



## Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room  
April 12, 2022 ~ 1:30 PM  
Minutes

### April 12, 2022 REGULAR MPC MEETING, 1:30 P.M.

**Members Present:** Joseph Welch, Chairman  
Karen Jarrett, Vice-Chair  
Travis Coles, Secretary  
Malik Watkins, Treasurer  
Laureen Boles  
Shedrick Coleman  
Elizabeth Epstein  
Joseph Ervin  
Jay Melder  
Jeff Notrica  
Wayne Noha  
Dwayne Stephens  
Tom Woiwode

**Members Absent:** Lee Smith

**Staff Present:** Melanie Wilson, Executive Director  
Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services  
Melissa Paul-Leto, Planner  
Nirav Gandhi, 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**

Approval of Agenda

###### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin - Aye

W. Lee Smith - Not Present

Tom Woiwode - Aye

Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

**IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements**

[2. May 3, 2022 Regular MPC Meeting, 1:30 P.M., Planning Commission, Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 East State Street.](#)

**Notice(s)**

[3. April 12, 2022 Finance Committee Meeting, 11:00 A.M., GO-TO- WEBINAR \(VIRTUAL\) to access go to: \[www.thempc.org\]\(http://www.thempc.org\) or Jerry Surrency Conference Room, 112 East State Street.](#)

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

[4. REZONING REQUEST | 5659 Ogeechee Rd | File No. Z-1221-000211](#)

<b>Motion</b>	
Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, May 3, 2022.	
<b>Vote Results ( Approved )</b>	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye

Jay Melder - Aye

[5. REZONING REQUEST | 241 Broadwater Lane | File No. Z-0222-000229 - Rezone from PDR-SM to R-A](#)

**Motion**

Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, May 3, 2022.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

[6. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 500 John Carter Road | Rezone from I-L to I-H | File No. 22-000807](#)

**Motion**

Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, May 3, 2022.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye

Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

[7. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 2180 East Victory Drive | Rezone from RMF-2-20 to RMF-2-45 | 22-001231](#)

**Motion**

Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, May 3, 2022.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles  
Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

**VI. Items Requested to be Withdrawn**

[8. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 0 & 6703 Johnny Mercer Boulevard | Rezone two \(2\) parcels from a R-2-A/TC \(Two-Family Residential Limited / Town Center Overlay\) and a P-D-N/TC \(Planned Development Rezoning for Certain Nonconforming Uses / Town Center Overlay\) zoning districts to a B-N/TC \(Neighborhood-Business / Town Center Overlay\) zoning classification. | File No. Z-0222-000234](#)

**Motion**

WITHDRAWN from the Final Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles  
Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
--------------	-------

W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

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

**VII. Consent Agenda**

[9. Approval of the March 22, 2022 Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes.](#)

[3-22-2022 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

[03.22.2022 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	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye

Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

10. Authorize Executive Director to Execute Contract with Consultant for CORE MPO Regional Freight Transportation Plan Update

📎 [Draft MPC Consultant Contract 4-12-2022.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Authorize Executive Director to Execute Contract with Consultant for the CORE MPO Regional Freight Transportation Plan Update.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

**VIII. Old Business**

**IX. Regular Business**

11. SPECIAL USE APPROVAL REQUEST | 2110 West Gwinnett Street | File no. 21-006747-ZA

📎 [ZONING MAP 21-006747-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [VICINITY MAP 21-006747-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [AERIAL MAP 21-006747-ZA.pdf](#)

📎 [Maps and Pics.pdf](#)

📎 [Revised hours.pdf](#)

📎 [Revised Narrative.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report 2.pdf](#)

📎 [Letter of Opposition from - Dr. ZaDonna Slay 04122022.pdf](#)

**Nirav Ghandi, Planner**, said the petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use pursuant to Section 3.10 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance to establish a recycling facility. The Special Use process includes review by the Planning Commission and the Savannah City Council. Should the use be approved by Council, a permit will be granted by the City of Savannah which will be governed by the permit enforcement criteria outlined in Article 3 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property is located on the north side of West Gwinnett St, between I-516 N exit 6 and Collat Avenue. The subject property, approximately 12.7 acres, consists of two undeveloped parcels. The proposed development is a recycling facility with associated office space.

Per the Zoning Ordinance, a recycling plant is permitted in the current zoning (IL, Light Industrial) with a special use permit. The applicant's business plan includes some suggested operations information.

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.

The current Light Industrial zoning of the property allows for several uses by right that would be more disruptive to the neighborhood, such as a crematorium, correctional center, adult entertainment, nightclub, freight yard, or mulch composting. The Special Use process allows the MPC and City Council to tailor the operating restrictions on this property so the new use is as non-disruptive as possible to the neighborhood.

The intent of this zoning district is to provide for a wide range of research and development, light manufacturing and assembly, warehousing, and wholesaling activities as well as some support services. The ordinance states "Development must be operated in a clean and quiet manner, with most activities occurring indoors, and should not be a nuisance to nearby non-industrial uses." The concept plan and hours of operation as described by the applicant appear to be as non-intrusive to nearby residential properties as possible, and therefore in line with the Ordinance.

The applicant is seeking to use this property because of the proximity to the railroad. They intend to have trucks come in only from I-516, trucks will never enter the Carver Village Neighborhood. Staff has made this a specific condition for approval of this petition. The residents of Carver Village should not see the trucks from their homes effectively. The distance from the edge of this property to the closest home is approximately 625ft. Carver Village is two industrial properties away from the subject property.

Other uses allowed by right on this property would be things like a night club, mulching facility, freight yard, or correctional facility. All of those could be built without ever coming before this board and with no special restrictions placed on them. However, because this recycling facility requires a special use, it allows the Board, staff, and community to place specific restrictions on it to be as non disruptive as possible. The Concept Plan and narrative presented by the applicant appear to describe a use that is as non disruptive as possible to this neighborhood.

The conditions that staff is recommending:

1. The hours of operation shall be limited to 7a.m - 5.p.m Monday – Friday
2. An architecturally designed solid fence or wall not less than 8-feet in height shall be required along the southern property boundary.
3. Commercial vehicle traffic entering the facility shall travel eastbound along Gwinnett Street and shall exit westbound only.
4. This special use permit shall be non-transferrable.

**Jim Gerrard, Attorney for Petitioner**, said we have been trying to develop this property since late last year. We have had several meetings, held neighborhood meetings, and talked to a number of people. A lot of the feedback presented there was a lot of confusion about what we were going to put on the property and what we could put on the property. A lot of the residents thought this was a rezoning and we were rezoning the property to industrial use. The property is already zoned industrial. The other rumor was this would be a recycling center similar to the one which is next door. This is not, the materials that are going to be brought in will already be processed. They will be processed in a more fine way so they can then be loaded on a railroad track and

shipped out. This will not be a bunch of junk cars or metal that will be piled on top of this property. It will be like an assembly line. The piece of property in question is approximately 8-10 acres. There will be several common areas within this property. There will be an office, a training center, an equipment storage place, a processing area, and a loading area. There are retention ponds within the property, it is a self contained unit. This is not an intensive industrial use like the TIC property next door. In addition, we are proposing a 16ft fence along the property on Gwinnett Street. We also propose a 40ft landscape buffer within the fence. The other issues that have come up have been environmental issues. We are doing an environmental study for these issues.

The petitioner was raised in Savannah, he wants to employ the people in the community to work on the site. There will be 45 jobs with salaries totaling over \$2 million. We have offered to work with the neighborhood associations and help them with stopping the crime in the area. We sponsored a rally against violence at EOA. We talked to the head of the NAACP there and the Director of the Equal Opportunity Employment agency.

**Madison Elliott, Petitioner**, said this facility will generate at a minimum of 42 jobs with an annual payroll of \$2.9 million. The purpose of this proposed use for us is this process is a state of the art process. It is a very expensive process to put in. It allows us to efficiently refine the materials to a more marketable and more profitable state in a more efficient manner. The proposed facility has a tremendous amount of concrete infrastructure, so there will not be dust on the property.

**Jim Gerrard** said a lot of the residents thought the railroad which was going to pick up these materials would continue east into their community. There is another railroad track that does go through their community and cause noise. The railroad that is going to be picking up this company's material is going to pick them up and then go back to the west. They will not go further east through Carver Village. This is the same for the trucks. They are mainly owned by the petitioner, they will be controlled as to where they go. They will be coming off the highway into this gated area. There will be a security gate at the front, the trucks will enter and exit at this gate at the west end of the property.

**Dwayne Stephens, Board member**, asked for explanation between processing vs fine processing.

**Madison Elliott** said this facility is not open to the public. There will not be people in pickup trucks dragging whatever they have cleaned out of their back yards into the facility. What will happen, my trucks from the other facilities will pick up processed material, scrap that has already been compacted, flattened, bailed, and densified. It will arrive in this facility where it will be unloaded and run through the machinery to liberate it from insulation, glass, and other non recyclable materials to yield a marketable product.

**Dwayne Stephens** asked what does the liberation involve to get it to the material that you are trying to send out?

**Madison Elliott** said the materials, white goods, refrigerators and stoves. Those materials run through a hammer mill process, they are shattered and then go through the various refining processes. When these materials are processed in the machinery, they come to the facility in a depolluted form. The fuels and oils have already been removed, as well as any gas.

**Jay Melder, City Manager**, said he will be abstaining with this board today since this will be coming before the City Council as well. I believe this Special Use Permit is in line with the current Comp Plan and would offer less intrusion than others allowed by right and would probably be a better neighbor than others. There are some conditions the petitioner offered in a letter to MPC that were not included in the staff recommendations, I would urge the Board to consider these as conditions, if this petition moves forward. Specifically that the truck traffic be limited to 25 trucks per day. The facility and all recycling activities shall be completely shielded with a 45ft wide landscape buffer and a 16ft high fence. All noise generated, and activities associated with the facility shall be restricted to the rear portion of the property away from west Gwinnett Street. The facility shall be secure during off hours by security gates at all exits and entrances. Any litter, dust, or other omissions generated by the recycling center shall be controlled by the strict application of federal, state, and local environmental statutes or its rules and regulations and through the implementations by Southern Metals properties of written in-house rules of operation as well.

**Mr. Elliott** said 25 per day is too limiting. 50-60 would be acceptable.

**Mr. Melder** said, was the 25 trucks per day not in the letter submitted?

**Mr. Elliott** said that was earlier in January when we were trying to make some decisions. This is not a significant difference. We have a business model that is built on a certain amount of tonnage. That would limit the amount of tonnage thru the facility not making it profitable.



**Karen Jarrett, Vice Chair**, asked what is the steam used for? Are you doing an environmental assessment to show there are no environmental hazards?

**Mr. Elliott** said the steam is more of a climate issue. There will be days when you see no steam and days when you do. It will depend on the humidity in the air. During the process, heat is generated from friction of materials running through the hammermill process. A phase 1 environmental assessment has been done on that property. There are no current environmental issues on the property as it exists today. As far as further and future assessments, we plan to run the machinery in an environmentally safe manner. There are controls in place to keep it as such.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked what is future land use for this property and why this is a special permit as opposed to a by right?

**Mr. Ghandi** said the Future Land Use Map does designate this parcel as industrial.

**Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services**, said during the NewZo process, we identified uses that were within areas or within zoning districts that in some cases throughout the city were adjacent to residential properties. In this particular neighborhood there are a number of industrial uses that are in close proximity to residential. The special use will allow the Commission and the City Council to create conditions in those cases.

**Mr. Melder** said I am concerned about the truck traffic. We look at near port communities and see that truck traffic is going to be a given, but a big impact on the community. We were planning on 25 trucks per day and trying to mitigate that. Now learning from you today, to meet your business model it would need to be double if not more. We need to learn more about the kind of truck traffic you will need, to see how we can mitigate that if this moves forward at all. This will be a key issue as this petition moves forward.

**Mr. Elliott** said the entrance and the exit on this particular parcel, blend themselves nicely to getting on and off Gwinnett Street.

**Mr. Gerrard** said the traffic is not going to Carver Village. It comes in and then is restricted to go back out to I-516 which is right next door. The truck traffic is only going to be between where it comes off the highway into the entrance of the facility which is right next door to the intersection.

**Mr. Elliott** said the trucks never penetrate Carver Village or further down the Gwinnett Street corridor toward the arena.

**Mr. Melder** asked how this would be enforced.

**Mr. Elliott** said he owns 95% of the trucks that would enter the facility. We currently use about 5 to 8 subcontract trucks per day. They are under our instructions.

**Joseph Ervin, Board member**, said he is very concerned about not only the petitioner's trucks going in there but other trucks taking that same route. When you went from 25 to 60 trucks, that stopped my thought process. I am concerned about noise generating activities. The noise already generated from I-516 is almost unbearable to the citizens of Carver Village.

**Mr. Elliott** said OSHA requires the decibel levels be acceptable to a certain level to not damage ones hearing. We have had decibel studies at our current facilities in the past and they do not exceed that which is dangerous. We are proposing a very tall privacy fence. There are other things that can be applied to that fencing to deaden the kind of noise that goes on behind it. The fence will not only shield any view of what is going on as far as the processing of materials, it will also deaden the sound.

**Mr. Shedrick Coleman, Board member**, asked what happens to the materials that are not acceptable to recycle? Do they leave by railcar or do they leave by truck back out of the site?

**Mr. Elliott** said the materials can all be shipped out by rail or export container. In this case, they would all be shipped out by rail.

**Mr. Coleman** said we have a petitioner who is willing to work with the community and with the by right opportunities that are on this site. We need to take advantage of having someone who will work with the community. Someone else could come in, you never get the opportunity to talk to them and the truck traffic

could be at a generation where you would not get the opportunity to talk about it.

**Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member**, said the noise is a big concern. The height of the wall is a concern. It needs to be 16ft high. The petition says a 40ft wide landscape buffer, this needs to be a heavily vegetated buffer to break the noise that will be resounding off that wall and pushed back into the neighborhood.

**Ms. Jarrett** asked how does the neighborhood felt about this project?

**Mr. Gerrard** said they have had two neighborhood meetings and the feeling was negative toward the project. I think they were misinformed as to what we were actually doing. They just do not want industrial uses on that property. They feel it will cause their properties to deteriorate and depreciate.

**Mr. Ghandi** said staff, over the last few months, has received several phone calls and letters in opposition to this project. Staff attended the first neighborhood meeting, where there were approximately 100 people in attendance. The feelings were largely negative there as well.

**Mr. Malik Watkins, Board member**, said it looks like we have been misinformed like the community has. The information provided, said 25 trucks, now we are up 60. Also, the information you provided talks about the community being proud of this facility. I don't know anyone who would be proud living next to a 16ft high fence. There seems to be some miscommunication.

**Mr. Stephens** said if you have a flat panel fence, not only do you have a massive wall that is going to create sound reverberation, you also have a blank canvas for graffiti which would make that community less desirable.

**Mr. Melder** said he agrees with the comments regarding the fence and the dirt berm. I think there is a lot of value in the special use process. The uses by right could be much worse and more intrusive and intensive. There still needs to be some discussion about the particulars in this, specifically the truck traffic.

**Mr. Ervin** said he agrees with the other board members. My concern is for the residents of Carver Village. What I would like to see is something more on point and accurate. That way everyone in the community will be aware of what is being done. With the amount of traffic already in that area, if there is an emergency, there will be a problem getting through there.

**Ms. Melanie Wilson, Executive Director**, said I suggest making a recommendation for the petitioner to do a 4-5ft berm with a 10ft fence. When you go over 10ft, you run the risk of the stability of the fence as well as graphite. A 16ft is going to be hard to maintain and keep structurally viable. A berm gives the applicant in the community to do something more decorative and help with the noise.

**Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman**, asked what type of fence were you planning on building?

**Mr. Elliott** said they were planning on putting up a steel fence. When discussing the trucks and putting a cap on the number of trucks, when talking about the number, we were talking about an average per day. The 25 trucks per day, were at an average of 8000 tons per month.

**Mr. Coleman** said the discussion on these trucks, due to the land use in that area, would a traffic study need to be done?

**Mr. Tom Woiwode, Board member**, asked if the truck traffic goes all the way to Gwinnett both ways?

**Mr. Ghandi** said yes, we are recommending they exit off the ramp onto the property.

**Mr. Lotson** said the applicant is agreeable to a condition of the entrance/exit off the ramp area. The site plan can be designed for a right turn only from the property.

**Ms. Jarrett** said another concern is how many trucks can be accommodated on the site?

**Mr. Elliott** said they made provisions for that in the site plan already. There is more than enough room to keep trucks on the site so they are not in the street.

**Mr. Welch** asked about the number of cranes and the number of trucks needed per crane. Could the exit be moved further to the west end of the property?

**Mr. Elliott** said part of the strategy as we route trucks during the day, we have GPS tracking on all the trucks. We try to plan throughout the day so that too many trucks do not arrive at the same facility at the same time. They could not efficiently be handled and we end up with loss of payroll. With the correct engineering the exit could be moved, I don't feel it needs to be.

**Mr. Loreen Boles, Board member**, said it sounds like the community was not in support of this project. Transportation and the impact on the community is the big discussion. The ability to have the trucks enter and exit by I-516 without coming through the community, we need to consider the impact on the community that wants to go to work on I-516. Even though the trucks might not go through the community itself, you are limiting access for the community that is there. We need to consider what the cumulative impact is.

### Public Comments

**Ms. Bethany Campbell**, said there are a number of concerns. The 96 letters that came this morning because this has been taken off the agenda in the past. I wanted this to be fresh on peoples minds. The original letter, in opposition to this, came to the MPC back in January. The community's opposition to this did not just show up this morning. There was an opportunity for everyone to know what the community's concerns were before today. If you want to know what we are living with in Carver Village and how we are impacted, come to Carver Village. In a 24hr span, there is never a period where we do not hear industrial sound. Trains, trucks, lawnmowers and equipment from the City of Savannah, school buses, and Coastal Marine. The smells and sediment on our vehicles that does not come off. Ailments, respiratory ailments from people who have never put a cigarett in their mouth. Nothing in this proposal seems to be fluid. We were given one set of numbers and then all of the sudden that number more than doubles. There is so much back tracking. The retention pond, we were never confused in Carver Village about what this facility was for and what it would be bringing. We knew exactly what it was, we did our research. We were told before this would be metal that would already be ground up. We were never told whole cars. We never had a voice as to how this area would be zoned.

**Ms. Carolyn Slay**, said her family is a long time resident of Carver Village. I lived through the teaching and side effects of Malaria, and all types of industrial coming in here. My father died 12 years after we moved there from cancer. My aunt was there on Gwinnett and died from cancer. March 11th of this year, trying to get to the arena for a meeting, trucks held up traffic for 25 minutes trying to get into a gate. We already have busses that park there. Crown Royal has trucks going out. Trains go through making noise at all hours of the day and night. There is 80% elderly in our neighborhood. The rest are newcomers and renters. I am asking please oppose this.

**Chairman Ellis, Chatham County**, said I am the president of the Carver Village Neighborhood association. I remember when we did not have a say for what was going on in our neighborhood. 1947 and 1948 when the federal government and the City of Savannah decided to put Carver Village in play, we did not have a say as to where we were moving. Now we have the opportunity to address you. I want to say to all of you, yes, you are being misinformed. The only response as the president of the neighborhood association I got was in December. There have been no calls, no conversation, just a packed from the attorney. Then they went to the city alderwoman and arranged a meeting with her for our community without even letting the community know, By chance, one of the flyers ended up in my mailbox because one of the residents that got it, delivered it to my house. I made everyone else aware. We talked to our county commissioner who is not in favor of this. The neighborhood is not in favor of this. The petitioner calls a meeting, gives out a flyer after 5 o'clock on Friday for Saturday at noon. The only reason we were able to come, was the flyer was put in my mailbox by someone else. We questioned them as to the retention pond. The retention pond in the City is going into ground water. You are not going to be able to control what is going in the ground. There are too many uncontrollable factors. This is not what the members of the historic Carver Village neighborhood want. This would not be brought to downtown historic Savannah so do not bring it to our historic neighborhood. We are begging you, do not allow this. It will negatively impact our neighborhood. The steam coming off of here, you don't know what is coming off that steam. What we do know, the WWII fuel tanks were put on the old Tenebaum property, the remnants of the jet fuel seeped out and into the ground. Now they want to put a parking space over there but keep running into contamination. They promised us the environmental study at the meeting. They have not produced it. The fence will not control the steam. What is in the steam, we do not know. If they are grinding up old cars, there is the possibility there is a remanence of fuel. If a fire starts in there, you will have to evacuate the 742 homes in Carver Village. Where will you put those families if a fire starts. I am asking you to deny this petition.

**Mr. Colin Elgood**, said the operational time might generate additional noise in the area. The nature of separating metals or crushing metals sounds like the noise will be difficult. Will there be any long term storage of materials that are not going to be recyclable and are possibly hazardous? Do you have a timeline or an amount of things to be stored?

**Mr. Elliott** said we have no desire to store materials. We do not get paid for stored materials. We only get paid for shipped materials. The metal recycling business is designed for product to come in be processed and sold. The material that is left over will be shipped out for further processing. We do not intend to generate any waste at all. The Louisville Road fire, there was an excessive amount of wood that was not hauled off from that facility. We do not handle anything like that. It is not even what our materials appear to be like.

**Mr. Elgood** asked if an additional lane will be available on Gwinnett Street or ramps for a turn lane? Will there be a ramp for a truck to pick up speed to get onto Gwinnett?

**Mr. Lotson** said things like access points, decel and acceleration lanes from the property will be determined by the City's Traffic Engineer at the time the applicant submits a site plan for review. Those issues are part of the development review process. Should it be determined that those kinds of infrastructure improvements are required, then it will be the applicants responsibility to complete those improvements.

**Mr. Gerrard** said he had meetings with the client, with Marcus Lotson and Bernita Lanier two to three times before the end of last year. The suggestion was made to me to contact Mr. Ellis sometime after the first of the year. I drafted a letter and sent it to the neighborhood association headquarters. I did that pursuant to the advice of Ms. Lanier and Mr. Lotson. I followed up the letter a number of times calling Mr. Ellis's Chatham County number trying to set up a meeting with him. I never got a call back. As far as the notice for a second meeting, we wanted to meet with the neighborhood association again. I got a call from Alderwoman Lanier on Tuesday indicating that she could secure the neighborhood association headquarters that Saturday. She suggested I draft flyers and get as many as possible to the neighborhood. She gave me the name of a person who is familiar with the neighborhood to distribute those. I produced approximately 2000 flyers and gave them to be delivered on Thursday to put on as many homes possible without discriminating who they were going to. I have tried to be as transparent as possible in this process to put everyone on notice concerning what we were doing.

In regards to CSX operating during the night, my client has an arrangement with CSX to only operate during business hours. There won't be any noise being made by railroad cars past 5pm.

**Mr. Elliott** said we have an open gate policy with CSX. They only service us when we are open. This property is served by the G & W railroad. In regards to the concern about fire, we are making an significant investment in this facility. There is a lot of technology on the market today to mitigate fire risk. We will employ all of those technologies. Some of which are 24/7 camera systems that utilize thermal seeking technology to scan the property 24hrs per day 7 days a week to alert any potential risk for fire. We train the personnel to look for risk of fire. With this type of investment, we fully intend to buy a fire truck and have it on the property. We don't want to lose a machine that cost \$6-7 million. The question regarding waste, leftover materials called shredder residue, it contains approximately 3% metallic still in the material. There are companies that are far superior to our company that have technology that cost upwards of \$30 - 40 million that can extract the metallic from the waste stream. They are the ones that deal with the waste.

**Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member**, asked if any size warehouse could go on that lot? If the petition did not come through here then there would be no limit on the traffic.

**Mr. Ghandi** said that is correct.

**Ms. Lauren Boles** said there has been discussion regarding an environmental study. Is it possible to get that information. Are there any violations that the company has been sited by either EPA, Chatham County, or the municipality?

**Mr. Ghandi** said the environmental study is something that is done at the site plan phase.

**Mr. Elliott** said they have never been sited for any environmental contamination.

**Mr. Lotson** said the special use process requires a recommendation by this Commission that will be forwarded to the City Council for final decision. The Commission does have the authority to continue this item, make other recommendations, or make a vote today.

**Mr. Melder** said he urges the petitioner to reach out to the community to reach an agreement.

**Mr. Welch** said he agrees with Mr. Melder. The petitioner is willing to make the suggested changes. There seems to be a lack of communication or break down of communication. It would be in the best interest to meet with the community.

**Mr. Ervin** said it would be better to continue the petition to allow the sides to come together and come up with a specific plan.

**Mr. Coleman** said this neighborhood is impacted by the traffic already generated in and around that area. This petition adds to that. The noises and everything else are cumulative, what I'm hearing is the biggest issue is the traffic. What can be brought back by continuing this project that can get the community on board or to at least articulate that the problem can't be solved.

**Mr. Travis Coles, Board member**, said if the petitioner has another community meeting, make sure and pull the by right table so it is clear that the current zoning is industrial. The current uses a petitioner could do without having to get any permissions, include a truck stop. A truck stop would have a lot of truck traffic that is limitless. The community has an opportunity to work with the petitioner in this case and try to get the best fence, the best berm, and the least amount of traffic. The next petitioner that comes down the road, may put something devastating there, something they would not need permission for.

### Motion

Item continued until the regularly scheduled May 24th Planning Commission Meeting.

### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

## [12. AMENDED MASTER PLAN | Veterans Parkway and Buckhalter Road | 22-000455](#)

[Amended Master Plan 0322.pdf](#)

[Highlighted Property.pdf](#)

[Calvary Campus Master Plan.pdf](#)

[Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services**, said the petitioner is requesting MPC approval of an amendment to a previously approved Master Plan for property located between Buckhalter Road and Chatham Parkway on both sides of Veterans Parkway. The subject property consists of three rectangular parcels comprising a total of approximately 212 acres. In 2007, a Master Plan was approved entitled the Calvary Campus Master Plan. That plan was never implemented, and the property remains

undeveloped. The existing 2007 Master Plan was designed to include a mix of residential housing types, congregate care, recreation, commercial, educational, and religious facilities. The proposed access was to be taken along Buckhalter Road. Additional access was shown intersecting with Chatham Parkway. A trip generation study done at the time indicated that approximately 8,200 new vehicle trips per day would be created. The approved plan included:

- Single-Family Detached Residences: The single-family homes were proposed to be located in the middle portion of the site. 170 single family detached units. The site area was 73.28 acres in size with a density of 2.32 units per gross acre.
- Condominiums: The residential condominiums were proposed on the northern portion of the site adjacent to the single family. 216 residential condominiums. This site area was 23.7 acres in size with a density of 9.11 units per gross acre.
- Apartment Complex: The apartment complex was located on the eastern portion of the site along Veterans Parkway, east of the single family. 120 residential apartments. The site area was 8.51 acres in size with a density of 14.1 units per gross acre.
- Assisted Living: The assisted living complex was to be located on the eastern portion of the site along Veterans Parkway adjacent to the apartment complex. 120 assisted living units were included. The site area was 7.2 acres in size with a density of 16.67 units per gross acre.
- Nursing Home: The proposed nursing home was to be located at the northwest corner of Veterans Parkway and Buckhalter Road adjacent to the assisted living complex. The development was to consist of 120 beds. The site area was 6.95 acres in size.
- Alzheimer's Facility: The Alzheimer's facility was to be located on the southern portion of the site along Burkhalter Road adjacent to the nursing home. The development was to consist of 60 beds. The site area was to be 4.04 acres in size.
- Community Center: The community center was located on the southwestern portion of the site along Burkhalter Road adjacent to the alzheimer's facility. The community center was to be for the use of the residents within the development. The site area was to be 3.53 acres in size.
- Storage Area: The storage area was to be located on the northeast portion of the site along Veterans Parkway adjacent to the residential uses. The site area was to be 6.07 acres in size.
- Total Residential Development: The total residential development encompassed 133.28 acres and consisted of 626 residential units and 180 beds for nursing home and Alzheimer patients. The net of all residential units will be 5.87 units per net acre. The nursing and Alzheimer's care was not included in the overall density.
- Church: A proposed church was to be located at the southeast corner of Chatham Parkway and Veterans Parkway. The total site area was 28.08 acres in size including an existing 7.2-acre pond. The church buildings included a total area of 175,000 square feet with a maximum seating capacity of 1,200 persons.
- School: The school was to be located on the middle portion of the site along Veterans Parkway adjacent to and south of the church site. The site area was 12.52 acres in size. The school buildings were to have a total area of 130,000 square feet with a maximum of 1,500 students.
- Sports Complex: The sports complex was to be located at the northeast corner of Buckhalter Road

and Veterans Parkway adjacent to and south of the school site. The site area included 26.7 acres.

The proposed plan does not include the array of nonresidential uses that are a part of the current plan. It includes residential uses and recreational amenities only. The residential housing types include single family detached, single family attached and multifamily residential apartments. The proposed residential density for the site is 6 units per net acre. The single family (detached and attached) are proposed on the east side of the development in Pods 5,6 and 7. Multifamily residential is concentrated on the west side of the development in Pods 1, 3 & 4.

The proposed Master Plan area includes existing wetlands, ponds, and opens space as outlined in the graphic below. Through the Specific Development Plan review process, stormwater management, open space and wetland mitigation will be addressed.

The subject site has frontage on Buckhalter Road and a portion abuts Chatham Parkway. There is no access to Veterans Parkway. Proposed access points are similar to those associated with the approved plan; however, final location of any curb cuts will be determined during the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which will be required before any development takes place. In addition, because both Buckhalter Road and Chatham Parkway are maintained by Chatham County, connections to those roads and improvements will require approval by the Department of Engineering. Public Transit is available along Chatham Parkway with the nearest stop being at the intersection with Garrard Avenue.

Under a master plan, prior to any development taking place the applicant would have to go through a specific development plan review process with the MPC and the City of Savannah as well as address the stromwater and traffic issues with Chatham County.

The approved plan, if built out, would have had implications on the existing development pattern and character of the area. The number of residential dwellings and the nonresidential uses are quite different than that which currently exists in this part of the county. This scale of development would have transformed the area over time. The proposed development will likely have similar impacts upon build out. The issue at hand, in staff's opinion, is whether the area can support the proposed residential development in a way that would be in keeping with the area and be a benefit to the community. While a Master Plan does not create any entitlement to develop, based on our review, there are several components that will need to be understood prior to any development plan approval. These components include a flood study, a traffic study, and a yield study to determine the maximum number of dwelling units. These studies should be completed and implemented prior to any Specific Development Plan approval.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the petitioner's request to amend the Master Plan with the following conditions:

1. Site plans for multifamily residential shall be consistent with the development standards of the RMF-2 zoning district as found in Sec. 5.10 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance. Single family residential plans shall be consistent with a minimum RSF-5 zoning district.
2. A traffic impact study (to include Intersection Control Evaluation at Buckhalter and Garrard), a flood study and unit yield shall be completed prior to approval of any Specific Development Plan.
3. In regard to Chatham Parkway and Buckhalter Road, Chatham County Department of Engineering shall determine if improvements will be required and approve any curb cuts.

**Mr. Josh Yellin, Attorney for petitioner**, said this site was rezoned in 2007 to the PUD-M6 designation. That is a County designation that permits at most, 6 units per net acre. We are not proposing to change the density of this site. We are willing to adhere to the 6 units per net acre classification. When the site was rezoned in 2007, the uses that were proposed were for 170 single family homes, 220 apartment units, 120 retirement units, 120 assisted living units, 120 units in a nursing home, 60 alzheimers beds, 175,000 sq ft church with seating for 1200, 25 acres of sports complexes, 1500 student school, and 80,000 sq ft shopping center. The staff report in 2007 indicates the traffic impact report for this Calvary plan would generate 8200 daily trips. We have recalculated the numbers in 2022 standards, that same plan would generate 15,036 daily trips today. We had a traffic engineer look at the residential plan we are proposing, The number we are proposing would be 7250 daily trips. That is a reduction of more than half of what was approved in 2007.

**Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member**, said a big concern in that area is the canal system. Will this dump into that same canal system or will it dump somewhere else?

**Mr. Jim Collins, Thomas & Hutton**, said yes, this will end up in the Forest River. There are two canals that go to the property. Lewis Mills Canal and Red Gate Canal. Thomas & Hutton has done drainage studies for Chatham County. That will be incorporated in the internal drainage design. We have met with Bill Nickleson at Chatham County. He has provided some parameters. We will come back with a drainage study once we are at General Development Plan approval stage.

**Ms. Karen Jarrett, Vice Chair**, asked if it was possible to connect pod 3 or 4 with the property line so ultimately, you might be able to provide a route to Chatham Parkway from that side of Veteran's Parkway?

**Mr. Lotson** said all of the property north of the area, is part of Red Gate Farms. That is something the applicant would need to discuss with their owner. That is all private property.

**Mr. Yellin** said the applicant is willing to talk to the Red Gate Farm owners to discuss the potential connection. When Veterans Parkway was built, this was dug out as surface mines. It not as rural and agricultural as it seems. The neighbors to the immediate north are still zoned for surface mining under the County Ordinance. The access would benefit everyone to explore the option.

**Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager**, said the studies as part of the condition, the flooding, yield, and traffic are necessary. Can we ensure that the traffic study addresses access along Buckhalter and Chatham Parkway?

**Mr. Lotson** said the traffic study will have to determine if those access points that are proposed are valid and will work from a traffic engineering standpoint, and would access be permitted on Chatham Parkway.

**Mr. Shedrick Coleman, Board member**, said there is a County study going on Garrard Avenue for improvements. Does that go down to Buckhalter Road?

**Mr. Lotson** said yes.

#### **No Public Comments**

#### **Motion**

Approve to amend the Master Plan with conditions:

Site plans for multifamily residential shall be consistent with the development standards of the RMF-2 zoning district as found in Sec. 5.10 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance. Single family residential plans shall be consistent with a minimum RSF-5 zoning district.

A traffic impact study (to include Intersection Control Evaluation at Buckhalter and Garrard), a flood study and unit yield shall be completed prior to approval of any Specific Development Plan.

In regard to Chatham Parkway and Buckhalter Road, Chatham County Department of Engineering shall determine if improvements will be required and approve any curb cuts.

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Jay Melder

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye



Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

13. SPECIAL USE | 2805 Bull Street | A special use request for a bar/tavern | File No. 22-001219-ZA

- 📎 [Maps\\_Combined.pdf](#)
- 📎 [BOUNDARY SURVEY\\_ FLOOR PLAN\\_ ELEVATIONS.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Sanborn\\_Map\\_1955\\_Sheet166.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Site\\_Visit\\_3\\_30\\_2022.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Application, File no. 22-001219-ZA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Letters of Support for Late Air Wine.pdf](#)
- 📎 [STAFF REPORT.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Postponed to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting, Tuesday, May 3, 2022.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

**X. Presentations**

**XI. Other Business**

14. Adjourn

There being no further business to present before the Board, the April 12, 2022 Regular Metropolitan Planning Commission Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Wilson  
Executive Director

MW/sh

**XII. Adjournment**

***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.***