the I-L-R and the I-L-T districts. This would not include the newspaper.

Catering Establishment

Ms. Bunce: There is no equivalent use in the County; it exists in the City as Catering Service and also permitted under the general service use in Mid-City. For producing meals to be served off-site, true catering; not considered as banquet hall. In mixed-use, office, business, and I-L-R and I-L-T districts.

Check Cashing; Title Pawn; Payday Loan

Ms. Bunce: Does not exist separately in current ordinances, which is under banks. We separated this use out from banks and offices. We've proposed that it have a 1,000 ft separation from a similar use to avoid concentration of this use. We originally had a 500 ft separation but we received feedback during the Advisory Committee process. Step Up Savannah wanted to see a greater distance between these uses that are viewed as predatory lending.

Mr. Ragsdale: I can't tell McDonald's who sells food which is generally unhealthy not build next to Wendy's which sells food that is generally unhealthy. So how can I tell a predatory lender that they can't be beside another?

Mr. Marshall: I think we need to be careful that we assume they are doing something illegal. We shouldn't use term predatory lending. There shouldn't be any separation for this use. They are a bank; they must comply with the law.

Ms. Bunce: Some neighborhood associations and Step Up would say they locate near poor neighborhoods and tend to locate close to one another.

Mr. Ragsdale: What about fast food and convenience stores who do the same? I move to strike the separation.

Mr. Manigault: Step Up knows this is an issue. This use hooks people.

Mr. Ragsdale: This wouldn't hold up in court.

Ms. Bunce: Is this a use where the members want us to strike the condition?

Mr. Marshall: I propose we decide what zone they can go in and that's it.

Mr. Ragsdale: Agree.

Mr. Thomson: We'll park this and come back to it.

Mr. Marshall: I understand the issue. But it's legislative not zoning.

Mr. Blackburn, Jr.: Remove the term payday loan because they aren't allowed. The state prohibits it.

Crematorium

Ms. Bunce: This use does not exist in the County ordinance; it is combined with funeral home in the City's. It's proposed to be separated. It is proposed to have a use condition of 300 foot setback from a conforming residential use. It is proposed in the D-C, OI-E, B-C, I-L-T, I-L, and I-H districts and has a special use in TC-2 district.

Mr. Ragsdale: What is the reason for the 300 foot separation from residential?

Ms. Bunce: Our experience is that people don't want to live near this use. I'd have to check notes to see where that came from.

Mr. Thomson: The Board will remember the Stephenson Avenue case. There was a lot of contention about that use.

Mr. Manigault: The concern was over the smell.

Mr. Blackburn, Jr.: I'm opposed to separating funeral homes and crematoriums because you're not going to have them separate as separate facilities.

Mr. Ragsdale: It is a possibility to have them separate. It could be stand alone.

Mr. Blackburn, Jr.: There are none here.

Mr. Manigault: Correct.

Ms. Bunce: Separating the use was based on complaints of the crematorium, not the funeral home. We didn't want to prevent a funeral home from locating somewhere because of a possible crematorium.

Funeral Home

Ms. Bunce: Proposed is similar to the districts in the City and County ordinances. It is allowed in the R-I-P-A, which comparable to the proposed D-R district. We've not proposed that it be allowed in that district.

Banquet or reception hall

Ms. Bunce: For rental that may have kitchen facilities. Requested that we return to this use as we anticipate additional use conditions for certain districts.

Ms. Ragsdale: Why is this a special use in TC-1?

Ms. Bunce: It's not currently permitted in TC-1 and this can have large numbers of people. We felt additional review is warranted.

Instructional Studio or Classroom

Ms. Bunce: Dance, martial arts, music, etc. for educational use not part of a school. It is proposed to be allowed in all mixed-uses, office, business, I-L-R, and I-L-T districts with no use conditions.

Laundromat

Ms. Bunce: Exists as several uses in the City. Laundry drop-off facilities; not a dry cleaners.

Dry Cleaner/Laundry, Neighborhood

Ms. Bunce: Standard dry cleaner, proposed to be allowed in the mixed-use, office and most industrial classifications by-right.

Personal Service Shop:

Ms. Bunce: Nail, tanning, hair shops, spa, etc. Proposed in similar districts as listed currently. There are no use restrictions except in B-M district. It can be no more than 25% of building operation in marina areas.

Psychic; Palmist; Medium; Fortune Teller

Ms. Bunce: Proposed in similar zoning classifications as currently allowed.

Repair-Oriented Services

Ms. Bunce: Does not include internal combustible engines.

Mr. Ragsdale: What about golf carts?

Ms. Bunce: Electric golf carts may be ok. The use only prohibits repair of internal combustion engines. The “such as” in the definition means it’s intended to be like those items listed and nothing in the list is similar to autos, so that wouldn’t be allowed.

Tour Company Terminal

Ms. Bunce: New use added in Draft 2. This regulates the location of where they sell and distribute of tickets. Does not include storage or dispatch of vehicles.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

16. [Adjournment of June 25, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Ragsdale entertained a motion to adjourn the June 25, 2013 MPC Meeting at 3:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson
Executive Director

TLT/bf

Note: Minutes not official until signed.

XIV. DEVELOPMENT PLANS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

17. [Development Review Log](#)

Attachment: [Development Review Log 062513.pdf](#)

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.