



Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room
November 23, 2021 ~ 1:30 PM
FINAL Agenda

November 23, 2021 Regular MPC Meeting, 1:30 P.M.

Members Present: Joseph Welch, Chairman
Karen Jarrett, Vice-Chair
Travis H. Coles, Secretary
Laureen Boles
Elizabeth Epstein
Joseph Ervin
Wayne Noha
Lee Smith
Dwayne Stephens
Tom Woiwode

Members Absent: Malik Watkins, Treasurer
Eula Parker
Jay Melder
Ruel Joyner

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services
Melissa Paul-Leto, Planner
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Agenda

[1. Approval of Agenda](#)

Motion

Approve agenda as submitted

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin - Aye

W. Lee Smith - Aye

Tom Woiwode - Aye

Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

[2. December 14, 2021 Regular MPC Meeting, 1:30 P.M., Planning Commission, GO-TO- WEBINAR \(VIRTUAL\) to access go to: www.thempc.org or Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 East State Street..](#)

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

[3. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 7672 Johnny Mercer Blvd | Rezone request from R-1 / EO to R-3-12 / EO | File No. Z-1021-000179](#)

Motion

This item is Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, December 14, 2021.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[4. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 7810 Abercorn Street | Rezone from B-C to RMF-2-25 | File No. 21-005936](#)

Motion

This item is Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, December 14, 2021.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

VI. Items Requested to be Withdrawn

[5. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT | Sweetwater Station | Rezone from R-A - to RSF-4 | File No. 21-003991-ZA](#)

Motion

Zoning Map Amendment| Sweetwater Station| Rezone from R-A to RSF-4|21-003991-ZA| withdrawn from agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[6. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 700 Christopher Drive | Rezone from OI-E to RMF-2-40 | File No. 21-005198-ZA](#)

Motion

Rezoning Map Amendment|700 Christopher Dr| Rezone from OI-E to RMF-2-40| 21-005198-ZA, withdrawn from the agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[7. MINOR SUBDIVISION VARIANCE REQUEST | 8624 Old Montgomery Road | File No. SUBD 0621 - 000140](#)

Motion

Minor Subdivision Variance Request |8624 Old Montgomery Rd| SUBD 0621-000140, withdrawn from the agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

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

[8. Approval of the November 2, 2021 Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes.](#)

📎 [11-2-2021 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

📎 [11.02.2021 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

9. Adoption of the 2022 Holiday Schedule

[2022 Holiday Schedule87522MWSigned.pdf](#)

Motion

APPROVAL of the 2022 Holiday Schedule.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present

VIII. Old Business

IX. Regular Business

10. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | Wicklow Street | Rezone from B-C and RSF-E to RMF-3 | File No. 21-004883

[21-495 Rendering 11-09-2021.pdf](#)

- ② [21-495 Sections 11-09-2021.pdf](#)
- ② [Land Use Context.pdf](#)
- ② [Traffic Impact Analysis 2021.pdf](#)
- ② [Street Photos.pdf](#)
- ② [Combined Maps.pdf](#)
- ② [Staff Report 04883.pdf](#)
- ② [Public Comment.pdf](#)
- ② [2021-11-19 - MPC Letter Signed.pdf](#)
- ② [21-004883-ZA.pdf](#)
- ② [Concerns for 280 Unit Development Plan to the Olympus Neighborhood.pdf](#)
- ② [Proposed development at the old Johnny Harris site.pdf](#)
- ② [Wicklow Street Proposed Development Public Comment.pdf](#)
- ② [Proposed Johnny Harris site - update from APCCNA.pdf](#)
- ② [280 Unit Development in Olympus Neighborhood.pdf](#)
- ② [Wicklow Development email opposition.pdf](#)
- ② [Additional Public Comment Received.pdf](#)

The petitioner is requesting to rezone the subject parcels to the Residential Multifamily designation with the intent of combining the parcels and developing the property as apartments on the north and south sides of Kerry Street. The proposed density is 23 units per acre, which would allow up to 280 dwelling units.

The properties are currently zoned B-C (Community Business) and RSF-E (Large Lot Single Family), and the applicant is requesting the RMF-3 (Residential Multifamily) zoning district. The site includes 16 parcels of varying sizes. The properties on the north side of Kerry Street, identified on the attached Tax Map, are the site of the former Wicklow Stables. The property is no longer an active use and was the subject of a rezoning in 2015 that resulted in the current B-C zoning. The property identified on the south side of Kerry Street is an undeveloped parcel and is zoned RSF-E. This zoning district allows single family residential and requires a one-acre lot size minimum. The site is divided by Munster Street, an existing public street right-of-way that extends from East Victory Drive to Kerry Street and across Kerry Street to its termination point at the southern boundary of the subject site.

The Munster Street right-of-way varies in width from 30 feet to 40 feet. A portion of the street right-of-way is paved and is the legal access for one of the properties adjacent to the subject site. The southern portion of the right-of-way is unimproved and is not an open street. The portion of Munster Street north of Kerry Street has been declared surplus by the City of Savannah, but has not been conveyed to the applicant or any other private party. The portion of Munster Street, south of Kerry Street has not been declared surplus. The applicant would have to obtain the rights to that portion of Munster Street in order to develop the property as shown on the attached Concept Plan.

The existing zoning on the northern parcels is commercial and would currently allow a shopping center, restaurant, hotel, office complex or a number of other non-residential uses. While the proposed development is a significant change to the development pattern, from a land use standpoint, The Planning Commission finds that it is more compatible than many of the uses allowed under the current zoning of the northern portion of the site. The southern portion of the site would allow 5-6 single family residences under the current RSF-E zoning. Other uses allowed in the RSF-E include a church, public safety facility or agricultural use. This portion of the site does not immediately abut any other residentially developed property.

The northern portion of the site is proposed to include 124 dwelling units (22.5 units per acre). The southern portion, which is larger, is proposed to include 156 dwelling units (24 units per acre). The

proposed height for the residential buildings is 4-stories. The land use intensity, including height and mass is different than nearby property, specifically on the northern portion of the site. However, the Planning Commission finds that multifamily residential land use is appropriate and can be compatible with the neighborhood at large.

The Planning Commission recommends **Approval** of the request to rezone the subject properties from B-C and RSF-10 to RMF-3-25. In addition, the following conditions are recommended.

- No vehicular or pedestrian access directly to Dixie Avenue.
- The provision of a 10-foot multi use path on the south side of Kerry Street.
- A vegetative buffer and privacy fence between the site and residential properties on Dixie Avenue.
- Pedestrian connectivity to Bee Road.

Mr. Harold Yellin, Petitioner, stated the report tells you three important things. 1. If the property is developed under the existing commercial zoning district, there will be negative impacts. According to the staff "current commercial zoning will potentially allow uses that are less compatible to the area, than the uses allowed under the proposed multifamily residential zoning". We agree with that. In addition to the uses that you were just told, BC permits convenient stores, service stations, truck stops, bars, taverns, night clubs, restaurants, package stores, hotels, motels, in addition to all the usual general retail that we identify going into commercial. 2. The staff report also tells you that the proposed zoning will generate less traffic than commercial development. We agree with that finding. 3. The staff report also tells you that this zoning will permit multi family residential, which has been identified as a need, by the Mayor and Alderman of the City. We agree with that finding as well. It appears that staff recommendation is not based on our zoning request, but instead its based upon our concept plan. The concept plan is not before you today for approval. There will be no vote taken on our concept plan. It was prepared for illustrative purposes only. NewZO specifically eliminated site plan specific zoning. We would love to be here with a site plan that goes with zoning but your Ordinance eliminated that. Perhaps, it is time to bring it back. We frequently introduce concept plans to show how our apartments can easily function on the 4.7 acre tract North of Kerry and on the 6.9 acre tract, South of Kerri. What is before you today is a zoning petition, not a site plan. We will discuss elements of the site plan because we made changes based on four public hearing meetings that were held.

This is a petition to rezone the front parcel from community business to RMF-3, Residential Multi Family. The South Parcel from RSF-6, Single Family to RMF-3, Residential Multi Family.

The front parcel is closest to Victory Drive. This parcel was rezoned in 2015 from BH, which is Highway Business, and RS, Single Family Residential, to the current BC. Six years ago, MPC staff recommended approval and City Council approved a change to commercial. At that time, there was no site plan approved. It was only zoning, like what is before you today. One year later, in 2016, the MPC approved this general development plan. This plan included 115 spaces, 346sq ft. of retail. It included 555 parking spaces. There are three access points on Wicklow and there are three access points on Dixie Avenue.

Shopping centers are not being built today like they were in the past. This site as business commercial would support a big box store, or one of the more consumer-oriented package store, restaurant uses, which could be 24/7. It could bring a whole host of interruption to this neighborhood. We feel that whatever goes here, pure commercial, will actually be a greater impact to property owners than what we are proposing today. We feel we are more appropriate and we do agree with staff findings, if not their conclusion. Commercial uses are less compatible, multifamily generates less traffic, and this is an identifiable need in the City of Savannah.

The back parcel is 6.9 acres. There are trees to the East , West, and South but no trees on this site. This is a site of a former dump. We believe the cost to remediate is over \$2.4 million. Density is needed to subsidize the cost of remediation. Just a few years ago, there was a similar petition before the MPC Board, on the Bremer Tract on President Street. The same discussion was had then; this Commission and City Council approved a rezoning of 35 units per acre, a much higher density than we are asking for. Everyone recognized there is a public benefit to be derived from this cleanup.

We realize we cannot make everyone happy. There were four open public hearings. There have been a

number of revisions made. We have letters of support from the neighbors on Dixie Avenue. At Mr. Huff's request we put in writing there would be no access to Dixie Avenue. That has been committed to our writing. It is called a non access easement.

This site is located next to an existing grocery and within walking distance. It is next to transportation services, near to Truman Parkway, near to Daffin Park, and next to the City's bicycle path. This is a great location for a multifamily residential.

Mr. Neil McKenzie, Project Engineer for Coleman & Co., stated the site plan, even though it is technically not part of this application. It is important to understand the context of how we got the plan and implemented the input from the stakeholders. The Northern parcel, the 4.7 acre tract with 124 units, Kerry St. bisects the project, on the South there is 6.9 acres with 156 units. Each tract has two main structures. There is a pool area with parking around the buildings. The site plan was put together with avoiding some large oak trees in the middle of the site. Currently there is access off Wicklow St on the Northern and Southern sides. To compare the traffic, based on the 2016 approved plan, and just the 85,000sq ft. retail, that equates to roughly 8000 trips per day that development could produce, per the zoning. What we are proposing, from the north and south sides, there are 2050 trips. This is a significant reduction in the traffic from this development. These trips are based on the ITE trip manual from the 11th edition. There was a traffic study done, which recommended some improvements to make traffic operate better once the plan was implemented.

After community meetings, based on the scoping meeting with the City, we removed the access points from Kerry St and moved them to Wicklow St. This is where the access points were moved and created the extension of Wicklow through the unopened right-of-way. Vehicular access was removed from Dixie and created a pedestrian only path. The walking path on the eastern side, and pedestrian access point, next to Dixie, was removed. Sidewalks to Kerry St. were added, a 10ft multi use path across the front of the property was added. There was an entrance on the parcel that was aligned with the house across the street, in order to minimize the headlights into that home, the access was moved in between two homes to minimize that impact of headlights into front windows.

The 10ft multi use path down Kerry Street and the enhanced buffer between the northern parcel and the neighbors on Wicklow will help decrease the noise, headlights, and lighting levels. The developer has committed to connect the multi use path from this project, out to Daffin Park.

Ms. Karen Jarrett, Vice Chair, stated, if commercial were to be developed, at the peak hour there will be greater traffic volume than if this were residential property. There is a 10ft trail proposed along Kerry Street, in front of the apartment complex. There is a proposal to do one along the Salvation Army property connecting to Daffin Park. That would be nice but the pedestrian access along Bee Road is concerning.

Mr. Yellin stated, there was one more walking trail that was eliminated. There was a walking trail that ran in a north/south direction along the eastern boundary line. The neighbors on Dixie Street said they did not want their back yards to have a walking trail. An additional buffer was put there instead. A suggestion was made from one of the public meetings, to put the walking trail on the other side of Kerry Street. That is the bicycle trail side. Dixie Avenue will have access to the trails.

Mr. McKenzie stated, Dixie Ave does not have walks and there is no place to put them. Kerry street multiuse path will connect to the hiking trail along Dixie Avenue. We are proposing sidewalks down Wicklow for people to get to Whole Foods. Crossing Bee Road would be a concern. We would build a crosswalk, per the standards with the flashing lights, etc.

Ms. Jarrett stated there is one on Louisville Road that does not do any good at all regardless of the fact there is a museum on one side and the Children's Museum on the other side. Children cross that road all the time.

Public Comments

Mr. John Yale stated, he and his wife own property on the south end of Dixie Avenue. The main concern looking at the conceptual plans, was the access from the new apartment complex onto Dixie Avenue. It was going to split our street into two. If we as homeowners, at some point, want to sell our property together as a unit, it would destroy that. We are trying to get a letter from Mr. Yellin that states they will

not try to develop that property in the future. The problem with conceptual plans, they change. They could come back, when they actually do the project, and something get added that changes this. We would like some protection from that happening.

Ms. Artis Wood stated Victory Drive is a memorial for WWII servicemen. It was once the longest palm line drive, double canopy of trees, and provided vertical borders for a landscaped frame for this roadway. It has been considered for a scenic byway. It has been nibbled away primarily by accommodating roadways. It nibbles away at the median, the side roads, and takes away trees. \$100,000 was spent a few years ago for a very professional corridor study of this area. This should be a reference used when talking about this petition and future developments. In the context of Victory Drive and the involvement or impact of nearby areas, we would like you to consider what that means. I am in support of residential, it needs to be tiered down, not all four stories. There needs to be some sort of stepping down to nearby, single family, low scale residences.

Mr. Mark Horne stated, he owns property on the corner of Kerry and Wicklow. He was doing work on the property, the other day, and he noticed a meeting going on. He was not informed or involved in any of the meetings or been notified of any proposes. He states the only people represented in the neighborhood are the Dixie Street neighbors. There is no one from the Wicklow neighborhood. The traffic will be congested at the red light, no one will be taking a left turn on Victory Drive at certain times of the day. Right now where they have everything dumping out, they have everything from the south end coming to the corner of his property. A lot of the traffic is going to come down Kerry St if they are going to turn to the left on Victory or go back to the red light, or they will not be able to get out. The other issue is drainage. When the city had the record amount of rain a few years ago, the water then, was just a few inches from coming into the bottom apartments. He would like to see things downsized.

Gretchen Hilmers, Co-Chair of the Parkside Neighborhood Association, states one of the biggest concerns for their residents is traffic. Mr. Yale made it 100% clear their intentions for their property, which is to sell it as a large parcel to a developer later down the road. This means when we are told that Parkside has no business being a part of the discussion, we will be the ones that have to live with the consequences of how this unit is developed. We do feel like we should have a say in this. When we look at the traffic study that has been put out there, we can see they are estimating some extremely high numbers. When you say there will be daily two way trips, over 5000 of them, once everything is developed, this will effect us. As it stands now, our streets are flooded with speeders. We get traffic coming through us constantly. The closest road to Kerry Street is Washington, which will be up for speed humps hopefully in the near future. 52nd Street is another cross through which currently does have speed humps. As soon as the speedhumps were installed, traffic switched over to 51st Street. Once speedhumps go in on Washington, then it will be diverted to 49th Street. All of these cars will be coming through our neighborhood. We do not understand why the developer is unwilling to find a way to funnel traffic more directly into their complex. Lester Street is a perfect way of doing this. Why do we have to keep dealing with this? Parkside should be given a say in this.

We want affordable housing in this city, we want people to have homes, love our neighborhood and welcome people to our neighborhood. A four story high apartment complex that looks more like a jail house complex, no, we feel like something better can be here. We ask that The Planning Commission support a denial of this petition until we can go back to the drawing board and find a way to protect the neighbors and residents who are currently here.

Ms. Mary Landers stated, she and her husband own a house on the east side of Dixie. This is in our front yard and we are not part of the Dixie owners who are in favor of the zoning change. The people on the west side of Dixie have a different interest in this than the rest of the neighborhood. They are already zoned BC, unlike everybody who is zoned residential, they have a different business interest in this. The requested zoning is not appropriate for this site. RFM-3 is supposed to be for institutions, this is not an institution. It is supposed to be on a collector street. This is not on a collector street. Wicklow, Dixie, and Kerry are not collector streets.

Mr. Stewart Dohrman stated, he and his wife have property on Dixie Avenue, across from the proposed project. The petitioner is asking a lot from the City. They are asking for purchase of Munster Street, the zoning concessions, and the collector street issue. He is in support of residential. This would be a plus for this plot of land. The shopping center would have to purchase Munster Street if it went in this area. The comments from the east side of Dixie were given much more weight than those on Wicklow. Several

residents on the Wicklow side, including Mr. Horne from the fourplex, they voiced dissent but were not listened to very much. One decision that kept getting pushed away, why not connect Munster Street into the apartment complex to give apartment dwellers a way in and out onto Victory. This would relieve some of the congestion on Wicklow Street.

The project is way too suburban for this area. It appears as if it has been brought in from a different state or different part of town and just dropped onto this site. Little effort has been made to use the trees that are on the site. There are now only two trees left on this site. On a positive note, some tweaks to this design will make it much more friendly to this area than it is. This is a very urban parcel of land, it has been since the 20's. Munster street access in and out, should be considered. The changes that were made by the developer, were minor. Functionally they did not change at all. The buildings were the same size and same orientation. We only get one chance at doing this, delaying this decision a few months, to negotiate the development, will not hurt.

Mr. Tom Woiwode, board member, stated, this petition is for a rezone from B-C and RSFE to RMF-3. That is the purpose of this petition. This has nothing to do with the presentation we have had about the plan of the site. Should this petition be approved for rezoning, the next step would be a site plan to come back. The denial that staff recommends, is this based upon the appropriateness of the rezone or the appropriateness of the plan as presented?

Ms. Melissa Leto, Planner, stated this references the rezoning as what it could be. The site plan could change. Staff wanted to create some assurances, there would be a tier in height and have a lower density on the north side.

Mr. Woiwode stated, as the zoning is today, there are no assurances of anything other than the possibility of a big box store. This request effectively downzones and reduces the existing opportunity for intensity.

Ms. Leto stated this does not necessarily downzone the area, it proposes something that is different. It still has an intensity of density. It will increase traffic.

Mr. Woiwode stated as the property is currently zoned, by right, the owners of this have the opportunity to do something that would quadruple the traffic counts that we are currently looking at, if it would be zoned as it were proposed today.

Ms. Leto stated if a Walmart was proposed, that would not be four stories high.

Mr. Woiwode stated, the current, by right, zoning, and the current traffic study that was approved, had up to 10,000 trips per day. These trips are estimated to be 2000 per day.

Mr. Wayne Noha, board member, stated the property on the north of Kerry would allow warehouses. How tall can those warehouses be?

Mr. Leto stated no more than 50ft.

Mr. Noha stated, the storage units, like on Victory Drive further down toward Thunderbolt, are either three or four stories. This development that is proposed, which he agrees with co-board member, does warrant discussion but we are not here to determine what can go there, what size, and how many entrances. This has the potential to become more intrusive should this possibly not be developed as proposed and the big box store, the warehouse, or the storage units come in with 18 wheelers delivering. There is concern in regards to the Comprehensive Plan. Where does this fit in, how does this go together?

Ms. Leto stated this conflicts with the comprehensive plan. The Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Map, designates a subject property as Suburban Commercial north of Kerry street, and residential general, south of Kerry Street. The south would be residential, but not the north.

Ms. Jarrett asked what multi family zoning would be appropriate for this location. We clearly do not have collector roads here. There are clearly a number of vehicles that are going to be using Kerry and Wicklow to get to this property.

Ms. Leto stated that is why staff is recommending a lower density.

Ms. Jarrett asked what density would be appropriate with the roads that exist?

Ms. Leto stated reduction of the density but also it is more the location of the density. Staff is recommending it be moved to the south and not the north. The density is through the allowed units per acre. The Planning Commission has the choice to approve with a lower density in the northern portion and create a higher one in the southern portion to make it more appropriate.

Ms. Jarrett asked why The Planning Commission did not get a change in the Comprehensive Plan prior to getting a rezoning request.

Mr. Yellin stated land use plans generally change every time property is rezoned. In 2016, the land use plan said this was single family residential, then it was rezoned commercial and the land use plan became commercial. This evolves, if we say we cannot change from a Comprehensive Plan or a land use plan, there will never be another zoning to come before you.

Ms. Jarrett asked if it was possible to have the Comprehensive Plan changed before the zoning change?

Mr. Yellin stated in the past, they came together. Under NewZO, they eliminated that.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, board member, asked if this petition were to be approved today, will this Planning Commission see a site plan for review or will it just go to Development Services and continue on.

Ms. Leto stated once a rezoning happens, a development site plan review occurs but is not open to the public, it is an internal process. The City staff review the plan as a technical review.

Mr. Lee Smith, Chatham County, County Manager, stated as the report from staff was read, it was confusing seeing denial. The actual recommendation does not match what is presented. When the presentation is looked at, it is apparent that the residential multi family use is less intensive and less disturbing. The transportation issues will be there no matter what is proposed.

Ms. Leto stated there are positives in the proposed and existing zoning, as well as negative effects. Staff feels uneasy in regards to the height intensity of the one story bungalows and the intensity of density.

Mr. Stephens stated, with those concerns in mind, would it not be appropriate for those conditions to be accompanied with this rezoning in the event there is a rezoning? This does seem to be a less impactful zoning type; however, if there are some concerns within the conditions in that would make it much more contextually appropriate. Would it be appropriate to add conditions to, potential approval?

Ms. Leto stated yes, that would be appropriate.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the condition to bring the site plan back to The Planning Commission for approval could be added.

Mr. Noha asked about making this petition contingent upon the site plan coming back before the Planning Commission. Is that allowed, prior to going to the City Council?

Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman, stated the conditions do not go with the zoning.

Mr. Woiwode stated should The Planning Commission approve the rezoning, it would then go to City Council for the rezoning. There would then be a site plan, which will come to The Planning Commission, the rezone is simply rezoning of the parcels.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the site plan will only come before The Planning Commission if The Planning Commission asks for it to. Ms. Jarrett would like to ask for the site plan to come before The Planning Commission.

Mr. Noha asked if Ms. Pamela Everett could give some legal advise on this petition. What are the legal

boundaries?

Ms. Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director, stated she could not give a legal opinion. The City Attorney would need to be contacted in regards to this. She can look at the zoning ordinance and give an opinion. Typically, what would come before you here would be the approval of the rezoning, and a recommendation made to the City as to whether or not it should be rezoned.

Mr. Yellin stated they understand the concerns and agree to come back before The Planning Commission.

Mr. Donald Perry, member of the public, stated he has a rental house on Wicklow street. He lives on Williams Street. He has family property on the corner Kerry Street. He questioned the access to Victory Drive at one of the public meetings. There is a Legacy Tree on Munster Drive that the developer says he cant get around. The developer needs direct access to Victory Drive. Sixty years ago, there were four houses on that street, there was not a Legacy Tree then. He does not support this petition mainly because there is no access to Victory Drive.

Ms. Melanie Creece, stated based off of the Comprehensive Plan in 2040, which was approved by City Council in October, this area is deemed Urban Transitional, according to the character area map. Most of the neighborhoods are pedestrian oriented with well used sidewalks, parks, and open spaces. redevelopment and infill development opportunities are prevalent in this character area. Special attention should be paid to corridors. There are three goals in Plan 2040 that are key in highlighting this specific parcel. If rezoning is approved, the suggestion is to add some conditions that would reinforce these goals that are within Plan 2040. The ten foot multi use trail from Bee Road to Police Memorial Trail. That supports goals 1, 4, and 5. Goal 1, walkable neighborhoods, increased connectivity, and open space preservation. Part of the objectives of this goal is to prioritize the preservation and the enhancements of the existing public realm and encourage the incorporation of the public round spaces and the elements within the new development. With goal 4, continue to create innovative ways to connect people with places. The objective, to increase mass transit and other mobility options like walking and biking. Goal 5, enhance the character and image of major corridors that implement the design and construction of safe, attractive, vibrant, and pedestrian friendly streets. Create a series of new and enhanced public spaces including; parks, plazas, greenspaces, and pocket parks throughout the City and particularly in mixed use areas to improve the experience of residents who gather and interact in these locations. Everything within goal 5 is directly relevant to this site.

The suggestion is to support with conditions, if this petition is approved.

1. 10ft multi use trail
2. Dedicated greenspace with pocket parks in proximity to the trail head. (this would support goals 1, 4, and 5)
3. Height restriction north of Kerry Street or a facade set back in height. (directly support goal 5)
4. Parallel parking on Kerry Street, this would act as a traffic calming agent. (support goals 1, 4, and 5)
5. Use of permeable pavers, which would decrease water run off into the retention ponds that are presented in the plan (support goal 5)

The multi-use trail would align with the City goal for safety, socioeconomic development, and social equity laid out in the Tide to Town master plan, supported by the City of Savannah. Currently, Kerry Street is already designated as a bike corridor and experiences very heavy bike and pedestrian traffic. Currently traffic volume is low enough for the cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists to share the road. If the properties are developed as multi family, traffic volumes will increase substantially. Dedicated bike and pedestrian facilities must be part of the development evolution.

Ms. Jarrett, asked if the pocket park is being proposed for public access.

Ms. Creece said yes.

Mr. Noha asked, with Daffin Park being close, would you consider it a pocket park for gathering and then get on Kerry to take the trail?

Ms. Creece said yes.

Mr. Yellin stated, at this point, we agree with MPC staff, a commercial use is less compatible and multi family generates less traffic. We also agree with MPC staff that multi family is an identifiable need for the city. We do think this is an exceptional site, it is downzoning from commercial to multifamily. This is next to a grocery store that is walkable, next to transportation, vehicles to Truman Parkway, and public transportation on Victory Drive and Bee Road. it is near the bike path and Daffin Park, which we are making every effort to connect to Daffin Park. We have tried to listen and be sensitive to the public (the surrounding neighbors). We will be considerate to all the expressed concerns if this petition is rezoned and later brought back for a site plan review.

Motion

Approval of the zoning requests, Rezone from B-C and RSF-E to RMF-3, 23 with conditions

Petitioner return with a site plan that includes;

1. No vehicular or pedestrian access directly to Dixie Ave.
2. 10ft multi use path
3. Vegetative buffer and privacy fence
4. Pedestrian connectivity to Bee Rd.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Tom Woiwode

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Not Present
Malik Watkins	- Nay
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[11. SPECIAL USE PERMIT | 2110 Montgomery Street, Suite A | Packaged Alcohol Sales | File No. 21-005177-ZA](#)

📎 [AERIAL MAP 21-005177-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [FLU MAP 21-005177-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [LABEL MAP 21-005177-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [VICINITY MAP 21-005177-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [ZONING MAP 21-005177-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [SITE VISIT.pdf](#)

📎 [Application.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of objection 1.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of Objection 2.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of Objection 3.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of Objection 4.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of Objection 6.pdf](#)

☞ [Letter of Objection 5.pdf](#)

☞ [Staff Report.pdf](#)

The petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use pursuant to Section 3.10 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance to permit packaged alcohol sales. The Special Use process includes review by the Planning Commission and the Savannah City Council. Should a permit be granted by the City of Savannah, it will be governed by the permit enforcement criteria outlined in Article 3 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance.

The request for a Special Use to have packaged alcohol sales in the TC-1 zoning district is step one in the City's process to issue an alcohol license. Once a Special Use is approved, there is a separate process for an alcohol license where the City Council will determine which type of alcohol license is appropriate to issue.

The subject property is located at 2110 Montgomery Street, between W 38th Street, and W 37th Street in the Thomas Square Historic Neighborhood. The parcel is .16 acres, or 6,969.6 square feet, and includes a one-story structure with two units. Unit A is a restaurant named Munchies BBQ. Unit B is the subject unit for this Special Use request and faces the northern side of W 38th Street. There are two residential properties adjacent to the subject parcel, and Wells Park is located diagonally across from 2110 Montgomery Street. 315 W 38th Street recently received an approval to change zoning districts to construct twenty-seven (27) residential units within the existing two-story structure.

The Special Use provisions of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance are designed to allow the reviewing authorities to consider the establishment of uses in zoning districts, where the use may be appropriate but should not be allowed by right.

The review criteria outlined in Section 3.10.8 are the standards for considering a Special Use. In review of the standards, it appears that the subject property and proposed use meet the requirements. Since the petitioner has offered the submitted hours of operations, the Commission may revise the hours or consider the proposed hours as conditions to the approval. The intent of the zoning district provides for commercial areas that are developed at a mass and scale harmonious with nearby residential neighborhoods. The proposed use would be located within an existing structure and appears to be harmonious with the mass and scale of the nearby residential neighborhoods. However, the proposed use is not harmonious with regards to the amount of packaged alcohol and drinking establishments located within the surrounding area. Based on the existing alcohol packaged and drinking establishments map, there are eight (8) existing package stores and nine (9) existing drinking establishments within walking distance from the subject parcel. There is an existing fueling station located directly to the rear of the subject parcel that is one of the eight licensed packaged stores. The special use process allows the Planning Commission and the Mayor and Aldermen to consider individual circumstances and apply conditions if necessary. It also allows the City Council to manage the permit issuance based on the ongoing compliance of the permit holder to include revocation if necessary.

Based upon the criteria for a special use permit; staff recommends **Denial** of the request to establish a permitted packaged alcohol sales establishment at 2110 Montgomery Street.

Petitioner not present

No Public Comments

Mr. Wayne Noha, Board Member, asked has there been any contact with the petitioner since the last hearing.

Ms. Melissa Leto, Planner, stated right after the pre-meeting and prior to the actual Planning Commission meeting on November 2nd, the petitioners came and asked to postpone their petition so they could meet with

staff in person. The following week, staff did meet with the petitioners, and went over all permitted uses that are currently allowed. They were interested in a lottery ticket sales and package ice cream. The petitioner was going to discuss with his partner,(his brother) about the possibility of using the permitted uses vs using the special use. They were going to try and mitigate the letters of objection and gain letters of support. There has been no communication since then, until this morning when they called to say they would not be able to attend the meeting. The petitioner did not ask to postpone or withdraw the petition. He said to move forward.

Motion

Denial of request for special use permit on 2110 Montgomery St. Suite A for Packaged Alcohol Sales

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[12. AMENDED GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN | 4704 Ogeechee Road | 21-000432](#)

📎 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

📎 [Letter of Agreement.pdf](#)

📎 [Pier Rock GDP 11.22.21.pdf](#)

The petitioner is requesting to amend a previously approved General Development Plan in order to vary certain conditions associated with the approval.

Background: During the November 2, 2021 MPC meeting, a presentation was made by the petitioner to outline the history and update the Commission on the progress of an existing borrow pit at 4704 Ogeechee Road. The subject property is located on the north side of Ogeechee Road, between Chatham Parkway and Dean Forest Road in the City of Savannah. Under a former owner, the site was rezoned to the P-D-R (Planned Development Reclamation) zoning classification in 2006 for the purpose of establishing a borrow pit. The borrow pit began operation consistent with the approved site plan and was later amended in 2010. The current owners are in the process of closing out the pit, under the review of the Environmental Protection Division (EPD). Less than 10% of closeout is remaining. However, they are also responsible for satisfying Code Compliance issues, identified by the City of Savannah, as having occurred under the previous owner. These are the variances that are being requested. They include fencing, sloping and completion date. Once closeout is complete, the former borrow pit will serve primarily as a nature preserve.

Adjoining Properties: The applicant, who is in the process of developing the front +/- 60 acres as a warehouse, is transferring the balance of the property to adjacent property owners and the Savannah Wildlife Rescue Center. The properties west of the site are residential. Those properties will be expanded to the amount agreed upon with each property owner by recombining their property with portions of the subject property. The industrial property to the east will be combined with a portion of the subject property as well. Letters of agreement from the property owners are attached.

The MPC staff recommends that the General Development Plan conditions be amended in accordance with the variance requests as follows:

- Eliminate the condition for fencing required by the current GDP.
- Eliminate the condition for sloping required by the current GDP.
- Amend the closeout language to be consistent with the expiration of the EPD permit.
- Revise plan to eliminate property donation to the City of Savannah.

Mr. Jeff Jepsen, Petitioner, stated this GDP approval is the precursor of allowing us to follow up with subdivision recombination maps, so these parcels can be split up and given to the owners that were promised them.

No Public Comments

Motion

Approval of the Amended General Development Plan and Approval of the following variances;

1. Eliminate the fencing required by the originally approved GDP
2. Eliminate the sloping required by the originally approve GDP
3. Closeout of the borrow pit shall be consistent with the expiration of the EPD permit

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Wayne Noha

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Nay
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Not Present

[13. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT |Sec. 2 Definitions; Sec. 3-6.1 Locaton of Accessory Buildings on Residential Lots |](#)

📎 [Staff Report Text Amendment County.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services, stated, in review of the County Zoning Ordinance,

staff had identified certain omissions that have resulted in someone wanting outcomes in residential properties specific to accessory structures. Accessory buildings are typically any detached building that is subordinate to a principal residential use on the same property. These can include detached garages, storage buildings, pool houses, barns, and buildings of a similar nature. Unfortunately there is not a definition for residential accessory buildings within the Zoning Ordinance. With the things we are proposing staff would like to address both the definition as well as the section that references location of these buildings and some design issues (language within the ordinance that needs to be changes slightly).

In terms of a definition, what staff is proposing is within Section 2, the definition section. Create 2-1a, titled Accessory Buildings Residential. It would read, any detached buildings on a residential lot, that is subordinate to a principle residential dwelling, and is typically used for lodging, storage of vehicles, household, recreational equipment, or other similar use. For these purposes, any building connected to a principle building by a breezeway or similar architectural feature greater than 16ft in length shall be considered detached.

The last sentence was added to the language because detached buildings have different development standards from a setback standpoint than attached buildings. That loophole within the Ordinance has been used by some property owners to take advantage of the regulations and build extremely long breezeways to suggest that one building is attached to another.

As it relates to section 3-6.1, part of that language concerns electrical meters. Where one is allowed within a residential property, we are recommending that an exception be made for marine docks, barns, and similar structures that do not include habitable space. What that will allow, for those types of buildings to not have to go through a variance process to request an additional electrical meter.

Accessory buildings typically are required to be within rear yards only. But on marsh front property, they are permitted to be in front yards with some caveats. One being, the building not to exceed 900sq ft. Staff attempted to create a sliding scale that larger properties could potentially be permitted greater use of their property with larger accessory buildings. The language that was included was the building not to exceed 900ft and shall not exceed the height of the principal building. Right now, the language states it shall not exceed one story in height. But as we know, a one story building could easily be 25ft tall. There are additions to the language that are important. Provided, however, an additional foot in height shall be permitted for each additional foot in which the accessory building or structure is set back from the side property line. This will allow one additional foot in height for each foot that the building is set back from adjacent property however, still being capped in the overall allowable height in the district.

Accessory buildings must be constructed of materials of like kind in appearance of those used in construction of the principle residential dwelling on the site and is compatible with development on adjoining lots.

Staff is proposing the language be revised as follows;

The accessory structure is constructed of materials in keeping with the principle residential building and or the residential character of the area as determined by the building official.

We are recommending that this language be forwarded to Chatham County for them to proceed with it as they see fit in terms of placing it on a County agenda.

Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman, asked about a building being put in the back yard and there being a marsh there. How many feet from the marsh should they be?

Mr. Lotson stated there is a 35ft marsh buffer requirement that is along all properties in Chatham County. You are not permitted to build within 35ft of the jurisdictional wetlands.

No Public Comments

Motion

Approval for Zoning Text Amendment Sec. 2 Definitions; Sec. 3-6.1 Location of Accessory Buildings on Residential Lots

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Tom Woiwode

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
W. Lee Smith	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Eula Parker	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Ruel Joyner	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Not Present

X. Presentations

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

[14. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to present before the board, the November 23, 2021 regular Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Wilson
Executive Director

MW/sh

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.