



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
May 7, 2013 1:00 P.M.  
MINUTES

**May 7, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting**

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

**Members Not Present:** J. Adam Ragsdale, Chairman  
Russ Abolt  
Stephanie Cutter  
Timothy Mackey

**Staff Present:** Thomas Thomson, P.E. AICP, Executive Director  
Charlotte Moore, AICP, Director of Special Projects  
Amanda Bunce, Project Planner  
Christy Adams, Director, Administration  
Bri Finau, Administrative Assistant

**Advisory Staff Present:** Geoff Goins, City Zoning Administrator

**I. Call to Order and Welcome**

**II. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements**

**Notice(s)**

1. [May 7, 2013 MPC ByLaws Committee Meeting at 12:00 PM in the West Conference Room, 110 East State Street.](#)
2. [May 9, 2013 2:30 PM to 5:00 PM Archaeology Site Visit](#)

3. [May 14, 2013 MPC Finance Committee Meeting at 11:30 AM in the West Conference Room, 110 East State Street.](#)

4. [May 14, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

### III. Consent Agenda

5. [March 26, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting Minutes](#)

#### Board Action:

Recommend **APPROVAL** of the MPC Planning Meeting Minutes as submitted. - 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 - 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

### IV. Regular Business

6. [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](#)

**Mr. Cook** asked if the name of the Unified Zoning Ordinance should be changed. He said it was brought out it is not a unified ordinance; it is two separate documents. Will it remain as such or truly merged into one document.

**Mr. Thomson** stated a name change is under consideration; it may be presented when Draft 3 is released. We would like to keep it as one document until it has to be split.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** asked if the current ordinances are similar, other than in use districts. He wanted to know what the major differences were.

**Ms. Moore** stated the format is different; there have been some amendments in the City but not the County. There are overlay districts in the County, as well as historic in the City with different procedures.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** asked if most of the changes came about because of amendments.

**Ms. Moore** replied yes. She then mentioned that the presentation today was a review of the proposed commercial uses. Before beginning the review, she mentioned upcoming meetings with the Woodville neighborhood and with the Tourism Leadership Council.

**Mr. Manigault** asked if enough support from the public is anticipated. We want to make sure adequate review coverage is provided.

**Ms. Moore** replied yes; they are requested by specific groups. She added that the Board of Directors for the Chamber of Commerce has requested a meeting.

**Mr. Mackey** asked when will the Commission have completed what it needs to do.

**Ms. Moore** stated that will need to be discussed. This is Draft 2; not the draft moving forward to City Council and County Commission. The release and review will be done concurrently. Draft 3 will be on a question basis only, not page-by-page as being done now.

**Mr. Mackey** asked what presentation is presented to public forums.

**Ms. Moore** stated an overview of the ordinance and the UZO website; it's not as detailed of a review as with the Board. Specific details can be discussed as requested.

**Mr. Marshall** stated he believes there will be page-by-page review in further drafts because the context of the document changes as the pieces change. It will be necessary in order to forward to the elected officials.

**Ms. Moore** stated Draft 3 will encompass the changes that are the result of the Planning Meetings.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** asked how many districts have the same name as previously had.

**Ms. Moore** stated about ten. The uses may change but many of the same names have remained.

After Ms. Moore concluded, Ms. Bunce came to the podium and began to review the individual uses proposed in the office category of the principal use table (Sec. 5.4).

**Ms. Bunce** started with Office General. This is any type of office use that is not called out specifically in the use table; the category of office general will address it. It is generally allowed in same type of zoning districts in the current ordinances, and by-right in nearly all of them.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with Call Center. She explained the use and the purpose for separating it from the general office category (greater number of people in building than a general office, and it may be 24-hour operation). The operational characteristics determine the districts where it can be permitted; there are fewer districts where it is proposed to be

permitted than the general office use.

**Ms. Myers** asked about parking for call centers. Would it affect its eligibility in the downtown area.

**Ms. Bunce** replied outside of the downtown area, there are three parking areas: "exempt", "reduced", and "Victorian/Streetcar." The call center use is one space for every 100 square feet.

She continued with Day Labor Employment Center. There is no equivalent use in the County, though it exists in the City. Proposed in similar zoning classifications as it currently exists. It is a limited use with conditions that include: location on a collector or greater street, and all activities in a fully enclosed building.

**Mr. Mackey** asked what district is the closest to residential where this use is proposed.

**Ms. Bunce** replied it is proposed in four mixed-use districts, TC-2, D-C, D-C-B-D, and D-X. The other three districts are B-C, I-L-T, and I-L. D-X is Downtown Expansion, on either side of the downtown.

**Mr. Mackey** stated he is opposed to them being anywhere close to a residential area. They have people lingering, then it turns into an issue for inspection. It can be enforced from a zoning perspective before it gets to that. There should be a separation standard from residential; there needs to be a serious buffer between the two.

**Ms. Bunce** stated it will be reviewed.

**Mr. Lufburrow** asked how this should be defined to differentiate between employment agencies and day laborers.

**Ms. Bunce** stated proposed definition is similar to the City's definition: a place of assemblage for persons applying for temporary day labor work. There is zoning for that now in the City.

**Mr. Marshall** stated he agrees with Mr. Mackey. The separation should be from a residential zoning district, not from a legal residential use in a non-residential zoning district. However, that applies to the person that gets the license to do it.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** asked are they not allowed in heavy industrial areas.

**Ms. Bunce** replied it can be reviewed; they are usually along corridors with bus routes or walking distance.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** asked how it is different from a union hall that gets several calls a day; they have union members and day laborers as well.

**Ms. Bunce** stated that could be classified as a club as well as a day labor employment center.

**Mr. Farmer** agreed that it should not be near a residential neighborhood. If the criteria existed before, how and why are people being picked up on the squares.

**Ms. Bunce** replied because it is a de facto use; UZO is proposing a facility for the use.

**Mr. Manigault** stated if something has been working well for years and people are well

aware of it, let's not change it. We should not create a new area in a residential area.

**Mr. Marshall** asked what zone is a union hall allowed in and why wouldn't day labor employment centers be allowed in the same.

**Ms. Bunce** replied if a union hall is operating as a club or lodge, it will be allowed in more zoning districts than the day labor employment center. It may be viewed as two distinct uses occurring in the same building, each would have be determined if eligible for allowance in a zone.

**Ms. Bunce** moved to the Office Medical use. The equivalent existing use is "Banks and Offices" in both zoning ordinances. It is being proposed as a use by-right in most mixed-use business and office districts. The exception is in the D-R district; it is a special use in the O-I-T district.

**Mr. Blackburn, Jr.** stated this is a use that does not need to exist.

**Ms. Bunce** stated in certain circumstances it was practical. Because some medical uses can be quite intense, staff felt it was appropriate to have another level of review.

**Mr. Farmer** stated the parking is so restrictive under the current zoning. He asked is that being reduced.

**Ms. Bunce** replied the parking has been reduced by 25 percent. The parking will eliminate big medical operations but will allow smaller offices opportunities.

**Mr. Marshall** stated as planners, we should say where uses are allowed. It is penalizing a neighborhood that under current thought is a transition because it's being driven by changes in the demographics and traffic patterns.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the lots in transition are lots that used to be single-family lots; they don't have the depth to accommodate commercial development, parking, and required buffers, especially for the more intense uses that would be allowed in B-N and B-C. The districts that allow non-residential uses have a very limited number of uses.

**Mr. Marshall** stated that is his point. He asked what should it be; it is not deep enough to be B-C. He asked if there is a zone that accommodates a 100 foot deep lot or the setback requirements in the transition areas, rather than doing it one at a time. Montgomery Crossroad should be commercial from end-to-end. Instead of making a special uses, it should be a zone that accommodates what's there.

**Ms. Bunce** stated we are working on responding to your concerns on that.

**Mr. Thomson** stated it is important to note we are talking of use, not zoning and setbacks. He thinks staff has come up with a pretty good compromise. They did not want to give away the zoning in certain areas unless someone comes in with a viable proposal, which could then be considered.

**Mr. Marshall** stated if a special use will be allowed in a residential area because it is transitioning away from its residential attractiveness, then we should be looking at the total picture of the community. Once set in place, investors will target it because it now has a use.

**Mr. Thomson** stated there are some areas in which staff has done that.

**Mr. Marshall** stated by saying some areas are eligible for special use, the persons on either side should not be penalized because we approved the special use. Just make the whole thing the same.

**Mr. Farmer** agreed it should not be done in pieces.

**Ms. Bunce** stated that is the very reason for the Future Land Use Map. The Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in November 2006, identified how the corridors should develop over the 30 years. The area along Montgomery Crossroad is indicated as a transition area that should be handled carefully given the residential near it; it was not recommended to be commercial neighborhood or commercial suburban. The guidance in current decision-making is from the County and City adopted Comprehensive Plan. There are some proposed amendments for clarity in certain areas; however, we are not in the process of amending the Future Land Use Map and making changes to it. Small area studies can be done, and they should whenever there is a zoning ordinance that will work well with our Comprehensive Plan.

**Mr. Farmer** stated some of these plans may look good on paper, but now that it's here, it may change.

**Mr. Marshall** stated more time should be spent on discussion about various areas of the community that need micro-planning instead of looking back to 2006.

**Mr. Manigault** stated that is the whole idea. We cannot go above what was already planned; it took many years. That is why it is being consulted for advice.

**Mr. Marshall** stated he is recommending making changes to it; spend time on where planning should be implemented.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with Office for Utility Contractor. The use is listed in various forms in the City ordinance. The equivalent is Banks and Offices in the County. It is an office that will have fleet vehicles or equipment to be stored on the property; a storage area with the office. The district is proposed as it is listed in the current ordinance from the mixed-use districts to the industrial districts.

**Ms. Bunce** followed with Studio Multi-Media Production Facility. This use is a movie production or television studio, or radio studio. It currently exists as radio and television broadcasting studio in both ordinances. It is proposed similarly as it is permitted currently.

**Mr. Farmer** stated this causes him concern since technology is rapidly changing. He recommends getting someone from SCAD or the like for advisement. He wants to make sure we don't restrict anyone because a studio today is not like the studios of the past. He stated he would like input from someone in the field.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the intent is for studios with the satellite dishes and etcetera.

**Ms. Moore** continued with Indoor Recreation, Arenas and Convention Centers. This use is not currently listed in the County or City. It would fall under a public use and located within four zoning districts. Three of them are a matter-of-right, the other is in the Downtown Expansion Area as a special use.

She followed with the Indoor Amusement use, which includes bowling, game arcade, skating rinks and the like. This does not include adult entertainment. This use is in the City

and County ordinance. There are no use conditions currently in the City; in the County there is a condition for the B-N-1 district that it cannot be located within 150 feet of a dwelling unit and has to operate between the hours of 6 a.m. and 12 midnight.

**Ms. Moore** continued with the Indoor Firearm Range use, which is in the City ordinance but not the County. It is proposed with two conditions: 1) that it be within a fully enclosed building, and 2) that it have a sound transmission class rating of 70. The conditions that currently exist are to comply with National Rifle Association standards that sounds are not to be heard beyond the property line.

**Mr. Coleman** stated the rating is more applicable because it is really hard to control not hearing sound out of a building. Closeness to residential areas was a big concern; he sees nothing relative to that listed here and that does matter to some degree.

**Mr. Farmer** stated due possibilities of accidental discharge outside, residential closeness is a concern.

**Mr. Marshall** stated that is dangerous in any environment. Sound criteria can help with this.

**Mr. Coleman** stated ballistics are very important to study as well.

**Ms. Moore** continued with Indoor Sports Facilities. This use includes athletic clubs, racket clubs, swimming pools, etc. There are similar uses in the City and County. The proposed use is more modern and allowed in more districts.

**Mr. Manigault** suggested considering residential distance.

**Mr. Marshall** asked if clubs such as JEA, Jenkins Boys Club can be restricted in the same zones.

**Ms. Moore** replied yes.

Ms. Moore discussed the Indoor Archery Range and Paintball Facility use. It is more limited in locations than Indoor Sports Facilities. There are no proposed use conditions. It is proposed to be permitted in the A-1, B-C, and I-L-T districts.

**Mr. Farmer** requested parking review for overflow purposes; it should be managed on-site.

**Ms. Moore** continued the Theater, Cinema and Performing Arts Centers. This use does not currently exist in the County. Cultural Facilities is the closest use in the City, along with Amusement and Recreational Activities Use. It is allowed in most mixed-use and business zoning districts and there are no conditions proposed.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with Campground Recreational Vehicle Park. It is proposed to be allowed in only three zoning districts with a limited use in the A-1, which is similar to the R-A where this use is currently allowed. It is also allowed in the Conservation District and the Conservation Park District with a Special Use Permit. There are use conditions that would apply: the site would have to be at least five acres, the outdoor storage of non-occupied RV's or watercraft is limited. Permanent structures are not permitted in the C-zoning districts, not including the caretaker's quarters. When adjacent to a conforming residential use, the required buffer is specified.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with Drive-In Theater. It is proposed as a limited use in the B-C zoning district and a special use in the A-1 zoning districts. There are standards for setbacks of a theater screen and prohibiting central loud screen. The screen may not exceed the maximum height of the zoning district.

**Mr. Marshall** stated it is more likely to be placed in an agricultural zone than a B-C zone. Rather than do a special use, it should be by-right with setbacks in agricultural.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with Fairgrounds. It is a public use is currently being used for fairs and carnivals and temporary special events. It is proposed to be allowed as a special use in the A-1 district.

The next use reviewed was Golf Course. This is a principle use golf course; it can include club houses with or without a bar or restaurant, locker and shower facilities, driving ranges, club shop. It is allowed in several residential zoning classifications.

The meeting ended at 2:52 due to the loss of a quorum.

## V. Adjournment

### 7. [Adjournment of May 7, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting](#)

*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.*