



Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 14, 2019 ~ 1:30 PM
Minutes

May 14, 2019 REGULAR MPC MEETING

Members Present: Joseph B. Ervin, Chairman
Ellis Cook, Vice-Chairman
Tommy Branch
Travis H. Coles
Lacy Manigault
Tanya Milton
Wayne Noha
Lee Smith
Linder Suthers
Joseph Welch
Tom Woiwode

Members Not Present: Karen Jarrett
Roberto Hernandez
Eula Parker

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services
Matt Lonnerstater, Development Services Planner
Marcel Williams, Development Services Planner
Kait Morano, Comprehensive Planner
Jessica Hagan, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

Advisory Staff Present: Bob Sebek, Chatham County Zoning Administrator

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Agenda

[1. Approval of Agenda](#)

The agenda was approved as written.

Motion

Approve agenda as submitted.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Joseph Welch	
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

[2. May 21, 2019 Planning Meeting, 1:00 P.M., Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 E. State Street](#)

[3. CANCELED - May 21, 2019 Planning Commission Board Retreat, 11:30 A.M., SEDA, 131 Hutchinson Island Road.](#)

Motion	
Motion to cancel the Board Retreat	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

V. Item(s) Requested to be Removed from the Final Agenda

[4. NEW CONSTRUCTION: MID-CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT | Habersham and East 37th Street | Petitioner: Ward Architecture + Preservation | File No. 19-000854-COA](#)

Motion

Motion to Continue.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Lacy Manigault

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

VI. Items Requested to be Withdrawn

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

[5. Approval of April 23, 2019 Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 04.23.19 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

[📎 04-23-19 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

The April 23, 2019 briefing and regular meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

Motion

Approve the April 23, 2019 briefing and regular meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Joseph Welch

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye

Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

[6. NEW CONSTRUCTION CARRIAGE HOUSE: VICTORIAN DISTRICT | 216 East Duffy Street | Petitioner: Paul Bush | File No. 19-002312-COA](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [19-002312-COA Recommendation.pdf](#)

Item was approved as submitted.

Motion

Staff recommends Approval for demolition of existing single-story garage and new construction of a two-story carriage house at 216 East Duffy Street, including the side-yard setback variances as requested, because otherwise the proposed work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Joseph Welch

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

VIII. Old Business

[7. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 7201 Van Buren Avenue| R-6 \(One-Family Residential\) to I-P \(Institutional Professional\) | File no. 19-001443-ZA](#)

📎 [Staff Report 19-001443-ZA - Revised.pdf](#)

📎 [Pictometry.pdf](#)

📎 [Application 1443.pdf](#)

📎 [Maps_combined.pdf](#)

[7201 VAN BUREN AFFIDAVIT.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcel Williams, Development Services Planner, stated, the petitioner is requesting to rezone one parcel on the west side of Van Buren Avenue near the intersection with Eisenhower Drive from the R-6 (Single-Family Residential) zoning classification to the I-P (Institutional Professional) zoning classification.

The subject property is the only parcel of land zoned for single-family housing directly fronting Eisenhower Drive. To both the east and west are more intense office and commercial uses. Despite this, the property lacks direct vehicular access to Eisenhower and currently connects only to Van Buren Avenue, which is a dead-end residential street. A change to a more intense land use could result in significantly more traffic on Van Buren, which could have adverse impacts on neighboring single-family residences. In response to these concerns, the petitioner has committed to permit access only from Eisenhower Drive.

I-P zoning designation permits a vastly greater range of uses than R-6, which only allows single-family residences and a handful of civic uses and care homes. Among the permitted uses in I-P are retail, personal service shops, restaurants, hotels, funeral homes, laundromats and medical laboratories. Some of these uses have clear potential to impact the adjacent residential properties to the south, especially since the I-P development standards only mandate a 5-foot rear-yard setback. In practice, the limited size of the site is likely to constrain the viable commercial uses and many of the most intense are subject to review by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Per an affidavit submitted by the petitioner, a site plan must be approved by the MPC for any change in use, which mitigates some of these concerns.

With the commitment to provide access solely through a new curb cut on Eisenhower and the context nearby surrounding commercial districts, a more intense land use may be warranted. The requirement for review of any site plan by the MPC should help address concerns over incompatible land uses.

Mr. Josh Yellin, representative of the petitioner, stated they agree with staff's recommendation.

No Public Comments

Motion

Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone the subject property from the R-6 district to the I-P district with the condition that a site plan be approved by the MPC for any future change in land use and that all access to the subject property shall occur from Eisenhower Drive.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

IX. Regular Business

[8. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 569 BUSH ROAD | R-A to PDR-SM | FILE NUMBER Z-190410-00038-1](#)

[MAPS.pdf](#)

[MINING PLAN.pdf](#)

📎 [RECLAMATION PLAN.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report - Z-190410-00038-1 Zoning Map Amendment.pdf](#)

📎 [Amended Staff Report - Z-190410-00038-1 Zoning Map Amendment.pdf](#)

📎 [County Engineer email.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services, stated, the petitioner is requesting the rezoning of a 104.52-acre tract of land from an existing R-A (Residential-Agriculture) zoning classification to a PDR-SM (Planned Development Reclamation-Surface Mining) zoning classification. The petitioner is requesting that the site be rezoned to create a surface mine (borrow pit) to harvest dirt for use roads and other developments requiring fill material.

The subject property will have frontage and access on Bush Road, an existing two-lane public road designated as a collector roadway on the Street Classification Map of Chatham County. It is likely the majority of the trucks servicing the borrow operation will exit the site onto Bush Road and proceed in a southerly direction for a distance of approximately 1,675 feet to its intersection with Fort Argyle Road. Because of this, the County Engineer may require that a specified distance on both Bush Road and Fort Argyle Road be inspected pre-development and post-development to determine what repairs are needed, if any.

The latest traffic count for Fort Argyle Road at Bush Road was 7,230 vehicle trips per day, according to the 2017 Georgia Department of Transportation Traffic Count Map. There are available traffic counts for Bush Road. With the exception of haul trucks during the specified hours of operation, the subject site will not create any appreciable long-term vehicular traffic on either road.

The proposed rezoning, if approved, will provide needed fill material for ongoing and future developments and road construction projects in Chatham County. Several conditions have been added to the recommendation if approved. In addition, the future land use designation will provide conventional single-family housing that will complement the immediate area.

Mr. Terri Coleman, representative of the petitioner, agreed with staff's recommendation.

Public Comments:

Mr. John Yates, stated he has a petition with 27 signatures in opposition to this petition. He believes that the proposed use would increase traffic on a already decayed road.

Mr. Phillip Jennings, stated he is opposed. He has concerns about quality of life and safety of the roads.

Mr. Perry Banks, stated he is opposed. His concerns are about the road.

Mr. Coleman, stated they would be happy to move the access road to 204, as long as DOT doesn't have a problem with it.

Mr. Lacy Manigault, Board member, asked if the petitioner has spoken with the residents regarding the road.

Mr. Coleman, stated no. He believes the only concern is Bush Road and we are comfortable about that not being our access road.

Motion

The Metropolitan Planning Commission staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request to rezone the subject property, known as 569 Bush Road (PIN 1-1036-01-015), from an R-A classification to a PDR-SM classification. Staff further recommends approval of the proposed General Development Plan to include a Mining Plan and Reclamation Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall be responsible for maintaining the sections of Bush Road and Fort Argyle Road, to be determined by the County Engineer, regarding any impacts (including dirt and dust removal) associated with the surface mining activity.
2. The area to be mined shall be fenced for security purposes, as required by the County Engineer.

3. Revise the Mining Plan to show a “tire knock-off zone” for the purpose of knocking off dirt and clay and tracking it onto Bush Road. The knock-off zone shall be constructed of loose stone not less than 50 feet in length (or as determined by the County Engineer) with a depth of not less than six inches with underlayment. The knock-off zone shall begin at the pavement on Bush Road.

4. Revise Operation Note 1, hours of operation, to read as follows:

7 AM to 7 PM Monday through Friday

8 AM to 7 PM Saturday

Closed on Sunday

5. Revise Operation Note 12 to read “shall be” instead of should be.

6. Revise Operation Note 6 (second sentence) to read, “The length of mining shall be three years from the issuance of a land disturbance activities permit, which is tentatively scheduled to begin on July 15, 2019.”

7. Revise the Mining Plan to identify the 75-foot perimeter buffer as a 75-foot undisturbed vegetative buffer.

8. Approval by the County Engineer.

Petitioner added a condition that they would not use Bush Road as the access road.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

[9. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 109 Chevis Rd. | R-A \(Residential Agriculture\) to R-3-24 \(Multi-Family Residential - 24 units per net acre\) | Z-190417-00042-1](#)

📎 [Staff Report-Z-190417-00042-1.pdf](#)

📎 [Exhibit A - Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Exhibit B - Pictometry .pdf](#)

🔗 [Exhibit C - R-A Use Table.pdf](#)

🔗 [Exhibit D - R-3 Use Table.pdf](#)

🔗 [Exhibit E - Sketch Plan.pdf](#)

🔗 [Application 00042.pdf](#)

Mr. Matt Lonnerstater, Development Services Planner, stated, the petitioner is requesting to rezone property at 109 Chevis Rd. in unincorporated Chatham County from R-A (Residential Agriculture) to R-3-24 (Multifamily Residential – 24 units per net acre).

The subject property consists of one parcel, approximately 3.14 gross acres in area, on the south side of Ogeechee Rd., west of Chevis Road. The subject parcel does not have direct frontage along a public road. The parcel is immediately east of three parcels currently zoned R-3-24; per a sketch plan provided by the petitioner, it appears that the intent is to combine the subject parcel with these adjacent parcels to accommodate a multi-family development. However, this sketch plan does not represent a formal General Development Plan (GDP) submittal.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the existing R-3-24 zoning to the west of the subject site and is compatible with business uses to the north along Ogeechee Road. While the proposed district is not entirely consistent with the planned future land use category for the site (Suburban Single-Family), the R-3-24 district is compatible with planned business uses to the north and general residential uses to the west. The R-3-24 district would enable a coordinated multi-family residential development on the subject parcel and the parcels to the west (currently zoned R-3-24). While the proposed rezoning would permit approximately 55 additional dwelling units, the MPC should note that approximately 227 multi-family units could currently be developed by right on the subject parcels to the west. A proposed multi-family development would be subject to screening and buffering requirements to protect adjacent single-family residences.

Mr. Harold Yellin, representative of the petitioner, stated they agree with staff's recommendation.

No Public Comments

Motion

Approval of the petitioner's request to rezone the subject site from an R-A zoning classification to an R-3-24 zoning classification, conditioned upon the following:

The subject parcel shall be combined with the adjoining parcels to the west, currently zoned R-3-24.

Primary access to the subject parcel shall be from Ogeechee Road.

In association with the requested rezoning, MPC staff recommends amending the Future Land Use Map to change the parcels future land use classification from Suburban Single-Family Residential to General Residential.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Tanya Milton

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye

Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

[10. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 5907 Beverly Street | R-2 \(Two-Family Residential\) to RMH \(Residential Manufactured Home\) | File no. Z-190422-00048-1](#)

📎 [Maps_combined.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report Z-190422-00048-1.pdf](#)

📎 [Application 00048.pdf](#)

** The public notice for this rezoning request incorrectly indicated that the petitioner was requesting the RMH-1 (Residential Manufactured Home Park) zoning classification, which is not possible in this case since that district requires a parcel of at least 5 acres. Since the RMH-1 district—though similar—is in most respects a more intense classification than RMH, it is staff's belief that the existing notice is sufficient. This report will address the petitioner's original request for the RMH district.*

Mr. Marcel Williams, Development Services Planner, stated, the petitioner is requesting to rezone a 3-acre portion of a 4.22-acre parcel on the west side of Beverly Street near its terminus from the R-2 (Two-Family Residential) zoning classification to the RMH (Residential Manufactured Home) zoning classification.

The proposed rezoning, if approved, would permit the construction of at most 3 mobile homes on the rear portion of a 4.2-acre lot near the end of Beverly Street. The site is well-screened and has sufficient acreage to permit generous buffers along adjacent properties. The proposed RMH district permits a narrower range of residential uses than R-2, which allows duplexes and multifamily dwellings by right. Since R-2 also permits more nonresidential uses, RMH can be understood as a more restrictive classification. Development standards are generally consistent between R-2 and RMH; at issue is simply whether mobile/manufactured homes are permitted.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the statement of purpose for the RMH district, which recommends use in "areas where development is sparse" and explicitly permits use "on a lot-by-lot basis." Since there are 3 existing instances of the RMH district directly along Beverly Street and additional instances nearby, there is a clear precedent for the proposed district and it is compatible with the predominant patterns of land use. The RMH classification in this case raises few concerns over impacts on adjacent properties and the scale of development would have negligible impacts on traffic.

Ms. Linder Suthers, Board Member, asked if the access road will go through Beverly Street through the 1.22 acres not being rezoned.

Mr. Williams stated yes, the access road will be treated like single family homes. Each home will have to be on an individual lot.

Ms. Suthers asked if that should be part of the rezoning.

Mr. Williams stated that's address administratively through the subdivision process.

Mr. Randy Parrish, petitioner, stated he's wanting to develop 3 single mobile homes on 3 acres. I have talked to several neighbors that had concerns we were putting in a mobile home park but that's not what we are doing. There will be one mobile home on each acre. He stated his property is surrounded with mobile homes.

Public Comments:

Mr. Jeffrey Cortez, neighbor, presented a signed petition from surrounding property owners in opposition to the rezoning. The petition had 46 signatures. He stated he was opposed to the rezoning because he felt it would cause traffic problems.

Ms. Sandra Sheeran, neighbor, stated she opposed the rezoning because she felt it would hurt property values.

Motion

Deny the request to rezone 5907 Beverly Street from the R-2 district to the RMH-1 district.

Approve staff's recommendation to rezone from the R-2 district to the RMH district.

Vote Results (Rejected)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Ellis Cook

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Nay
W. Lee Smith	- Nay
Linder Suthers	- Nay
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Nay
Tommy Branch	- Nay
Lacy Manigault	- Nay
Tanya Milton	- Nay
Wayne Noha	- Nay

Motion

Motion to continue to the next MPC meeting on June 4, 2019 so re-advertising could be done with the correct district.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Wayne Noha

Second: Linder Suthers

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

[11. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN | Green Island Road | P-190417-00043-1](#)

📎 [27638.0000 - GDP 4.30.19.pdf](#)

📎 [Tax Map P-190417-00043-1.pdf](#)

📎 [Aerial GIR.pdf](#)

📎 [Road Context.pdf](#)

📎 [Traffic Counts.pdf](#)

📎 [Context Aerial.pdf](#)

- ☞ [Context Aerial 2.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Concept Design.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Report-Green Island Road 040919.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Opposition emails.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Letter of support.pdf](#)
- ☞ [1-Google Earth Aerial Perspective_5.8.19.pdf](#)
- ☞ [2-Google Earth Aerial Perspective_5.8.19.pdf](#)
- ☞ [The Landings Assn. Ltr. to Stephen Lufburrow 2019-5-10_.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Support 2.pdf](#)
- ☞ [PetitionComments5-13.pdf](#)
- ☞ [PetitionSigns5-13-19.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Green Island Road Project - General Development Plan Review County Engineer.pdf](#)
- ☞ [4-6.66 PUD-R.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services, stated, the petitioner is requesting approval of a General Development Plan (GDP) for a proposed development to include single family attached and detached residences, multifamily residences, assisted living residences and memory care residences. The petitioner is also seeking a 10 foot height variance from the 36 foot height maximum for the congregate portion of the development, as shown on the GDP and a variance from the required off street parking.

The proposed development includes a mix of housing types as shown on the attached General Development Plan. They include single family attached and detached products designed to serve independent senior residents. The congregate portion of the development abutting the marsh is proposed to include additional independent multifamily units (apartments), as well as assisted living, memory care and amenities. The unit count is as follows:

Single Family - 16 detached units and 20 attached units
Multifamily - 35 one bedroom units and 35 two bedroom units
Assisted Living - 14 studio units, 44 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom
Memory Care - 50 one bedroom units
Total: 216 units

Per section 4-6.66 (10) of the PUD-R zoning classification, a minimum of two parking spaces per dwelling unit is required. Based on the proposed number of 216 dwelling units, 432 parking spaces would be required. The general parking standards for residential uses in the zoning ordinance are based on housing type. The parking requirement for multifamily residential is calculated based on the bedroom count. In the PUD-R zoning classification, however, multifamily is not specifically differentiated. Multifamily housing, in the ordinance at large, requires 1.25 spaces for a studio, 1.5 spaces per one bedroom unit, 1.75 spaces per two bedroom unit and two spaces per three plus bedroom unit. The requirement for nursing or convalescent care is 0.5 spaces per bed. This is the ratio that has been used for other similar facilities in the county since the use is not specifically listed in the table of uses. The PUD-R zoning district is different, it requires a flat two space per dwelling unit parking ratio which is appropriate for single family, but insufficiently specific for multifamily. The applicant is proposing 254 off street spaces as follows:

- 72 spaces for the single family portion (2 car garage for each unit)
- 182 off street spaces for congregate area
- 254 total spaces

Additionally, there are 32 on street spaces within the single family portion of the development that are identified but are not counted toward the total, which is 286.

The petitioner is requesting the following variances:

Variance 1: A 10 foot height variance from the 36 foot maximum height permitted.

Variance 2: A variance from the parking requirements of the PUD-R zoning district.

Variance 1: The permitted maximum height for this development is 36 feet. The petitioner is requesting a 10 foot height variance for the congregate care portion of the site. Based on the concept building elevations, the proposed congregate facilities are 2-3 stories high. Staff finds that the design decisions made by the applicant are the impetus for the requested height variance. The 30 acre site is undeveloped and there is little precedent for the proposed height in the vicinity of the subject property. There is no precedent for this combination of scale and height in the vicinity.

Variance 2: The PUD-R zoning classification requires 2 off street parking spaces per dwelling unit. A literal interpretation

would require 432 parking spaces for the proposed development. The applicant is proposing parking standards that meet those that are outlined in the general parking requirements of the ordinance for single family, multifamily and convalescent care. Because of the lack of specificity in the county ordinance as it relates to congregate care as a use, determinations have been made previously by the Zoning Administrator regarding some standards, including parking. Staff finds that an isolated, gated community is unlikely to have impacts on adjacent properties related to parking. Also, the PUD-R parking requirements are substantially different than the requirements in the base ordinance.

Mr. Lotson also read the comments received from the Chatham County Engineering office.

**Note: should approval of the staff recommendation or an alternative occur, a revised site plan would be required to be submitted identifying the details of the MPC recommendation. Further, a Specific Development Plan must be approved by Chatham County and the MPC prior to the issuance of building permits.*

Mr. Harold Yellin, representative of the petitioner, stated the property is already zoned PUD-R/EO which requires a site bigger than 25 acres, which we are, and allows a wide range of single family residential, multifamily and business uses. Some of the business uses are permitted by right including a grocery store, drugs stores, barber and beauty shops, restaurants, flower shops, professional offices and a few other similar uses. The petitioner is not looking to put the highest density allowed for this lot. Instead they are requesting 216 units total, that consist of single family, multifamily, assisted living and memory care units. We believe this use would have less of a impact then the rest of the allowed uses, especially for traffic. Our engineer will tell you that a multifamily development would generate about 1300 trips per day, where this particular plan that we are showing you would only be about 500 to 600 trips per day. Due to the concerns raised at the neighborhood meeting regarding the height of the buildings, we have revised our plans to only go above the 36 feet in the lobby. The variance will only need to be for 6 feet instead of the initial request of 10 feet. The parking spaces required for this type of development would be 202, that includes the 30 staff members. We are providing 254 spaces and that doesn't include the additional 32 on street parking spaces.

Mr. Stephen Lufburrow, petitioner, gave a brief presentation on the history of the property. He stated it was very important that the neighborhood looks, feels and functions as a residential neighborhood. The two story Sprenger buildings will be in the rear of the property. The buildings will be placed at ground level with surface parking instead of parking beneath the buildings, like The Marshes. The buildings will be placed, more or less, 100 feet from the DNR line, to preserve some magnificent virgin Live Oaks and other trees. We placed a minimum of 50' wide undisturbed and heavily vegetated natural buffers to the North and South of the property and also along Green Island Road. All buffers contain trees that are 60 to 80' tall, making the property barely visible from the road. The neighborhood will have security and will be gated. The 36 single family homes will be on the front of the property with a boulevard that features tree islands and trees along the side that leads into the neighborhood. The homes are arranged so that residents will enter a common motor courtyard that leads to their car garages. They will enter from the side to avoid front loading garages. Short streets with good connectivity were designed to minimize traffic and sidewalks. Cart paths are planned so that the community will be pedestrian and golf cart friendly. Parking will be provided along the boulevard, on the Green Island Road side of the Sprenger buildings, along the sides of the streets and motor courtyards of the single family houses. To address one important concern regarding lighting, parking for the Sprenger building will be behind it. To help eliminate light escaping the community we plan to incorporate lamp post and other lower level lighting.

Ms. Linder Suthers, Board Member, asked about saving the existing trees on the interior of the property.

Mr. Lufburrow stated we have not done a tree survey yet to identify trees but I promise we will save what trees we can.

Mr. Lacy Manigault, Board Member, asked if the builders needed the extra 10 or 6 feet on the height.

Mr. Lufburrow, stated they are only asking for the variance to make sure the entrance into the large building looks proportional.

Mr. Joseph Welch, Board Member, asked if the residents on Green Island Road requested a larger buffer than 50 feet, could that happen.

Mr. Lufburrow, stated one problem is that the County is requiring us to line up the main boulevard with the entrance and exit of South Harbor. So we can not shift the multifamily part because we then would encroach upon that space and we don't have enough space to add another street right.

Mr. Welch, asked if this project will be built all at once or in phases.

Mr. Lufburrow, stated our plan is a little different. The entire development will have a Homeowners Association. The units will not be sold, just leased. The buildings and homes will be phased in.

Mr. Welch asked if the cottages or Sprenger buildings will be built first.

Mr. Lufburrow, stated they will be built at the same time.

Ms. Sanfilippo representative for Sprenger Health Care Systems, gave a brief description of Sprenger Health Care.

There will be a grand entrance that will consist of a bistro, dining space, beauty and barber shop, bar, community room, exercise area and a pool. We are trying to keep it where it's self contained and residents will not have to leave the facility.

Mr. Lotson, stated that every comment received by this office, is attached to the electronic agenda.

Public Comments:

Mr. Richard Liberth, spoke in opposition. He stated he is speaking on the behalf of several residents. With the current zoning, it does not allow anything of this nature. However, PUD-RM allows nursing homes. This particular property abuts residential homes on all sides. We request the project be denied with the two variances and we also ask for this to please continue for 90 days to allow staff additional time to review all the matters that have been brought to you today.

Mr. John Evens, spoke in opposition. He stated we don't need any more senior living and care facilities on Skidaway Island. Approving additional ones in any location will only result in a declining tax base, significant budget shortfalls for the County, the school district and a significant drop in philanthropic support to many community organizations.

Mr. Patrick Breslin, spoke in opposition. His main concern is the evacuation of the Island in the event of a disaster.

Mr. Jeremy Merklinger, spoke in opposition. He stated he would like to preserve the history of the Island. Under the current zoning, a lot of the uses Mr. Yellin mentioned like a grocery store isn't permitted. He believes they should have to ahold to the standards that are in place. He asked staff to review whether the parking is for cars or golf carts.

Ms. Deborah Conway, spoke in opposition. She stated she lives right next door and her concern is the buffer. She stated she can see through the buffer now and especially when the trees lose their leaves. She also has concerns for the eagles.

Ms. Joanne Jenkins, spoke in favor. She stated she would rather have this use then some of the others that could go on this property.

Mr. Ken Mangelsdorf, spoke in opposition. He stated to please listen to the residents. He doesn't feel this is appropriate for the zoning and land use.

Mr. Welch asked, during Hurricane Michael, how did the storm surge effect your property?

Mr. Mangelsdorf stated he has concerns on water drainage because, during storms, the water can rise up in his back yard.

Ms. Lin Wieland, spoke in opposition. She stated she has concerns on traffic. A significant increase in traffic will cause traffic to back up at the Landings main gate and the four way stop causing an accordion traffic effect at the two stop lights. In many places, the swale is quite significant and will pose a danger to motorists who will have to pull over more often due to the increased number of emergency vehicles.

Ms. Katie Joyner, spoke in opposition. She stated the additional traffic, noise and congestion this development will bring to the area from future residents, staff, deliveries and increased emergency services will have a serious detrimental impact on existing property values and is incongruous with the surrounding existing land uses. As of 1:30 p.m. today, she had 1,063 signatures in opposition for this petition.

Ms. Emilie Miller, spoke in opposition. Her concerns are traffic and water issues.

Ms. Claire Marich, spoke in opposition. She stated her concerns are the variances and flooding problems.

Mr. Justin Redmond, spoke in favor. He stated he felt this use is better then some of the other alternatives. He felt the traffic counts would be half with this development. He asked that a traffic study be conducted. He also asked that there be a restriction on construction hours, a solid wood fence to help relieve noise and reduce the speed on Green Island Road.

Mr. James Lane, spoke in opposition. His concerns are safety and devalue of property.

Mr. Jack Robertson, spoke in opposition. He stated that under the current zoning a congregate care facility is not permitted.

Ms. Anna Kelly, spoke in opposition. She asked about the number of staff members. She also has concerns on the amount of traffic.

Ms. Carol Blaine, spoke in opposition. The impact on the marsh land and traffic is a concern.

Mr. Mike Lindsey, spoke in opposition. His concerns are if the zoning is appropriate.

Ms. Robin Clark, spoke in opposition. In the meeting last Tuesday, she believes she heard there will be a clinic open to

the public and that's a concern. Please consider what all the neighbors are saying.

Mr. Malcolm Harbison, spoke in opposition. He stated he is opposed to changing this property and having it rental property. He stated that Mr. Yellin said there will be 30 staff members, but at the neighborhood meeting we heard 100 staff over a 24 hour period.

Ms. Judith Hilderland, spoke in opposition. She stated there will be a lot of traffic coming and going out.

Mr. Joseph Rahimi, spoke in opposition. He stated his concern is the density. If the Board does grant this request, please deny the variances. This will become a Landings, problem not a County one.

Mr. Dan Scarboro, spoke in opposition. He stated his concerns are with the parking. He doesn't believe the 286 spaces will be enough to accommodate staff, with all the uses that are being proposed.

Mr. Bob Rogers, spoke in opposition. He stated his concerns are water usage. The Landings has concerns now that eventually they will have to pay more money to be able to have water.

Mr. Yellin, stated that the matter before you today is not a zoning issue, it's a site plan. All the concerns regarding traffic, water usage, evacuation, storm surge, density and drainage- the only way to solve all these problems are to do nothing and I'm afraid that doing nothing isn't an option

Motion

Motion to continue to the June 4 MPC meeting in order for the County manager to get clarification from the County attorney regarding if the use is permitted under the current zoning.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Joseph Welch

Second: Lacy Manigault

Ellis Cook	- Aye
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Linder Suthers	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Tommy Branch	- Aye
Lacy Manigault	- Aye
Tanya Milton	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

X. Presentations

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

12. Adjourn

There being no further business to present before the Board, the May 14, 2019 Regular Metropolitan Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Wilson

Executive Director
/jh

XIII. Development Plans Submitted for Review

[13. Development Plans Submitted for Review](#)

📎 [May 14th MPC Meeting Development Log.pdf](#)

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