



Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 26, 2022 ~ 1:30 PM
Minutes

JULY 26, 2022 REGULAR MPC MEETING, 1:30 P.M.

Members Present: Joseph Welch, Chairman
Karen Jarrett, Vice-Chairperson
Travis Coles, Secretary
Shedrick Coleman
Elizabeth Epstein
Joseph Ervin
Jay Melder
Wayne Noha
Jeff Notrica
Dwayne Stephens

Members Absent: Laureen Boles
Lee Smith
Tom Woiwode
Malik Watkins, Treasurer

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services
Melissa Paul-Leto, Senior Planner
Jacqualle Johnson, Assistant 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	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

Notice(s)

[2. July 26, 2022 Special Called Personnel Committee Meeting, 11:00 A.M., Marshall House Conference Room - 1st Floor, 123 East Broughton Street.](#)

[3. August 16, 2022 Regular MPC Meeting, 1:30 P.M., Planning Commission, Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room, 112 East State Street.](#)

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

[4. SPECIAL USE | 2110 West Gwinnett Street | File no. 21-006747-ZA](#)

Motion

Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[5. MAP AMENDMENT | 5659 Ogeechee Road | File No. Z-1221-000211](#)

Motion

Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

[6. MAP AMENDMENT | 6089 Ogeechee Road Street | 22-002358-ZA](#)

Motion

Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[7. MAP AMENDMENT | 925 and 1301 East President Street as well as a portion of Tybee Depot | 22-002294-ZA](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[8. MAP AMENDMENT | 543 Washington Avenue | File No. 22-003059-ZA](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Aye

Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[9. MAP AMENDMENT | Wild Heron Road | Rezone from A-1 to RMF-1 and RSF-4 | 22-002692](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, September 6, 2022	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[10. MAP AMMENDMENT | North side of Ogeechee Road, West of Canebrake | File No. Z-0622 000290](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	

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

[11. MASTER PLAN | South End of the Terminus of Cottonvale Road | SP-0622-000293](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
W. Lee Smith	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Shedrick Coleman	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

[12. MAP AMENDMENT | 1712 Ogeechee Road | File No. 22-003056-ZA](#)

Motion	
Item Postponed to the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 2022.	

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

VI. Items Requested to be Withdrawn

[13. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | Dillon Street | Rezone from RSF-4 to RSF-6 | 22-001625](#)

Motion

The Petitioner has requested that this item be Withdrawn.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

[14. Approval of the June 14, 2022 Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes.](#)

[📎 06.14.2022 Meeting minutes.pdf](#)

[📎 6-14-2022 MPC BRIEFING MINUTES.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the Briefing and Regular Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Travis Coles

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

VIII. Old Business

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

[📎 Staff Report 0726.pdf](#)

[📎 Maps Combined.pdf](#)

[📎 Access Pattern.pdf](#)

[📎 Application, File no. 22-001231-ZA.pdf](#)

[📎 Photos Combined.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services, said the petitioner is requesting to rezone the subject parcel from RMF-2-20 to RMF-2-45 for the purpose of redeveloping the property as a multifamily residential complex. This petition was continued from the May 24th agenda. This property is a multifamily

zoned property now. The 20 at the end of the current zoning designates the number of units per acre that are permitted under that classification. Thus the applicant is proposing to rezone it for higher density than the current zoning permits. The subject property, which is a 1.77 - acre parcel on the north side of Victory Drive, is developed with a residential structure constructed in 1938, and is currently uninhabited. The property also includes three accessory buildings which were constructed in the same style as the principal building. The property is adjacent on the west side with the former St. Mary's Home for Girls, which now operates as the administrative offices for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Savannah. East of the subject property is a multifamily residential development originally built in 1970, which includes 150 dwelling units on 9.35 acres.

Prior to the May meeting, the applicant did reach out to the Victory Heights Neighborhood Association which is the closest association in this area. They declined to have a neighborhood meeting. They did not feel that this potential rezoning impacted them. In terms of development pattern, properties along Victory Drive between Skidaway Road and Thunderbolt are primarily commercial, with the exception of the subject property in the adjacent multifamily development. During the last hearing one of the major talking points with the Commission was related to the traffic patterns on Victory Drive. Both the intensity of the traffic as well as the access to this property. Victory Drive is a two lane divided highway, there are no median breaks adjacent to this property. The next closest breaks are at the next intersection which is signalized and then the adjacent multifamily development. One of the reasons this petition was continued at the last meeting was so the applicant could investigate the opportunity, if there was one, to share an access point with the adjacent residential multifamily development. They have done that. The access pattern along this area, because there is no median break, Eastbound traffic coming from town, to access this property would have to pass the property, go to the median break, make a U-turn and enter the property. That was one issue staff had as far as the access to the property and propose increase density from under the current zoning approximately 35 units and approximately 79 units under the proposed zoning. Because this portion of Victory Drive is a state regulated highway, in our discussions with City of Savannah Traffic Engineering, they believe an additional curb cut or median break is not likely at this location because of the traffic and the closeness of the existing signalize intersection at the entrance to the shopping center.

In review of the proposed increase in density staff found the property has limitations in terms of its overall size and vehicular access from a land use standpoint. The location we believe can support residential units but the limitations on the site need to be factored in with an increase to density on this 1.7 acre site, to 79 units which is approximately 120% of what is currently allowed under the present zoning. With those findings, staff is recommending denial of the request to change the zoning classification from RMF-2-20 to RMF-2-45.

Mr. Phillip McCorkle, attorney for petitioner, said the property is zoned multi-family, surrounded by multifamily and businesses. The Comp Plan says it is good for multifamily. The Victory Heights Neighborhood Association had no problem with the request. We can build what we are asking to build with no variances yet the staff recommends denial. They said "the density is not consistent with the development pattern in the area" and they had traffic concerns. On the size of the units, the development pattern, City Council made it clear, they made a policy decision in the new Zoning Ordinance to encourage smaller apartment units. They want more affordable housing, the way to make them more affordable in the market is to make them smaller, and it reduces urban sprawl. There is a bus stop 200ft away. This is a perfect location to meet that goal that City Council has established. Staff said there were not examples of residential density in the vicinity similar to what is proposed. I agree with that, there has not been an apartment built within a mile of this site since 1979. Apartments on the East side are needed and the need is not being met. When other apartments were built there were limitations on unit density that have changed a good deal under the new Zoning Ordinance. Most apartments, were 12 units per acre, 15 units per acre, when the rezoning started. They were much smaller density then so that was the way they were built. That is changing now. Live Oak Landing on Wheaton Street, next to the new elementary school, where Gwinnett street deadends into Wheaton street, is rezoned RMF-2-40. That is only a three floor building. If they added a fourth floor like we will, they would need RMF-2-53 to build the units they are building there. The staff was concerned that we didn't have residential density in the vicinity of this Victory Drive property similar to what is proposed. After looking into the zoning near Wheaton Street that is zoned RMF-2-40, the highest density that we could find anywhere in the vicinity is RMF-2-60. That project was approved, being built, and is in phase two. The second example is Ogeechee Place on Highway 17, west of Chatham Parkway. They are zoned RMF-2-40. That is a four story project with that zoning. We looked at all the zoning in the vicinity and the most dense multifamily zoning, other than

the Ogeechee Place which is just a few months into construction, is RMF-2-15. You can't find an example of anything that is RMF-2-40. Not finding an example of that on Victory Drive, to me is not a position that is a legitimate position. 45 units per gross acre is becoming very normal in the City of Savannah. You will see more of this. This satisfies the Council's desire for smaller, more affordable apartments and reduces urban sprawl.

The other issue is traffic. I was asked two months ago to see if the neighbors were interested in sharing their median break with us. They have no interest in doing that. The liability issues, competition issues, and other issues. There are two issues with staff that would be the same regardless of us building 36 units or 79 units. The first one, staff says we can't have multiple curb cuts. My response to that is, so what. No matter what development goes here, there will be one curb cut. The two phases of Live Oak Apartments being build on Wheaton Street right now, hundreds of units, has one curb cut. Ogeechee Place on Ogeechee Rd has many many units and only one curb cut. This is normal. Having only one curb cut is not detrimental to an apartment development. The other issue was no median break. Again, whether it is a 36 unit multiple bedroom development or a 79 unit development, there is not going to be a median break. There is another residential development called Heritage Park Townhomes, they are 24 townhomes on Victory Drive slightly east that have no median break. Evergreen Street is the only access directly onto Victory Drive from the Victory Heights Subdivision. When Evergreen Street comes out, it hits Victory Drive with no median break. There are many places that operate not only on Victory Drive but all over the City without a median break. No matter how many units are put there, there is not going to be a median break. In the last sentence of the staff write up, it says, increase density will also increase conflicting vehicle movements on a busy arterial roadway. I disagree with that. The report also said the proposed development would create 39 am peak hour trips and 48 pm peak hour trips. This number may be lessened dependent upon the bedroom count unit mix of any future multifamily development. Looking at the trip generator, the average trip generation per dwelling unit for low rise apartments in the am peak hour is 0.47. The reason you have less traffic in midrise units is you don't have the big families. You have couples, single people, or retired people with an average rate of 0.35. The average number of people living in a midrise apartment is 2.5 according to the ITE manual. They recognize, as staff did, the calculations may be impacted by the bedroom count and the density. The ITE is saying it is expected the number of bedrooms and the number of residents are likely correlated to the trips generated by the sites. Future analysis, trip generation studies of all multifamily housing should attempt to obtain information on occupancy rate, the number of units by the number of bedrooms. They have not done that study yet but know they should because it does impact how many people are going in and out of the apartment complex. According to Mr. Lynch and the City of Savannah, a one bedroom apartment normally has 1.3 people. The ITE calculations of 28 and 31 are based upon 2.5 people in an apartment. This development is going to have 70% one bedroom units and 30% two bedroom units. There will be significantly less numbers of trips for the people living in the one bedroom apartments than in the normal 2.5 people living in two bedrooms. There is an absolutely insignificant number of people going in and out of this apartment complex if 70% of the units are one bedroom and 30% are two bedroom.

My client will be willing to stipulate that 70% of the units will be one bedroom as condition to the approval of the rezoning. I believe there is no difference in the amount of traffic this site is going to generate. You will have the same median break issue, the same one entrance issue, neither which are issues we can't deal with. My client is not going to build a suburban low density apartment complex on this 1.77 acres. My client believes small units are desperately needed. People that work, particularly in the hospitality and retail industries need a break on what they are paying for rent. Plan B for my client is to build 36 three or four bedroom units which would create more traffic than the 70% one bedroom units he is trying to build now. His true desire is to build what is being shown but if he needs to, he can build 36 units with four bedrooms. The low density is just an anachronism at this stage of development in the City of Savannah. We need small units, this is a great place for one. This would provide people who work and don't make a ton of money, a nice clean place to live.

Ms. Karen Jarrett, Vice Chair, said the traffic that will be created here, they are going to have to work with the O'hambre people at that crossover on Victory as well as the commercial property across the street in Thunderbolt correct?

Mr. Marcus Lotson said right now the subject property's curb cut could be relocated to another portion of this property. The crossing from the adjacent apartment complex, they do not have access to and will not have access to that.

Ms. Jarrett said the goal is to get these people back and forth to the central business district which is further to the west correct?

Mr. Lotson said yes.

Ms. Jarrett said so when they leave, there will be no conflict, but when they return, they will all have to use that little median break to turn around or go down to the next median break to turn around correct?

Mr. Lotson said yes. This will primarily be a right in, right out access based on the flow of traffic on Victory Drive. it is likely that most of the people that would use that site, would be taking a right out to go toward town. They would have to take the U-turn to enter the property unless they are coming from the south.

Ms. Jarrett said when they take that U-turn, they will be conflicting with people who are trying to get in and out of the O'hombre. Across the street there is another business drive that lines up with that. There will be a lot of conflicts there correct?

Mr. Lotson said this movement does create more conflicts than exist there to date.

Ms. Jarrett said the more units we have the more conflict there is.

Mr. Lotson said the trips that are created based on the development of the property would create the most conflicts.

Ms. Jarrett said there will be more trips at 79 units than there will be at 36, whether there are 4 bedroom, 36 units, or 1 bedroom 79 units.

Mr. Lotson said we would need to know the mix of units in order to answer that.

Ms. Jarrett said as far as the ITE manual, no matter what mix you talk about, a low rise or high rise. We are talking about one floor difference. Trying to say he is in a high-rise as opposed to a low-rise, we are talking statistics here.

Mr. Lotson said for the purpose of calculating trips, ITE apparently looks at a high-rise building as a lower trip count.

Ms. Melanie Wilson, Executive Director, said the Land Use Plan does not go into specifics regarding the number of units. In this particular case, this property was given the general residential classification because there was already a building on the property and it is right next to multi-family apartments. You can make the assumption that it is implied that the density would be somewhat comparable to the apartments that are right beside this particular property.

Ms. Jarrett said the Wheaton Street property that was an example, the traffic there is not Victory Drive is it?

Mr. Lotson said that is correct. Wheaton Street would have fewer daily trips than Victory Drive at this location.

Ms. Jarrett said Ogeechee Road, does that have a median cut around it? Is that area comparable as far as the traffic on Victory Drive?

Mr. Lotson said generally Ogeechee Road and that vicinity near Chatham Parkway is a four lane divided highway without a median. Traffic is very different there. Probably similar in overall volume.

Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman said there is more volume on Ogeechee Road with four lanes than Victory Drive.

Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member, said the petitioner stated the existing density, what could be build, the number of trips, what is projected and what could be build currently could generate more trips. Are you in agreement with that?

Mr. Lotson said what you are referring to is the petitioners description of a product that would be a more dense product from a standpoint of bedrooms per unit and his proposed project with fewer bedrooms would be

a lower trip count. I am not in a position to agree or disagree with that. I have not looked at the veracity of the calculations. Based on observation, I would say 36 four bedroom units vs. 79 one or two bedroom units, you need to figure out if a typical four bedroom apartment, if people are more likely to have cars vs. people who are in one or two bedroom apartments and I can't answer that.

Chairman Welch said there would be 144 people in those 36 units as opposed to having 79 if they were all single. I would say there is less traffic in the single bedroom units.

Ms. Wilson said one of the things you have to factor when looking at this is that you are assuming that one person would live in the one bedroom unit when it is probably very likely that there will be two people living in that one bedroom unit. That is why when you are calculating number of people based on density, you get a different number. All of this is hypothetical, you probably would be a little cleaner if you did have four bedroom units with one person if they had a car living in that unit. Then that becomes a different type of product. That is why it is difficult to specifically answer that question. You can still have as much density, if not more, with the 79 units because you could have two people living in that unit whereas in the four bedroom units, hopefully that would be something that would be more family oriented and you theoretically could have less if you have someone renting that with a family. Or if it ended up being something where you have a roommate type situation, you just don't know based on that number of units.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, said theoretically and hypothetically with a four bedroom unit model that is geared more towards young professional living, You could have some units with 8 people living in those units, two per bedroom. Just as much as you could say that two people would be living in a single 450sq ft unit, correct?

Ms. Wilson said that is correct. That is why it depends on what model they are proposing to use. If they did the 36 four bedroom units, if that is something the applicant decides to do. You end up with a different type of situation with regards to what some of the minimum standards are based on a number of unrelated people that can live in an apartment which is part of your code. That opens up additional questions that you would have to look into. You do have rules with regards to the number of unrelated people that can live in one property. For this issue, as we looked at it from a staff standpoint, we looked at it from the standpoint of public health, safety, this is probably one of the main roadways that is used to get to Tybee Island, and we looked at the overall use. As a Board and as the City Council when it moves forward with whatever recommendation, you can factor in a variety of things. We reached out and talked with several of the people at GDOT and they have no interest in doing a median cut.

Ms. Jarrett asked if a professional has looked at this, someone other than a planner, attorney or retired engineer? Has a traffic engineer looked at it yet and provided their opinion?

Mr. McCorkle said yes. It doesn't matter how many units there are, the same issues are going to be there. If I were coming home from work and I lived here, I would go down Bonaventure Road to Frank Downing Drive up to Victory Drive and I would turn right and go right there. You adopt to what the world gives you. People will find a way without doing a U-turn no matter how many units there are. I strongly disagree with the statement from the director that just because this is next to Alhombre, that the Comprehensive Plan implies in some way that it should have the same density. That just is not true.

Ms. Jarrett said she did not imply that.

Mr. McCorkle said the issues are going to be the same. If you look at the number of bedrooms, under our proposal, 70% one bedroom, 30% two bedrooms, that is 103 bedrooms. If you did 36 units of three bedrooms, that is 108. If you did a low-rise, which would be a suburban type development, which my client has no interest in, the 70% one bedroom and 30% two bedrooms is a normal mix, that is 83 bedrooms. We are proposing 103 bedrooms, suburban would be 83 bedrooms, professional student retail hospitality workers would be 144. My client wants to provide affordable smaller units. The affordable housing study says it stops at Truman Parkway, that is half a mile away. These folks would be in the City of Savannah.

Ms. Jarrett said, I have no problem with affordable housing, what I have a problem with is public safety. The configuration of the drives in and out of this building are not safe.

Mr. McCorkle said it will be that way whether it is 36 units or 79 units.

Ms. Jarrett said yes, but you add more traffic, you add more potential.

Ms. Artis Wood, Chair of Scenic Chatham, member of the public, said, I want to point out that about 10

years ago, approximately \$100,000.00 was put up by the City and County to do a study of Victory Drive. It was very thorough. It was done by people like Denise Grabowski and other professionals. It talked about the big picture. I suggest we consider the big picture here not just a piece by piece when you look at Victory Drive. There is something called pattern language in development and urban design. The pattern language of Victory Drive is that you have the median, you have palm trees, and you have a double canopy made up of live oaks on either side of Victory Drive. That gives you a sense of place in Savannah. We want to keep this pattern of Victory Drive as well. In fact, there is a law that has been re-instated by the Feds and there are millions of dollars available after twelve years of stopping byways. There is more than one Alderman that want to see this again made as a scenic byway.

When you develop something along here, you have to allow because of GDOT, a deceleration lane and an acceleration lane. This would be chipped away at if this was added. The staff report said the access to the property along East Victory Drive is a condition that gives support and grounds for disapproval. The width of the property in proximity to other intersections would not likely allow multiple curb cuts which would also be required by GDOT as we mentioned. The property has limitations related to the overall size and vehicle access. Based upon the site concerns and character of the area as well as the review criteria staff recommends denial of the rezoning request as submitted.

Ms. Jarrett said I am not opposed to affordable housing, it just doesn't seem to be the proper place for a high density apartment.

Mr. Melder said from the City's traffic and planning perspective, we certainly do not mind the density here. We would like to make sure that any traffic plan was analyzed and approved by GDOT. The petitioner was correct in saying that NewZO layed out new guide lines to create less urban sprawl and more density. We have a chance to do that with this project. The traffic concerns are there, from the City's perspective, I wouldn't mind approving the density just as long as the traffic analysis was reviewed and approved by GDOT, who owns the road.

Ms. Jarrett asked if it would be better to have that study done before we approve that much density.

Mr. Melder said that would be fine as well.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board member, said I appreciate Ms. Wood and what you do on Scenic Chatham, I think the curb cuts are basically by right anyway, as it stands now. I don't think that is really in our purview to say he can have more than one curb cut. I have concerns about the traffic as well. I appreciate the petitioner is retaining the contributing structure on the property. If we do move forward with a recommendation, appreciate that he would commit to a break down of specifics of one bedroom vs two bedrooms.

Mr. McCorkle said there is a specific bedroom count, 70% one bedroom (55) and the 30% two bedroom units is (73). Approving the rezoning contingent upon a traffic study which is acceptable to City Council, which we would have to go to DOT first, then take it to City Council, that would delay us getting the vote on City Council. I would like to move it past today if possible and have it contingent upon an acceptable traffic study and analysis by DOT which the City Council could then review when it came before them.

Motion

Approval of request to rezone from RMF-2-20 to RMF-2-45 with conditions.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin - Aye

W. Lee Smith - Not Present

Tom Woiwode - Not Present

Travis Coles - Aye

Joseph Welch - Aye

Shedrick Coleman	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Abstain
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye

IX. Regular Business

[16. TEXT AMENDMENT | Streetcar Historic District Boundary Amendment | Bridget Lidy for The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah | 22-002763-ZA - TEXT](#)

📎 [Parcel Image.pdf](#)

📎 [Proposed Ordinance Revision - 22-002763-ZA-TEXT.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report - 22-002763-ZA-TEXT.pdf](#)

Ms. Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation, said The City of Savannah is requesting petition to amend Section 7.11.2, Streetcar Historic District Boundaries description to include a boundary expansion; the expansion consists of an area south of West Victory Drive on the eastern side of the SCAD One West Victory complex. The area includes one (1) parcel and one (1) building. The address and PIN for the parcel, 2805 Bull Street; **20074 33001**

*“The boundaries of the Streetcar Historic District shall follow the National Register Historic District boundaries with the **exception of an addition of a small** area in the southeast corner of the district, and shall be the area bounded **by** the centerlines of the following streets and lanes: on the north by Anderson Lane; on the south by Victory Drive from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to Montgomery Street, **south on Montgomery Street to West 44th Street, West 44th from Montgomery Street to Bull Street, north on Bull Street to Victory Drive, Victory Drive from Bull Street to Price Street, and the rear property lines between 40th Street and Maupas Avenue from Price Street to East Broad Street; on the east by East Broad Street from Anderson Lane to the rear property lines between 40th Street and Maupas Avenue, by Price Street from the rear property lines between 40th Street and Maupas Avenue to Victory Drive, by Bull Street from Victory Drive to 44th Street; and on the west by Montgomery Street from Victory Drive to 44th St., and by Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The Streetcar Historic District includes Thomas Square, Metropolitan and portions of the Baldwin Park, **Bingville**, and Midtown neighborhoods.”***

The boundary expansion was analyzed by the MPC Historic Preservation Department following the survey of the existing expansion areas. Staff used guidelines and criteria from the *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, the National Park Service. The document provides the following information regarding geographical boundaries:

1. “A district must be a definable geographic area that can be distinguished by changes such as a density, scale, type, age, style of sites, buildings, structures, and objects, or by documented differences in patterns of historic development or associations. It is seldom defined, however, by the limits of current parcels of ownership, management, or planning boundaries. **The boundaries must be based upon a shared relationship among the properties constituting the district.**”
- 2.
3. The 2018 Victory Village Expansion [18-005583-ZA] did not include one (1) parcel on the eastern side of the historic boundary (Bull Street) nor did it include three (3) parcels on the western side of the boundary (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard), one of which is the other half of Rockwell Park, which is included in the Streetcar Local Historic District Boundary. All properties sit on the same

relative block as Victory Village and share a similar commercial and development pattern. The expansion of the historic district boundary towards Bull Street will provide for the inclusion of 2805 Bull Street, a contributing, historic structure, within the Streetcar Local Historic District.

Mr. Jeff Notrica, Board member, said at the first meeting we did the nine properties to add them to the historic area. That was voted on and approved. At the next meeting there was a subsequent group of seven properties that were going to be added. After that meeting Leah came up and apologized and said "in fact this was not the proper venue to bring those properties through, they needed to come through the HPC".

Ms. Michalak said that was a different historic district. That project has sense been withdrawn.

Mr. Notrica asked, in what way was it different?

Ms. Michalak said that was the Victorian Historic District. This is the Streetcar Historic District.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Board member, said, I believe the text amendment is a separate petition correct? Can you clarify where it says "exception of an area"

Ms. Michalak said yes, they are required to have two separate file numbers. I presented them at the same time but they are separate petition numbers. What the language says is, "It shall follow the national register Historic District boundaries with the exception of that area because that area is not in the national registry boundaries".

The Historic District names and boundaries are different than the City neighborhood names. I don't know specifically where the city delineation of Midtown is.

Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member, asked if the area east of this is part of another district?

Ms. Michalak said yes it is.

Motion

Approval to Amend Section 7.11.2, Streetcar Historic District Boundaries to revise the district boundary description with the addition to include language of including Bingville neighborhood.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

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

Jay Melder - Aye

[17. MAP AMENDMENT | Streetcar Historic District Boundary Amendment | Bridget Lidy for The Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah | 22-002103-ZA - MAP](#)

- 📎 [Streetcar District - Proposed District Boundary.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Parcel Image.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Proposed Ordinance Revision 22-002103-ZA - MAP.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Report - 22-002103-ZA - MAP.pdf](#)

See notes in previous item Text Amendment Streetcar Boundary - 22-002763-ZA These items were presented together.

Motion

Approval to Amend the Streetcar District Contributing Buildings Map to expand the district boundary to include language of Bingville neighborhood.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

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

[18. TEXT AMENDMENT | Section 7.13-1 Hotel Development Overlay District | 22-002694-ZA](#)

- 📎 [Overlay Exhibit.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Application, File no. 22-002694-ZA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [32 Bull Street.pdf](#)
- 📎 [21 West Bay Street.pdf](#)
- 📎 [ARTICAL 7.0 OVERLAY DISTRICTS - Sec. 7.13 Hotel Development Overlay District.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Savannah Hotel - Manger Building.pdf](#)
- 📎 [STAFF REPORT.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Leto, Senior Planner, said on June 7, 2022 Harold Yellin, Agent for Christian Chamblee, Manger Building, LLC submitted a text amendment request to the City of Savannah to amend the Savannah Historic District Hotel Development Overlay District Map 7.13-1 to include a portion of Bull Street and Congress Street. The request is to allow the Manger Building located at 7 East Congress Street, on the corner of Congress and Bull Street to be restored and re-established as its original hotel use from 1912 through 1977. MPC staff began researching historical files as well as sanborn maps to find other existing buildings located within the Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District that were once a hotel and may in the future want to be a hotel again. Staffs research found that there are two existing historic buildings located within the Savannah Historic District Overlay District that were once hotels. We found two, Moon River Brewing Company, located at 21 West Bay Street and the Manger Building located at 7 East Congress Street, which was originally addressed as 32 Bull Street.

MPC staff met with the applicant to discuss altering the text amendment request to add a portion of Congress and Bull Streets to the Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District. As Bay Street is currently an identified street within the Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District, the Moon River Brewing Company, located at 21 West Bay Street currently has the right to re-establish the existing building to a hotel use. Leaving, The Manger Building as the one remaining existing historic building that was once a hotel and is located within the Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District.

The applicant and staff have agreed the best direction would be to include an additional condition in Section 7.13.5 Hotel Use Conditions to allow for a re-establishment of a historic hotel. MPC staff recommends the alternative amendment to allow existing contributing buildings located within the Hotel Development Overlay District, that were converted from hotels to another conforming use within the Period of Significance, (1733 through 1960), as defined in Sec. 7.8.5 may be re-established as a hotel use. The intent of this overlay district is to establish standards to guide the size and location of future hotel development within the Savannah Historic District. The Overlay District distinguishes hotel categories by large hotels, 75 guest rooms or more and small hotels, 16-74 guest rooms.

On November 21, 2017, City Council approved a text amendment based on the Mayor and Aldermen's concerns regarding an increase in hotel development in the Savannah Historic District, particularly with regards to impacts on residential areas and the possibility that hotel development may discourage new residential development. A study was undertaken by MPC staff that identified regulations and policies that could make hotel development easier to pursue than residential development. The Savannah Development and Renewal Authority and City staff prepared a residential study that later led to the text amendment that was approved on November 21, 2017, to eliminate residential density requirements for the Savannah Historic District. As part of the study, MPC was also requested to provide text amendments to determine areas where large and small hotels would be most appropriate.

On January 12, 2018, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Hotel Development Overlay District and Lodging Establishments text amendment. The following month, City Council approved the amendment on February 1, 2018, to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the Hotel Development Overlay District and Lodging Establishments.

The Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District shows where hotels are permitted. Locations were regulated according to size. Areas that will permit small hotels (16-74 rooms) are shown in yellow. Areas that will permit large hotels (75 or more rooms) are shown in green. Red areas indicate hotels are not permitted at all.

Locations are further restricted by street. Hotels must be located on one of the streets or lanes identified on the map. They include all or portions of: Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Montgomery Street, Whitaker Street, Drayton Street, Abercorn Street (Bay to Oglethorpe), Fahm Street, Ann Street, River Street, Indian Street, Bay Street, Bryan Street (west of Lincoln), Broughton Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, Liberty Street, Zubley Street, Turner Boulevard, Louisville Road, and Jones Street (west of MLK).

The proposed Ordinance allows an existing contributing building that is located within the Hotel Development Overlay District that historically was once a hotel and has since been converted into another conforming use within the Period of Significance to be re-established once again. It is important, however, that the Historic Preservation Officer shall validate the historic use prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The proposed Ordinance does not apply to vacant lots and non-contributing

buildings. It only applies to existing contributing buildings within the Hotel Development Overlay District.

Staff recommends denial of the applicant's text amendment request to amend the Savannah Historic District, Hotel Development Overlay District Map 7.13-1 to include a portion of Bull Street and Congress Street as streets where hotels are permitted.

Staff recommends approval of the alternative amendment to allow existing contributing buildings located within the Hotel Development Overlay District, that were converted from hotels to another conforming use within the Period of Significance, as defined in Sec. 7.8.5 may be re-established as a hotel use.

Mr. Harold Yellin, Attorney for the Petitioner, said the petition before you today is a text amendment. The sole purpose of the text amendment is to permit the Manger Building to be restored as the Manger Hotel. As noted by the MPC staff, the Manger was built in 1912. It operated as a hotel from 1912 until it closed in 1977. We looked at the City of Savannah's Zoning Ordinance and thought the path of least resistance was to simply do a simple street map amendment, show the portion of Congress Street where the hotel will go and that would be the end of it. MPC staff disagrees with that approach. I understand why they are doing what they are doing and they understand why I am doing what I am doing. They would prefer to add a section permitting the re-establishment of a historical hotel that is already in the Hotel Overlay District. At the end of the day, we are literally two sides of the same coin with virtually identical results. For that reason, we do support the staff version before you today. We are in agreement with staff and would fully support the text amendment presented to you by MPC staff.

Sue Adler, CEO of Historic Savannah Foundation, member of the public, said we are in support of bringing this beautiful hotel back to how it was originally and we just wanted to state that for the record.

Ellen Harris, Downtown Neighborhood Association, said as Ms. Leto noted, the hotel map was adopted in 2018 which was just four years ago. It was adopted after a diverse group of stake holders were assembled. It included representatives from the Downtown Neighborhood Association, Historic Savannah Foundation, City staff among others. I believe this is the first petition to come forward since the adoption proposing to amend the map in the overlay. The Downtown Neighborhood Association is strongly in opposition to amending the hotel map and overlay as it is currently proposed. We feel that the hotel map and overlay is working well in its existing configuration. If we start amending it based on each individual petition that comes in, it erodes the process and the integrity of the original proposal when it was created. If the hotel map and overlay are in need of being updated or amending we are not opposed to this or this particular project. We just feel like it should be done in a comprehensive and inclusive way.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board member, asked, are you in agreement with staffs alternative recommendation?

Ms. Harris said I would like to have the opportunity to discuss it with more people around the table to be honest. I think there is merit there. My initial thought is, I would be concerned as to whether the hotel use was ever there historically. For example, was it there one year and then its not anymore. Does that grandfather it in in the future to be re-established? That didn't seem to be addressed. I feel things like that could benefit from a broader group discussion.

Michael Owens, CEO of Tourism Leadership Council, said I was involved in the hotel development overlay creation. We have a different interpretation and note the top of that document says "Hotel Development Overlay". It was our understanding at that time that we were talking about new construction that would need to fit in, not existing buildings. That building pre dates all of us here. It was a hotel. I speak in rise on behalf of this use in returning it to its original historic use. We do ratify and continue to agree and endorse with that hotel development overlay new construction and the development thereof. We do not feel like this case falls into the category. this use already existed in a building that already exists and has already taken into account the plan of this city. We support it being returned to its original use without reservation.

Mr. Yellin said, not including the street with the Manger Hotel was a clear oversight and I was also on that committee. It was a large discussion about new hotels and where they should go. New Hotels should not go and should not be intrusive on residential neighborhoods. The idea that NeZO would be cast in stone and never modified or that the hotel overlay district or the street map would never be modified, does not make sense to me. In fact Ms. Liddy is looking at additional maps now where she will be extending hotel overlay and prohibiting hotels in other districts. As we speak, there are some talks underway to continue to modify the map in a way that would actually prohibit hotels. The idea that the map would stand still and never be changed, doesn't make any sense. What is before you today is just an attempt to return the Manger Building to the

Manger Hotel.

Mr. Coles said, I believe the staff said to the point of being concerned about other properties being used. The only two they found that qualify under these guidelines were Moon River and this building. The only other possible building that would come before us again to say we were a hotel once, would be Moon River.

Ms. Leto said that is why we left the option of stating the Historic Preservation officer shall validate the historic use prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy just in case there is some missing hotel we did not identify.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Board member, said with that in mind, are we clear in specifying the period of verification or whether it was the initial use, is that the intent? For it being the initial use, or it having been used for that function for an extended period of time?

Ms. Leto said the specifics are that it need to have been constructed within the period of significance which is the 1733 through 1960. The building still exist, and that be the initial use.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, said, would the petitioner agree to meet with that stakeholder group prior to this issue going to Council to explain the text amendment and the uses and restoring the Manger Hotel?

Mr. Yellin said yes. I will immediately after this meeting get together with Ms. Harris and arrange for a time to meet.

Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member, asked for clarification again on the qualification for the amendment in the future. Does it have to be originally designated as a hotel or just be a hotel for a few years during that period?

Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services, said, because this question has become a question that seems to be unclear, it might be important, if there is a motion made to adopt this, that be made clear in the motion. The way it is currently written, it may not be as specific to answer that question in the language. If that is the boards position, then I think that should be made clear in the motion.

Mr. Stephens said, I agree. The reason being, that was my line of questioning because that was a very valid point raised by Ms. Harris. If it was used for one year, and is in the period of significance, it could become a point of argument. It may not be best serving us in the future.

Ms. Wilson said when staff originally talked about this, we talked about it initially being built for use as a hotel. If we put that specific language in there, it would address some of the concerns heard. We did do some research looking at the number of properties within the current district that would be able to be converted if they decided to move forward with that. The conversion process was not only on the dates but it is also the type of street that was used to make the determination of what buildings could be converted. That is why we recommended and moved forward with the alternative.

Mr. Shedrick Coleman, Board member, said any reason why the building might have stopped being a hotel might have had nothing to do with anything other than economics at that time. We are starting to say, how do you define saying why someone switched the use of a building. I think the way this is written is adequate and if something comes up, we have something where the preservation officer will do an evaluation of its historic use. That is enough and gives leeway to determine whether this would be appropriate to fall under this classification without us trying to micromanage this process.

Motion

Approval of the alternative amendment to allow existing contributing buildings located within the Hotel Development Overlay District, that were converted from hotels to another conforming use within the Period of Significance, as defined in Sec. 7.8.5 may be re-established as a hotel use.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jeff Notrica

Second: Travis Coles

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

[19. MAP AMENDMENT | Fountain Road | Rezone from R-A \(Residential -Agriculture\) to B \(Business\) | Z-0622-000286](#)

- 📎 [AERIAL MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [LABEL MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [FLU MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [VICINITY MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [ZONING MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [TAX MAP Z-0622-000286.pdf](#)
- 📎 [4-6.2 Developmental Standards.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Street Views.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Report .pdf](#)

Mr. Jacqualle Johnson, Assistant Planner, said the subject property is an undeveloped parcel near the southside of Fountain Road and Keller’s Flea Market Drive. On the southern boundary, the property abuts residential dwellings on Clys Circle. Fountain Road provides vehicular access to the subject property which does not currently have access to Keller’s Flea Market Drive. Fountain Road has a paved width of less than 20-feet and has two lanes. The property has a total area of 2.17 acres. It does not appear that any zoning actions have taken place on this property since zoning was adopted in Chatham County.

The petitioner is requesting to rezone the property from the R-A classification to the B classification. The existing zoning district was established to promote rural residential development and protect certain rural highway roadside areas against strip development, which can lead to traffic congestion, hazards and roadside blight. Although the parcels on the northside of Fountain Road are currently zoned Planned Community Business, the development pattern in the vicinity is residential. The proposed zoning district promotes heavy commercial and certain industrial-like activities such as: truck stop, cocktail lounge, nightclub, package store, adult entertainment establishment and the petitioner’s proposed use, truck storage. These uses are more appropriate in zoning such as: light or heavy industrial. Fountain Road operates as a divider between business and residential. Furthermore, properties zoned as Business front on Highway 17.

The proposed zoning could generate an extensive amount of traffic based on the uses allowed in the

Business(B) zoning district which Fountain Road cannot accommodate. Some of these uses include Manufactured Home Sales, Automobile and Container Storage Yards, Warehousing, Recreational Vehicle Sales and Service. The proposed zoning allows a mix of uses that are heavy commercial. If adverse impacts occur, it would likely be on the existing single family residential east and west of the subject property. The proposed zoning and permitted uses would be incompatible with the area. The land use development along Fountain Road primarily consists of residences. The proposed zoning would increase traffic volumes, specifically truck traffic volumes. The intersection of Fountain Road and Ogeechee Road is an unsignalized multi-way intersection, Ogeechee Road has a posted speed limit of 45 MPH. The proposed zoning would not impact the provision of services. There are no water and sewer services available at this location. The provision of those services would be at the cost of the developer. The proposed zoning district's permitted uses or scale of development would adversely impact future development of the adjacent properties. Due to the fact, of the potential traffic and environmental issues associated with the proposed zoning. The proposed zoning district is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff finds that the subject property would more appropriately be developed under the existing zoning, and that the proposed zoning could result in a less desirable development outcome in Chatham County. In addition, Fountain Road is designed to accommodate the traffic generated from R-A uses and not the potential traffic of B zoning uses. The heavy usage of traffic generated by B zoning would quickly deteriorate the current condition of the road. Furthermore, Keller's Flea Market does generate heavier than average traffic; however, it is only operational on weekends.

Mr. Ken Evans, Owner of property, said, I run Evans Asphalt and Concrete. We run about twelve employees and ten trucks. These are mostly pickup trucks. We do have an F-650 dump truck. We do a lot of patching. we have done thermo plastic work for the County and other projects for the County. The traffic we would generate would not be the type of traffic that perhaps the staff might have anticipated. The zoning request is basically allow us to give our business a home that is centrally located to where a good portion of the work we do is. This would make it much easier for our employees as well as less traffic on the roads for us. We would be traveling shorter distances to the jobs we do. We can leave a buffer zone for the residential that it backs up to or on either side. There are trees there. We can leave a tree area there for it. Keller's generates way more traffic in one weekend than we will generate in a couple of months. This is a laydown yard. We are not the kind of business where customers come and go. We are the business where you call us and we come to your site. They type of maintenance we would do would be very mild. Trucks go to the shop for the heavy maintenance. We might do our own oil changes on site. We have some small engines like paint stripping machines and things we would do minor maintenance on those but that is equivalent to fixing a lawnmower. We are normally not even there on the weekends. We would be mostly Monday thru Friday. We have worked maybe five weekends in the last 12 months.

Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman, asked, do you just have the one dump truck, the F-650?

Mr. Evans said yes, the others are F-250 and F-350.

Mr. Joseph Welch asked what the hours of operation are. Do you repair/put strips down late at night due to less traffic, and what is the latest you would come in in the morning from doing a night job?

Mr. Evans said 7am to approximately 6pm. We could put a berm on the backside or whatever would work to stop any noise that might bother anyone.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board member, said, I think the concern is, not what your business would do with the property, but what future businesses could do with the property. I know your intent is to stay there but we have no guarantee that if we were to rezone this, you wouldn't sell it ten years from now and it become a night club. That is certainly not amenable to the neighbors behind the property or the area.

Mr. Evans said, I will accept whatever stipulation lets us put our business there.

Mr. Coles asked, is there anyway to make this work for the petitioner without a rezone?

Ms. Wilson, Executive Director said, not that we can think of. Maybe the Zoning Administrator for the County could come up with maybe a less intense zone. This is a residentially zoned piece of property. A lot of the houses there use that little road primarily there for access. They already have the Flea Market that has a lot of business in that area. Based on his proposed use, which is pretty intense for even the zoning district that he is applying for, it was the least intense zoning district we could put him in without him asking for industrial. There

is nothing we can think of he could do without rezoning the property.

Mr. Noha asked if there was any response to the notifications that went out to the surrounding property owners?

Mr. Johnson said there were no responses.

Mr. Welch asked, what kind of facility are you planning to build there? Are you going to gravel the ground or blacktop it?

Mr. Evans said, I would like to put up a metal building that we can store our equipment in. We would just gravel the ground.

Mr. Coleman said our duty is for the future use and all the implications that come beyond that. His business is locating here now and he is giving very good reasons to locate it there but if his business gets more successful and this isn't adequate, he leaves and the business use is then there. We really have to consider the potential of the other uses as opposed to specific uses that are being portrayed by this property owner which I agree are probably not of issue. But the long term uncontrolled situation is what this board is about. We need to have that under consideration despite what he is proposing. We have no way to make sure the longevity of that never effects the surrounding property owners.

Ms. Elizabeth Epstein, Board member, asked, do you have any idea of the plans for the properties that are directly adjacent to you on the east and west?

Mr. Evans said I don't own those and I have no plans to purchase those properties.

Motion

Approval of staff's recommendation for denial of the request to rezone the property from R-A to B.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Travis Coles

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

X. Presentations

XI. Other Business

[20. Chairman to Appoint Nominating Committee](#)

Mr. Joseph Welch, Chairman, said I have selected a nominating committee for the next slate of officers.

1. Elizabeth Epstein
2. Dwayne Stephens
3. Jeff Notrica

XIII. Adjournment

21. Adjourn

The MPC Board went into Executive Session. Session started at approximately 3:33pm and ended at approximately 4:30pm There were no votes taken.

There being no further business to present before the Board, the July 26, 2022 Regular Metropolitan Planning Commission Meeting adjourned.

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.