



Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
March 26, 2013 1:00 P.M.  
FINAL

## March 26, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting

### I. Call to Order and Welcome

### II. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

#### Notice(s)

1. [March 26, 2013 SAGIS Training at 11:30 A.M., in the Jerry Surrency Conference Room, 112 East State Street.](#)
2. [April 3, 2013 Regular MPC Meeting at 1:30 P.M. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street.](#)

### III. Consent Agenda

### IV. Regular Business

3. [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](#)

Ms. Charlotte Moore, stated there will not be a scheduled UZO review presentation on the April 3, 2013 Regular MPC meeting due to the content. The next UZO review presentation is scheduled for April 23, 2013 Regular MPC meeting. The next Planning Meetings will be in May and July.

There is a meeting scheduled with the Woodville Neighborhood Association for May 8, 2013. On May 16, 2013 there will be a meeting with the Tourism Leadership Council. We are waiting for response from the Savannah Area Board of Realtors (residential).

We have not accomplished half of reviewing the draft UZO. It may best to ask questions as we go through the uses rather than at the end.

**Mr. Ragsdale** asked if the use will be presented then the Board is to ask questions about that use.

**Ms. Amanda Bunce** presented [Agricultural Uses](#). The current amendment that Allen is working on with Animal Control Ordinance and the recent revisions that have been

approved through the County Zoning Ordinance with regard to agricultural uses and also the proposed amendments to the City Zoning Ordinance for agricultural uses, those changes will be incorporated into UZO draft format.

**Agricultural General**: this encompasses any type of agricultural use, whether it's crops or animal. Proposed to be allowed in the A1 Zoning Classification, the only agricultural district that we have. It is comparable to the City and County Zoning Ordinance for the keeping of animals for commercial purposes.

**Agricultural Restricted Use**: allows only the growing of crops, no animals. It is proposed to be allowed in the A1 and the R20 (residential estate) classifications. It is currently allowed in the R20 in the city. In the RSFE zoning district in the UZO, there is a one-acre minimum lot size.

**Mr. Mashall** asked if the 'no animals' overrides the chickens that was approved recently.

**Ms. Bunce** replied no; the personal keeping of animals is not affected. Only for commercial purposes.

**Mr. Marshall** asked if this is a category for larger tracts of land. If one is growing crops, they will not be able to have chickens that they are selling the eggs from. He stated it does not seem prudent for us say one could do one or the other; both are farming type operations.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the current City Ordinance has a differentiation, between growing plants and any type of animals. It is not specific to chickens. There is a big difference between chickens and cows and the impact of that. While one may be able to have up to 30 chickens, they would not be able to sell the eggs. The definition of what we include in agriculture may need to be reviewed.

**Mr. Manigault** stated the problem is that a permit is needed to sell the eggs.

**Mr. Ragsdale** stated one can't sell them if not zoned properly, regardless of the permit.

**Ms. Bunce** stated it has not been proposed including chickens in the definition as cultural restrictions, but have included bees. That is something we determine if we should consider in this district.

**Mr. Farmer** asked why can't both be had - chickens and crops.

**Ms. Bunce** replied that's her question - should it be one type of animal be considered. She doesn't think the intent for the R-S-F-E district to open it up any kind of animal.

**Mr. Ragsdale** stated there maybe a health and agricultural standard when you get into larger animals; how many acres are required for a cow. If we start talking about chickens, then we will have to talk about ducks.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the R-S-F-E district is a single family district; the intent is for residential use. We have to be as similar as possible to the existing City Ordinance.

**Mr. Coleman** stated chickens can be a nuisance too. Any animal introduced into a residential setting, there needs to be a measure of control. He stated chickens shouldn't be singled out.

**Mr. Farmer** stated the point was that the eggs can't be sold. Three chickens will be enough for a family; twenty-five chickens will breed enough chickens to be sold, then it becomes commercial. The same principle would apply for cow's milk or goat's milk.

**Mr. Marshall** stated his point was we weren't liberalizing the ability to have animals. If the commercial sale of produce is allowed, why not allow the commercial sale of eggs, etc. The animals are all controlled by the Health Department and the state. If crop produce can be sold, the sale of produce from animals as well, if all requirements are met.

**Ms. Bunce** stated the Animal Control Ordinance will apply regardless.

**Mr. Marshall** stated if we prohibit the sale in this zone, this zone will prohibit it.

**Ms. Bunce** asked if chickens should be added with bees as a type of animal permitted with agricultural restrictions in the R-S-F-E district.

Mr. Ragsdale stated if it is not referring to a particular type of animal that meets the health code standard or the Department of Agriculture's standard. He stated stating chickens is too specific.

**Mr. Thomson** stated he sees a list of uses falling under A1; do they fall under other areas. If they are all A1, then none of these things really -

**Ms. Bunce** stated that was not intended to be left out of the R-S-F-E district. She will work with Ellen Harris and her group and bring revisions back to you at a later date.

**Mr. Thomson** stated the County adopted the recommended Animal Control Ordinance amendments. The City is holding them and Ms. Harris is explaining it to the neighborhood groups.

**Ms. Bunce** continued with **Agricultural Produce Stand/Seafood Stand**: This is in reference to the A1 as well. It is handled similarly to the existing County Ordinance.

**Livestock Sale and Auction**: It has the use condition that it must be set back at 100 feet from any residential use or mixed-use zoning district. It is a new use in the County; in the City it is only permitted in the I-H district currently. It is being proposed that it be handled as A-1 zoning district, based on the character of the area we see this as occurring.

**Tree Farming**: is proposed to be handled consistently with the existing ordinances. It is permitted in a few residential zonings now. It is proposed to be in the A-1 district.

**Surface Mine/Borrow Pit**: proposed to be allowed as a special use in the A-1 district. It is currently only permitted through a rezoning process for the zoning districts that are specifically for borrow pits, in both city and county zoning classifications. Those standards from those zoning districts will be put in the use condition section. we are waiting on

feedback from the city and county engineers for minor discrepancies; the intent is to keep it as close as possible to the existing standards.

Ms. Moore presented Civic Uses:

**Botanical Garden:** a new use identified as a public use. The appropriate areas were specified. the Conservation Park District, the Agricultural District, the Downtown Expansion Area. There are no conditions for this use.

**Cemeteries:** Commercial, state law directs them differently, which includes mausoleums, columbariums, and memorial parks. There are private family cemeteries; found only in the county. Pet cemeteries are currently only located in the unincorporated county. A cemetery would be areas with a lot of land.

## V. Adjournment

4. [Adjournment of March 26, 2013 MPC Planning Meeting](#)