



Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

November 7, 2023 MPC MEETING

Members Present: Karen Jarrett, Chairwoman
Travis Cole, Vice Chair
Laureen Boles
Shedrick Coleman
Jay Melder
Wayne Noha
Jeff Notrica
Tom Woiwode
Elizabeth Epstein
Dwayne Stephens
Joseph Welch
Traci Amick
Michael Kaigler

Members Absent Joseph Ervin

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services
Melissa Leto, Senior Planner, Development Services
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

[1. Map Amendment request to rezone from R-2/EO to B-N/EO | 202 Shipyard Rd | Z-0923-000412](#)

Motion

item removed from the final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin - 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[2. Special Use Request to have a place of worship within RSF-6 zoning district | 1202 East 69th St | 23-005388-ZA](#)

Motion

item removed from the agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[3. Special Use Request to have a place of worship within RSF-6 zoning district | 1206 East 68th St and 5302 Sanders St | 23-005389-ZA](#)

Motion

item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

VI. Items Requested to be Withdrawn

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

VII. Consent Agenda

[4. Approval of the September 26, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)

[9.26.2023-meeting-minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

approval of minutes

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[5. MPC 2024 Holiday Schedule](#)

📎 [2024 MPC Holiday Schedule.pdf](#)

Motion

..

Vote Results (Not Started)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

VIII. Old Business

[6. MAP Amendment | Nine \(9\) Parcels on East Broad St, Gwinnett St, and East Bolton St | 23-001408-ZA](#)

- 📎 [Revised Application.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Gwinnett Street Apartments S-PD 10.13.23.pdf](#)
- 📎 [EX1 GDP PLAN.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Arch Site and 1st Floor Plan_10122023.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Report Nov 3.pdf](#)
- 📎 [TC-2 Development Standards.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Letters of Opposition.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Suport Foram Gwinnet E Broad.pdf](#)

Mr. Morrow, Director of Development Services, presented the petition of FORAM Development, LLC, for the rezoning of nine (9) parcels from a TC-2 (Traditional Commercial-2) district to a S-PD (Small-Planned Development). The nine parcels are between East Gwinnett Street and East Bolton Street. The Petitioner’s intent is to develop two (2) buildings that will include mixed uses with upper story residential and commercial on the ground floor.

Background: The subject property is located in a neighborhood that exhibits the Ward structure of the Savannah Town Plan. The neighborhood is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as the Eastside-Meadows-Collinsville Historic District. The National Register (NR) nomination from 2002 states, “The Eastside Historic District is a large, residential neighborhood in the City of Savannah. Eastside developed as a series of subdivisions following the establishment of streetcar lines through the area in 1891. The district was first developed in the northwest corner, adjacent to the Savannah Victorian Historic District, which had been established three decades earlier. Development proceeded along the rail line with the largest houses built in the Queen Anne and Italianate styles at the north end in the late 1890’s. Subsequent development proceeded south and east through the 1920s with equally large houses but smaller Craftsman-style bungalows. Eastside, like other historic residential neighborhoods in Savannah,

follows the city-established gridiron plan with streets shaded by a canopy of mature live oak trees.

The Eastside streets were laid out by 1900 and mostly continue the City's 19th-century gridiron pattern of streets. East Broad, Paulsen, Harmon, Ott, Live Oak, and Cedar streets, and Atlantic and Waters Avenues comprise the major north-south streets. Park Avenue, Gwinnett, Bolton, Waldburg, Duffy, Henry, and Anderson streets are the major east-west corridors. Narrow service lanes run east-west through each block. Eastside's nearly flat topography was drained by the 19th-century Bilbo Canal, which runs below ground between Waters and East Broad streets. The historic rail line that extends north through the neighborhood features a plate-girder railroad bridge supported by steel lattice posts."

No local historic overlay district has been formed within the boundaries of Eastside Meadows-Collinsville. The NR district provides federal tax incentives for rehabilitation of historic properties. No local regulations prevent the removal of historic structures in Eastside-Meadows-Collinsville.

Of the seven structures within the subject property, five (5) of them were identified as contributing to the historic character of the Eastside district in the NR nomination.

- PIN 20043 07018, 621 East Gwinnett Street
- PIN 20043 07005, 610-612 East Bolton & 611-613 East Gwinnett Lane
- PIN 20043 07004, 614-616 East Bolton Street & 615-617 East Gwinnett Lane

The buildings at 610-12 and 614-16 Bolton Street and 611-613 and 615-617 Bolton Lane are all one-story, side-by-side duplexes. The National Register nomination notes this housing type as exemplary of the Eastside neighborhood: Eastside also includes a variety of multi-family dwellings, most of which do not include elements of an academic style. These include one-story frame duplexes with units set side-by-side.

East Bolton Lane is included in the nomination and shows structures at 610, 614, and 622. It is not clear if the buildings have been modified since the survey that was done for the nomination. One of the parcels owned by 621 Gwinnett ,LLC is 810 East Broad Street. Faith on the Move Ministries was present at this location until it was demolished in 2021. The Eastside nomination listed 810 East Broad Street as a contributing structure.

The developer could preserve the historic structures surrounding the subject property, relocate them, salvage materials if they are demolished, or conduct an archeological survey of the site.

One of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan's Historic Preservation goals is to "Broaden historic preservation efforts to highlight and include historically underrepresented stories, sites, and communities."

MPC Staff finds that the current TC-2 zoning permits all that has been requested by the Petitioner, only at a lower and more contextually appropriate intensity. Further, the Petitioner's proposal includes development procedures and standards that represent a departure from practices established in the Zoning Ordinance without sufficient justification for such changes.

Based upon the Ordinance review criteria for the Small Planned Development, MPC Staff recommends denial of the request to rezone from TC-2 to S-PD.

Robert McCorkle, Attorney for Petitioner, stated this property is made of 9 Parcels, about 1.4 acres total, approximately a city block except for the church towards the rear. He spoke about the different corridors in the historic districts, most specifically the Victorian Downtown and Mid-City areas. He believes that the City has chosen the corridors along MLK and Montgomery for additional density, additional height, and larger scale apartment projects, which he believes was an attempt to create additional housing and rejuvenate those areas. He states these reasons for the extra height:

- The Parcels are outside the historic district boundaries and various landmark districts. There is more leniency on what is required.
- The area has needed redevelopment. There are industrial uses and zoning, buildings that have been vacant for decades around the proposed property.
- Projects on Montgomery are used for examples of 4-story buildings, and sights multiple other

examples around in the Victorian and Mid-City areas.

He stated the Petitioner originally proposed a DX Zoning, partially to create new development, remove the height restrictions, and to allow for larger scale development. Staff have stated concerns about DX because it doesn't have design guidelines. Petitioner was asked to redo their application as a PUD. They applied for an SPD with the request from Staff that they create their own set of design guidelines and establish a complete ordinance for the proposed property. He believes a lot of earlier questions were about the PUD being unclear or inappropriate. They based their design guidelines on references from previous PUDs. They believe it is consistent with other PUDs in the City.

He stated that they acknowledge the guidelines are not identical to TC2 Zoning. He stated if the Petitioner could complete their project under the TC2 Zoning, he would not be here today. The goal of the PUD is to find middle ground between TC2 and DX zoning.

He stated there is a Parcel in the back of the proposed property owned by the City. They have been exchanging contracts with the City to acquire but have not completed yet. They believe the proposed site is good for the extra height because they believe there are not a lot of immediate neighbors. They also have a letter of support, which was included in the Staff letters of opposition, however they believe it was in support.

Behind the property is a railroad track, owned by CSX and heavily wooded. There are some areas zoned industrial, which they believe gives context to where the property is located.

Currently on the proposed property there are 4 duplexes for a total of 8 units, they do acknowledge that there are residents on the site. They stated that given the location and size of the site and the neighborhood, having a denser 185 units would be a more appropriate use.

He stated that when picking the multifamily site, transportation and walkability are important. There are schools and bus stops close by. They have lowered the height, reduced the south building to 4-stories, put a 55-foot setback on the 5-story of the north building. They believe this will make the building appear to be 4-stories instead of 5-stories. About 50% of the project is 5-story and the other 50% at 4-story.

Total density has gone from 205 to 185. They have addressed fire lane concerns. Staff has mentioned whether the range of permitted use is more suitable than currently allowed. He stated their Use Schedule is almost identical to the TC2 Use Schedule, the only thing they added was a Food Hall project.

He stated their project would address the housing shortage need in the County and City. The TC districts have 10,000 sq footprint maximums and 3-story height limits, which are two constraints on flexibility and construction. They stated limiting to the historic guidelines makes it hard to have extra density. He stated the 60-foot height would allow for the creation of additional units.

He stated they will have structured automated parking of 205 parking spaces. They are asking for a reduction of 2500 feet for their commercial parking requirement. The Petitioner has a letter from the Victorian Neighborhood Association, which is in support of the project. The letter was not posted on the website or shown today, the Petitioner is not sure if everyone received a copy. The VNA did ask for workforce housing, which they believe is between 80%-100% AMI. The Petitioner is committed to submitting some portion. The Petitioner is trying to find middle ground and they believe they have accomplished that.

Mr. Shedrick Coleman, Board member, stated the Petitioner's examples were granted an extra story because the properties maintained their TC1 and TC2 zoning districts. The Petitioner has only presented one example of a 5-story building, which is in a totally different setting. He doesn't think a comparison of DX to TC1 or TC2 is appropriate. He wants to understand the logic the Petitioner is using for going between DX and TC2 to create the smaller Specialized Zoning Area. He doesn't think the examples provided are adequate.

Mr. McCorkle stated he doesn't have the total zoning map available. He believes DX is mixed into districts around the property. He acknowledges almost all his examples are 4-stories but believes some of those were achieved through variances. He stated that an extra 13 feet needed for the 5th story gives flexibility to the project for pricing and additional units. He said that the property doesn't have a lot of neighbors and that in certain corridors there are appropriate areas for height.

Mr. Coleman stated the example properties that required variances also had requirements and trade-offs to allow for the additional height. He believes the distances between the proposed properties and the examples used are significant. He stated that height can be appropriate in the proper context.

Mr. McCorkle stated their proposed property is not in the Historic District, they have Mid-City zoning, although the Petitioner does not believe the property is in Mid-City.

Mr. Coleman asked if the Petitioner purchased the property as TC2.

Mr. McCorkle stated the Petitioner has not purchased the property but is under contract for the sale. He is authorized by the Owner to get the property rezoned for the purposes of the sale.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, asked since it is an extra 13 feet and 52 units, what is the difference between the ability to have an SPD or moving forward with TC2? Which would be going through the same variance process as the neighboring development with the old theatre to obtain 4-stories.

Mr. McCorkle stated the neighboring development has a Historic Structure that cannot be removed. He believes that a 10,000 sq foot restriction does not impact them because they must be built around it. Whereas the Petitioner's plans to develop would take up the entire block. He stated that obtaining a 5-story variance or more than 10,000 sq. foot variance would not be possible as he has not been successful in past experiences or projects. The Petitioner is trying to find a way to not be constrained by restrictions on height and square foot maximums which they consider to be inappropriate for this location.

Mr. Medler asked a if in the Staff's recommendation for TC2, did Staff find that both the 10,000 sq foot maximum and the height restrictions are necessary to maintain the character of the TC2? Is there one that is more important or are they both equal?

Mr. Morrow stated that having conservation with the Historic Staff, 10,000 square feet was the maximum for most historic structures. If he had to order them, the 10,000 square footprint is more important than the height.

Mr. Medler asked on Montgomery and MLK buildings used as examples, they are 4-story buildings, do they fit within the 10,000 sq maximum?

Mr. Morrow stated that he believes they may larger but is not sure how they came to be larger than the 10,000 square foot maximum.

Ms. Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director, stated that one of the things was when buildings came into the historic district, they are a little bigger but not much. She believes Montgomery Street and the Streetcar District are very different than the Broad and Gwinnett location.

Ms. Karen Jarrett, Chairwoman, stated it was also an economic development corridor and that is why the buildings received some leeway.

Ms. Wilson stated that Mr. McCorkle referenced his location is not in the Historic District, the DX zoning is usually only allowed in the Historic District. That is why Staff encouraged the Petitioner to go down this path to look at doing something else and to put a smaller building on the site.

Mr. Medler stated that he feels the Petitioner is pushing the envelope for what is appropriate at this location with the SPD. He also feels there is room for density similar to the project just north on Gwinnett Street. He asked of the two options, to approve the Petitioner's request or deny it, would there possibly be an option in between that is appropriate?

Mr. Morrow stated that Jerome Edler, who represented the property just north on Gwinnett Street, set a what he believes is new standard in community involvement for his petition and had multiple community meetings. To his knowledge the current Petitioner had one meeting that Staff was invited to. He does concede that other discussions were had but he believes did not involve the community. He states if the Petitioner is open to making a design process that takes the community's feedback into consideration, it would set it on a different trajectory.

Ms. Wilson stated in addition to Mr. Morrow's point, when Mr. Edler's project first came in, it was for 5-stories. Staff talked to Mr. Edler about lowering the height and speaking with the community to get them involved, which Mr. Edler did. While this application has been ongoing for 11-months, the Staff has spent a tremendous amount of time going back and forth, trying to get the project into an approvable format. However, it has not gotten to a point where Staff feel comfortable signing off on. She stated it is up to the Petitioner if they want to continue more discussion, but they will have to make some concessions to get to a point where it can be approved.

Mr. Medler stated the community engagement is admirable and essential. He asked to clarify the person we are talking about, Mr. Edler. Asked is that the Petitioner for the 4-story property just north on Gwinnett Street, which is north to this Parcel we are discussing today?

Mr. Morrow stated Mr. Edler is the architect for the Petitioner of the property north on Gwinnett Street.

Mr. Medler asked is barometer here community engagement?

Mr. Morrow stated no, there is an inappropriateness with this proposed development. He asks do we wait, or do we allow something to happen where there is admittedly a need? It is not just community involvement but that was the icing on the cake for Mr. Edler's petition.

Mr. McCorkle stated that his Petitioner had multiple meetings with various neighborhood associations. He stated that he was involved with Mr. Edler's project and believes there were multiple objections to that as well. He believes the Petitioner has involved the community and referenced the letter from the Victorian Neighborhood Association. He mentions conceding one building to 4-stories and the setback for the 5-story building to help hide that the building is bigger than it presents to be.

Ms. Wilson stated that Mr. Edler's property north on Gwinnett is zoned TC2. Mr. Edler had asked for a variance in height, other than that they are developing within the current standards of TC2 and restoring the historic theater. She urged to keep in mind the proposed project is currently zoned TC2.

Ms. Traci Amick, board member, asked was the MPC not involved in Mr. Edler's project?

Ms. Wilson stated Mr. Edler came into get variance for height only, not to have anything extra or above what is allowed in the TC2 Zoning. This current Petitioner initially wanted to use DX Zoning as there are not any standards for the location. In this case the location is not in the Historic District, so it would not have to go to the Historic Review Board for design approval. She does acknowledge that this Petitioner has held meetings with the community, however issues remain. For example, the VNA letter asked about affordability, which Staff has no control over. The issue is the zoning and is what has been submitted appropriate for this location.

Ms. Amick stated her concern that the Petitioner is asking to go from 3-story to 4-story and 5-story.

Ms. Wilson stated she agrees but would like to add it is more than the story issue. She believes if the Petitioner were to develop under the TC2 standards, they could go to the ZBA for the height variance. She stated the Petitioner is asking for additional things you would get under a planned development, as they would be basically creating their own district. She believes they are requesting more things in addition to asking for a 4-story or 5-story.

Ms. Amick asked Mr. McCorkle if they are not able to change the Zoning and only did the variance for additional height, would this project still be feasible?

Mr. McCorkle stated he does not believe it would be feasible. He believes the 10,000 sq. footprint maximum and height restrictions only make the buildings cost more money and takes away flexibility of building design. He stated there are 3 variances the Petitioner is looking to get approved, the height, the removal of 10,000 sq. footprint maximum, and a reduction of the first 2500 feet for the commercial parking.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board Member, stated he wants to echo what Mr. Medler said about pushing the envelope. He worries this would set a precedent that causes future development heights to continue to

snowball. He does not believe that 5-stories are necessary to make the project feasible. He believes the question is not about feasibility but what is appropriate. Asked Staff the difference between TC2S and TC2, as the development referenced on Liberty and Broad is TC2S.

Mr. Morrow stated with TC2S the S means “Site Plan Specific” which is a reference to the prior zoning ordinance. He stated TC2S is similar to TC2, except that it would correspond to meeting the requirements of the established zoning district. While with the PUD they in essence get to pick their own flavor.

Mr. Coles asked which is more appropriate for this area, considering most places seem to be TC2 or a variance of that?

Mr. Morrow stated the TC2 zoning is appropriate in Staff’s opinion. A TC2S would mean we are asking for approval of a General Development Plan. We would be at the same place, except it would be approval of the site plan meeting requirements of TC2, instead of the Petitioner providing their own standards.

Ms. Wilson stated in addition to the Liberty and Broad TC2S, they also had their design approved. Since it is just outside of the Historic District, there were concerns about the appearance of the building. She stated that Staff would have been happier if the building was pulled back as it is massive. She stated Staff spent time with that architect looking at the design and everything as they zoned the whole project. The community had a chance to see what was going on as well.

Mr. McCorkle stated he believes it is similar to the Liberty and Broad was Site Plan Specific that was tied to TC. He stated what the Petitioner is asking for is Site Plan Specific that is tied to TC. Stated they took from some of the Historic Guidelines to show that the building fits the character of the area. Stated that whatever they get approved through the Specific Building Plan is what the Petitioner will have to build, as that is the nature of the PUD.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Board Member, asked Staff, what is the Future Land Use Map showing for this area? Based on information from the Petitioner’s presentation, it stated this Body asked them to come back as a PUD. He asked if we have the minutes or information stating this Body asked the Petitioner to come back with a PUD?

Mr. Morrow stated to answer the first question, there are 9 Subject Parcels which are a combination of Traditional Commercial and Single-Family. There is a strict consistency requirement, once combined it will contain something that reflects an anticipation of intensified and mixed uses, so the zoning is consistent. As for the second question, he stated the Petitioner initially came in with an application for DX zoning, it is his understanding that all of the conversations were had amongst Staff.

Ms. Wilson stated she would like to clarify, because she was a part of those conversations. When the Petitioner came in, Staff advised the request they had was not consistent with what is currently in the Comprehensive Plan. DX is not seen outside of the Historic District; this is because within the Historic District there needs to be design review. Which is a big issue with the location being outside of the Historic District. She stated the other issue was massing in density. Staff provided a guide and was very clear that the Petitioner needed to provide more detail as they were essentially creating their own Zoning Ordinance. Staff spoke about reducing height, parking, road ownership issues, etc. which caused Staff to pause. Staff have spent months working with the Petitioner, trying to get to a place where something would work. Staff is looking at it from the standpoint of context and what is happening in that specific area of Broad Street and the Liberty and Broad Street example is a whole different area. Staff received pushback regarding lowering the height and number of units and how that influences parking. Staff worked with the City about a hybrid SPR for the road issues. The Petitioner needs to have a good set of Design Guidelines and Covenants. If the Board wants to continue, to give the Petitioner a chance to see they can come back with an alternative and be somewhere more in the middle for the context of the area. Staff did receive a lot of letters in opposition and some in approval, also concerns of housing affordability, which Staff cannot control.

Mr. Stephens stated to make sure he understands, from the current FLUM with the individual parcels, they are showing two different uses, correct?

Mr. Morrow stated yes, currently two different uses are shown on the FLUM. Adjoining Broad Street is currently Traditional Commercial, and the interior is currently showing Single-Family Residential.

Mr. Stephens asked as far whether this Body and/or Staff recommended the Petitioner come back with a PUD, it sounds to him not necessarily a direct ask but more-so a conversation to figure out what is the most appropriate path?

Mr. Morrow stated he believes that is accurate.

Ms. Wilson stated it was a suggestion and a request if the Petitioner wanted to move forward a PUD would be more appropriate. When the Petitioner asked what the PUD would look like, Staff gave general examples that are typically provided to everyone. When Staff shares that information, it is not meant to be taken exactly but to show this is the kind of stuff typically included, and make sure the Petitioner is taking into consideration the context of the specific area.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the TC designation is out of question because of the height, the footprint of the building and the parking?

Mr. Morrow stated not for the parking, that is a different set of standards.

Ms. Jarrett asked what about density?

Mr. Morrow stated yes, it is outside of the TC density. He came up with a gross metric of 141 units based on the area of 1.4 acres. That is dividing the 1.4 acres by 135 sq. feet per dwelling unit.

Ms. Jarrett asked, at this point the only plan available for parking is the one which shows two rows of parking back-to-back which require a machine or parking attendant?

Mr. Morrow stated that is correct. The 205 parking spaces referenced by the Petitioner does not appear anywhere in the October 13th petition.

Ms. Jarrett stated that 58 parking spaces are all we have been shown.

Mr. Morrow stated there are also 13 off street spaces between the north and south buildings. There were no additional details provided in regards to structured parking.

Mr. Jarrett asked if the structured parking would be multilevel. Would that mean basement parking?

Mr. McCorkle stated the intent is to have semi-automatic structured parking with 3 or 4 cars stacked up and some of the parking deck will be underground.

Ms. Jarrett asked whether more than one level be underground.

Mr. McCorkle stated it will not be more than one level underground. The automated parking does not need to have an entire floor of a parking deck to stack the cars.

Ms. Jarrett asked under TC zoning the Petitioner is asking for 4 variances, correct?

Mr. McCorkle stated he believes they would only need 3, not sure what the 4th one would be.

Mr. Morrow stated to clarify, the parking requirements are in section 9 and not directly related to Zoning. Based on specific uses, there is a one-to-one requirement for off street parking for residences, it varies depending on nonresidential use. The use related request then fall under the TC Zoning District, the density, height, and footprint are all associated with the TC2.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

James Hundsrucker, President of the Forsyth Park Community Alliance, in opposition due to traffic, parking, density and the large scale of the project in a small area. He believes the 5 structures on the property are Historic, recognized as significant on the National Register, and should be preserved.

Steven Theccanat, neighbor, spoke in opposition. He stated there are residents and neighbors close to this property. Seconded Mr. Coleman's statements about the DX Zoning. Concerned with parking, traffic

and believes the Petitioner is more worried about profit than providing housing.

Michael Higgins, neighbor, spoke in opposition, due to traffic and parking. Asked the Board to retain the TC2 Zoning.

Ed Pynch, neighbor, spoke in opposition. Asked the Board to retain the TC2 Zoning. Believes the site design has not changed much since the first submission. Concerns about traffic and parking.

Steve Edwards, Represents Downtown Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition. Concerns about the collateral effects of the project, traffic and parking.

Denise Flojo, neighbor, spoke in opposition. Stated there are residents in the area, a very active school, park, church etc. Asked Board to retain the TC2 zoning.

Chantel Morton, neighbor, spoke in opposition. Concerned about precedents set if the height is allowed and lack of community involvement. Concerned if the property were to be sold by the Petitioner after approval of the Zoning change.

Response to public comments, Mr. McCorkle on behalf of Petitioner, stated there were some letters of support. Stated they will be bound by the PUD Zoning, if they were to sell the property it would bound any future buyers to the same Zoning. He believes the benefits of a PUD are that you do know what is going to be built, as opposed to a variance or rezoning. Acknowledges we need housing in the City and that developers build to earn money. Stated they chose that location because the Petitioner believes the area needs development.

Motion: Approval of Staff’s recommendation – Denial of request to rezone from TC2 to SPD.

Motion

Denial of the request to rezone from TC-2 to S-PD.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Shedrick Coleman

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Nay
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

IX. Regular Business

- ☞ [AERIAL MAP Z-0823-000406.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Exhibit 1 - R-2 Uses.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Exhibit 2 - R-A Uses.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Development Standards for R-2 \(Table 1\).pdf](#)
- ☞ [Site Plan.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Combined Maps.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Application.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Report .pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Leto, MPC Planner, presented the petition of Donald E. Dyches, Jr., who is proposing to rezone a combined +/- 1.4-acres from R-2/EO (Two-Family Residential – Environmental Overlay) to P-R-A (Planned – Residential – Agriculture). The intent for the rezoning is to have a plant nursery use with ancillary storage for the equipment required.

This map amendment request originated from a Code Enforcement case on the subject property for functioning as a plant nursery/ storage equipment. According to the Petitioner, the business has been active for two years now. The subject properties are located on the west side of Ferguson Avenue approximately 88 feet west of Lehigh Avenue. The 1001 Bethesda parcel is undeveloped and has never been developed. It is too small for independent use and is more closely related to other parcels that it adjoins. The right-of-way between the two parcels provides access to existing homes. The 9965 Ferguson Avenue parcel currently functions as a laydown/outdoor storage yard for commercial operations. Based on observation during a site visit, the property contains box trucks, steer loaders and piles of debris. No plants were seen, and no trees are growing on the site for the nursery use. There is black mesh screening over a fence to protect the equipment.

The property owner would like to utilize the site for an office with associated parking for the seven to eight employees, storage for box trucks and steer loaders, and plants, trees, and turf. The property currently does not have active access to water, or a sewer so is not able to store any plants, trees, and turf. The plants, trees, and turf are currently purchased and delivered to properties that the property owner serves. Most of the properties the property owner serves are located within the Skidaway Island and Islands communities. However, if approved for the requested zoning, the applicant would pursue a drilled well and sewer systems and/or try to tie into the County's utilities. The proposed site plan indicates there would be a 3,000 square foot office building, eight parking spaces including one ADA parking space, ten storage bays, and a driveway providing access onto Ferguson Avenue.

The Future Land Use Map designates the subject properties as Residential – Single Family. This designation is defined as “Areas identified for single-family detached residential dwellings at a density not to exceed eight (8) units per gross acre. This category includes nonresidential uses that are compatible with the residential character and scale of the neighborhood.

The property is served by the Chatham County Police Department and Chatham Emergency Services. Currently there is no active water and sewer available on-site. However, if the requested zoning is approved, the applicant intends to install a drilled well and sewer systems.

Public Transit is available approximately 278-feet from the subject parcel, 9965 Ferguson Avenue along Ferguson Avenue. There is one bus stop on Ferguson Avenue.

The Petitioner is requesting to rezone the subject property to the P-R-A classification. The ‘P’ prefix at the beginning of the R-A zoning designation means the request is for a ‘Planned District.’ The following stipulation within the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance applies to a ‘Planned District’ submittal.

Ms. Leto stated that where the MPC finds that there are unusual or extraordinary conditions associated with an application for rezoning and that Planned District classification is warranted, the MPC shall require that the application prepare a General Development Plan. After review of the General

Development Plan, the MPC shall submit the Plan with its recommendation to the County Commission for consideration as part of the rezoning process. The County Commission may approve the plan as presented, amend the plan as part of the adopted rezoning, reject the plan and the rezoning petition, or return the plan to the MPC for further consideration and hold the rezoning application in abeyance. The General Development Plan approved by the County Commission shall constitute the approved use for the site. Any subsequent desired change in land use for the property that is not consistent with the approved General Development Plan shall be resubmitted in the same manner as the original General Development Plan and shall require review and a recommendation by the MPC and review and approval by the County Commission.

If approved, the request to rezone the property to P-R-A (Planned–Residential-Agriculture), would only permit the requested plant nursery use and only in the specific configuration established on the approved site plan. Any other use or other configuration of the requested use (e.g. – addition of a building, allowance of plant sales on site, etc.) would require a recommendation from the MPC and approval of the Chatham County Commission. Additionally, use of the property in a manner inconsistent with the approved conditions could result in Code Enforcement action against the business owner.

The subject property is adjacent to residential properties, The Bethesda Home for Boys, and Trailor Park. The requested rezoning from R-2/EO to P-R-A is conditioned so to as to not impact the residential uses surrounding the subject parcel. In addition, as the requested zoning is a ‘Planned District’, it has stricter conditions that require buffer requirements, limitations of no retail sales on site, hours of operation, specific types of equipment that shall be stored indoors and outdoors, as well as a preservation plan for the existing trees that will require approval of the County’s Tree Arborist. Staff finds that the proposed zoning is appropriate for this location.

Based upon the review criteria, MPC staff recommends approval of the request to rezone the identified property, 9965 Ferguson Avenue with PIN# 10470 01001 from R-2/EO (Two-Family Residential – Environmental Overlay) to P-R-A (Planned – Residential – Agriculture). The ‘planned’ R-A plant nursery in this specific instance is recommended by Staff to have the following conditions:

1. The hours of operation shall be 6:30 a.m. until 6:30 p.m.
2. There shall be no retail sales on site (employee use only).
3. The use of identified storage areas shall be only for vehicles / skid-steer loaders and landscaping materials.
4. The indoor storage shall only be used for other equipment.
5. There shall be a review and approval of a tree survey and preservation plan by the County Arborist.
6. There shall be no storage of waste that would attract vermin.
7. A 25-foot undisturbed vegetative buffer shall surround the subject site.
8. No mulch or composite on the site.

MPC staff recommends denial of the request to rezone the identified property, 1001 Bethesda with PIN# 10504 04005 from R-2/EO (Two-Family Residential – Environmental Overlay) to P-R-A (Planned – Residential – Agriculture). The existing zoning of that parcel shall remain the same and shall not be used in association with the requested plant nursery as it is too small to produce that site as well as being in the middle of a right-of-way which gives access to the residential properties in the back.

Don Dyches, Attorney for Petitioner, stated that rezoning request came from an enforcement action. When the Petitioner purchased the property, he wanted to build a house to run a home office for a landscaping business as well as the ancillary nursery. After purchasing Petitioner decided not to build a residence.

General overview of the site; to the north is a 39-to-40-acre timbered site belonging to Bethesda, currently under CM Zoning and only used by Bethesda to grow trees. Opposite side of the road is a 170-unit Mobile Home Park. Across the corner is zoned PUD-BN, which has Kroger, a gas station and other retail. The Petitioner considered BN or AR Zoning, chose AR as they believe it would be less intense than the BN. At request of Staff the Petitioner submitted as a P-R-A Zoning and limit the use to landscape and greenhouse nursery. Properties to the south and west are zoned R-2/EO. The property to the south is a vacant lot, the other properties are two single home parcels with the same owner.

The property is bisected by an unopened 50-foot-wide extension of Leigh Ave and Bethesda Road. He states the road does not serve as access to any other properties. The single property the road appears to serve has a separate easement that comes across the neighboring parcel and is not on the Petitioner's parcel. That easement is the sole access to that property, the access does not depend on the unopened road. The Petitioner is currently in process with the County to close the unopened road. This is why the decision was made to rezone both parcels.

The Petitioner plans to construct a building to house his office and provide storage for his business. He does store trucks and a skid-steer at the property. As part of the rezoning the Petitioner submitted a General Development Plan. Staff recommended approval to rezone the 9965 Ferguson Ave Parcel to P-R-A with conditions that Staff provided but did not discuss with the Petitioner.

He stated the conditions were not concessions from the Petitioner nor to his knowledge anything a neighbor has asked for. He would like to dispute some conditions the Petitioner believes are inappropriate.

1. The Petitioner would like to run a whole-sale plant nursery, they have no intention of retail.
2. Hours of operation are problematic due to:
 - The Petitioner will not be able to work in the office after 6:30pm.
 - Due to the nature of his employee's work being off site during the day, the Petitioner would need to work on the equipment in the evenings. He believes it is arbitrary and would not disrupt the neighborhood.
 - Restricts use during storms or hurricanes. The Petitioner uses equipment in storm clean-up for his clients.
3. He stated the Petitioner does not agree with limiting where they will be storing equipment and materials.
4. He believes the intent was to make sure things are stored indoors and not outside. He stated the way it is written limits use of the property to storage of equipment; they cannot run an office as limits the property use to storage. The Petitioner asks this be stricken.
5. He stated there are tree outlines the County already has, believes that is a stringent requirement. The Petitioner asks it be stricken.
6. He states since the business is a plant nursery and not a waste facility. He believes the County Health Codes would cover this. The Petitioner asks it be stricken.
7. The General Development Plan has a 15-foot buffer, where Staff conditions are 25-foot buffer. The ordinance has a minimum required buffer which the General Development Plan has met. The Petitioner does not believe an additional 10 feet of buffer is necessary.
8. The Petitioner does use mulch and does not understand why there is a restriction as mulch does not imply health or safety hazards. He stated they do not compost.

Staff recommends denial of the request to rezone 1001 Bethesda to P-R-A, as they deem the parcel too small for independent use. The Petitioner agrees it is too small, however if it is not rezoned, there would be split zoning. If the unopened road gets closed, the Petitioner will have to come back in to get the parcel rezoned to be consistent with the main use of the larger parcel.

Staff mentioned there were no plants growing on the property. He stated the property currently does not have water or power to keep the plants alive. The Petitioner requested the rezone to P-R-A per their submitted General Development Plan but limit the conditions Staff has imposed to no retail and no compost and strike all other conditions.

Mr. Wayne Noha, Board Member, asked the egress would not be on Ferguson Ave, the egress would be on Bethesda Road and accessing directly from Lehigh Ave?

Mr. Dyches stated it turns off Ferguson Ave on to the unopened section of Lehigh Ave.

Mr. Noha asked if that would be a County Road right-of-way? And the intent is to access it from the County right-of-way?

Mr. Dyches stated that is correct.

Mr. Noha asked if the south neighbor use the same access County Road right-of-way? The neighbor in the back uses the easement as well?

Mr. Dyches stated that is correct.

Mr. Noha asked about the fenced-in area, does it encompass part of both the smaller and larger parcels?

Mr. Dyches stated he believes the fence does go across the unopened road and across the edge of the small parcel and ties back into the Bethesda property.

Mr. Noha asked about the composting and that the Petitioner stated debris would not be left on site. Should the Petitioner come in at night with a truck load of palmetto fronds, with no composting and storage of waste. He stated to be careful about how the condition is worded, maybe in regard to long-term storage of waste. He believes there will be waste on the property, unless they take it to the dump before returning the equipment to the property.

Glen Brist, the Petitioner, stated sometimes weather conditions do not permit the trucks to go to the dump, they could get stuck in mud and damage the vehicle. The Petitioner opts to wait for dry weather and has a regular scheduled rotation to remove debris. He does not believe there is significant debris remaining on the property at any time.

Mr. Noha asked about the hours of operation, especially during the summer or after storms, would the Petitioner be out until dark or later working? On average, what are the latest times the crew would be working on sites?

Mr. Brist stated the work crew is usually done between 7:30 am to 5:30pm. As far as office work, the Petitioner would work as late as 9pm if needed to take care of his business.

Mr. Noah asked would the Petitioner be repairing equipment late at night to have it ready for the morning?

Mr. Brist stated most maintenance is done at a mechanic off-site.

Mr. Michael Kaigler, Board Member, stated that an office would be fine, but they have received complaints about the storage of mulch piles on site, so they are an issue. He stated equipment should be in storage or a warehouse. He believes that no storage of waste that would attract vermin, Staffs is referring to mulch piles and compost piles. Stated they want to keep the 25-foot vegetative buffer.

Mr. Dyches stated with respect to the vegetative buffer, their General Development Plan does show a 15-foot buffer and that is what is required under the ordinance. Staff recommended the 25-foot buffer.

Mr. Kaigler stated he agrees with Staff due to the change from residential to the P-R-A, having a buffer would help tremendously.

Mr. Dyches stated the Petitioner is proposing a 15-foot buffer and a fence. They plan to store equipment and such behind the building away from the road. Stated they have spoken to all the neighbors, and they do not have objections.

Mr. Kaigler stated that there have been complaints, it may broader than directly adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Tom Woiwode, Board Member, asked about the buffer. The buffer is requested to be 25-foot. Would there be a problem with the buffer being 25-foot along Ferguson Ave and then 15-foot along the two backsides of the property?

Mr. Dyches stated it takes up usable space and is in addition to what is already in the ordinance.

Mr. Travis Coles stated concerns about talking about the unopened section of Leigh Ave before it was granted. He stated that many points presented are too vague to be enforceable, he believes Staff recommendations address concerns and complaints received by the County.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Board Member, asked to get clarification on the unopened section of Leigh Ave. He asked if 1001 Bethesda is under the Petitioner's ownership?

Mr. Dyches answered yes, that is correct. Stated the road has been inactive for a long time.

Ms. Lauren Boles, Board Member, stated her concerns about emergency services to the properties at the back of the unopened section of Leigh Ave, as it does not appear accessible to her. Asked how many employees and how many trucks currently?

Mr. Brist answered they have 8 employees, 6 trucks, and 2 skid steers.

Ms. Boles asked what are the hours of operation you are asking for?

Mr. Brist stated he is concerned about the office staff's ability to work past 6:30pm, for example the event of an emergency with 25 mile-an-hour winds makes for a longer than standard day of clean up.

Ms. Boles asked what do typical emergency hours look like?

Mr. Brist stated they usually start by 7:30am and would work until the clean-up is done. He stated that he does try to be reasonable with hours, he worries about the limitations of afterhours work for warehouse activities or office staff.

Ms. Boles stated she believes there needs to be a separation between office staff versus landscaping staff.

Mr. Noha stated he can address the comments about emergency access. Stated they have had several calls from the rear property and have never used the unopened Leigh Ave, as there is good access to the back.

Mr. Dyches stated the neighbor is closer to Whitefield Ave.

Mr. Kaigler stated he wants to applaud Staff for the recommendations, but we do need to work on the conditions. Stated he suggested a continuance. He believes discussion with Staff and County Engineers may affect some of the conditions.

Mr. Coles asked Mr. Kaigler would that prohibit the County from enforcing any more violations until the decision is made?

Ms. Jarrett stated it could provide the opportunity to speak with the County to find out whether the Petitioner could include the other property with the unopened Leigh Ave.

Mr. Dyches stated he does not believe they could get the unopened Leigh Ave resolved by the next meeting. He suggested conditioning it on the closure of that road.

Ms. Jarrett stated talking with Staff maybe the Petitioner could work it out.

Mr. Dyches stated the Petitioner requests a continuance.

Motion: Approval of Petitioner's request for continuance to the November 28th Meeting provided the County and MPC Staff can come to terms with the Petitioner.

Motion

Approval of petitioners request to continue item until the November 28th Planning commission meeting

providing the County and MPC staff can come to terms with the Petitioner.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[8. Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment| 505 W. 36th St | 23-005400-ZA](#)

[📎 Application....pdf](#)

[📎 AERIAL MAP 23-005400-ZA-FLUM.pdf](#)

[📎 FLU MAP 23-005400-ZA-FLUM.pdf](#)

[📎 505 W 36TH ST FLUM Staff Report-abm.pdf](#)

[📎 505 W 36TH ST Staff Report Photos.pdf](#)

Anna McQuarrie, MPC Staff Member, presented Petitioner’s request for rezoning of the property at 505 West 36th Street from a Traditional Residential – 1 (TR-1) zoning classification to Traditional Commercial 1 (TC-1) zoning classification in association with a proposed use as a museum. The property, 0.11 acres, will be restored as an African American historic and cultural arts museum with a renovated carriage house.

The subject parcel consists of 0.11 acres (4,792 sf) and contains the Kiah House, a residential building constructed in 1910, the residence of Dr. Calvin L. Kiah and Virginia Kiah and one of the first African American museums in Savannah. The museum was opened by Virginia Kiah in 1959 and closed in 2001 once she passed. Both the main building and carriage house have been unoccupied and deteriorating since the closure. The parcel is in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District, established in 2 1997, and it is one of Savannah’s oldest African American neighborhoods. As of 2021, both structures are listed as contributing resources to the district.

Per the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, “Notable visitors included Civil Rights activist Rosa Parks and artist Margaret Burroughs.” Originally a Prairie style home, Virginia Kiah put a two-story addition on the front, with a full wall of windows to accommodate the museum. Due to the issues surrounding the probate, concerned citizens have been unable to apply for grants, conduct archaeological research, or perform any maintenance to the property. There is strong community support for the preservation and recognition of this resource, yet the house remains in danger of being lost.

The Historic Savannah Foundation hopes to restore the house to its use as a museum. Any construction, demolition, or renovation will need to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission, and any other exterior work will be reviewed by Historic Preservation staff. As a note they are on the Agenda for the Historic Preservation Commission later this month.

The subject parcel is currently zoned TR-1, to the east it is surrounded by TC-1 as well as Traditional Commercial, so it would serve as a nice transition between the two. The Petitioner's Agent reported to MPC Staff they requested a meeting by phone with the Executive Committee of the Cuyler-Brownville Neighborhood Association on October 12, 2023. This was due to the next meeting with the full neighborhood association falling on November 8, 2023, one day after the Planning Commission meeting on November 7, 2023. The Petitioner stated the Neighborhood Association Executive Committee was accepting of the idea to renovate the Kiah House as a museum. MPC Staff have not received any public comments about the rezoning.

The subject parcel is within 0.1 miles of four existing CAT bus stops along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (Route 25) with a continuous sidewalk available from West 36th Street to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

The rezoning request was filed concurrently with a request to amend the Future Land Use Map. At the time of the request, the subject parcel was designated Traditional Neighborhood. This character area is identified by the Comprehensive Plan for residential areas close to downtown or in outlying historically settled areas. This category includes non-residential uses that are compatible with the residential character of neighborhoods. The requested amendment to Traditional Commercial represents an effort to realign the future use of the parcel with its historic use as an African American culture and arts museum dating back to 1959. Traditional Commercial includes commercial uses that should be compatible with the character and scale of adjacent neighborhoods, most often found along collectors and arterials. Characteristics include walkability, limited or on street parking, and multi-tenant retail. The property is adjacent to a Traditional Commercial district on the Future Land Use Map.

The subject parcel is currently zoned TR-1; however, museums are not allowed as a principal use. The TC-1 district allows museums as a principal use and the FLUM needs to reflect TC-1 as well.

The range of uses permitted in the TC-1 zoning district is more appropriate for future restored use of the site as a museum than 5 those permitted in the current zoning district. Approval of the petition, however, should be conditioned on development in accordance with the conceptual plan provided for zoning review. Thus, any future change would require approval of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Preservation of historic and cultural resources is a priority of the City of Savannah. The subject parcel is within a the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District, demonstrating the significance of preserving the historic structure on the property. The proposed development is likely to have less adverse impact on the neighborhood than the current use as an unoccupied and deteriorating building. The proposed use as presented is consistent with the existing (historic) pattern of development in the neighborhood and surrounding area.

The structure has not been maintained and the Historic Savannah Foundation hopes to restore the building to its use as an African American culture and arts museum with the support of the City of Savannah. The building and carriage house are severely deteriorating. Without intervention, the buildings may be beyond repair and lost.

This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to promote and support reinvestment in older and historic places as a key component of community resiliency.

The subject parcel is a residential home that was converted to a museum. The building could not be restored for the purpose of historic use in the current zoning district; however, the home and parcel could have reasonable use as a residence.

Adequate City services are available for the property. The Petitioner will need to provide 1 parking space per 400 square feet with a minimum of 5 spaces. The lot currently has 2 parking spaces in the back and will need to provide 3 more spaces at a minimum. The building is 2,914 sf and the carriage house is 936 sf. If the entire main building is used as a museum, excluding the carriage house, 7 spaces will be

required. Bicycle parking should account for 10% of vehicle parking. Street parking is available on West 36th Street. These challenges will be addressed in the site plan review process and variances could be required.

The Historic Savannah Foundation and City of Savannah will work together to restore the property for use as a museum. If rezoned, to TC-1 it should be under the condition that the use will be restricted to a museum to ensure the building will be restored to its historic use. Looking at new plans that have been recently submitted and are part of the Historic Preservation Commission Application to include two apartments replacing the carriage house. The carriage house was reviewed by an engineer and not found to be structurally sound and will need to be demolished.

MPC Staff recommend approval of the requested FLUM amendment to Traditional Commercial.

Bridget Lidy, Director of Urban Planning and Design City of Savannah, said it is an exciting time for Savannah to recognize African American history in our neighborhoods. A quick overview, in 2022 there was a Historic Marker was placed celebrating the former residents and their contributions. In September of this year, the City of Savannah approved an agreement to provide half a million dollars in support of the development of a museum, as well as provide artist housing. We are excited to be moving forward with the FLUM and rezoning changes. The Petitioner now is the Historic Savannah Foundation, the property recently transferred as of last week. She is working with the new owners, the Gavin Foundation, and will be listing it as the Kiah House Museum Inc.

Jay Melder, City Manager, stated he wanted to make certain the use is limited to museums and includes the use of apartments or carriage house as affordable housing.

Ryan Jarles, Director of Preservation for Historic Savannah Foundation, said to quell any concerns, when they sell a property through their revolving fund, which is what this property is sold through. They have attached an easement to the property, in perpetuity, that requires the museum's use and maintenance. Also included in the sale is a 10-year affordability covenant for the singular apartment proposed in the carriage house. Thank you to Ms. Lidy and the City of Savannah.

Motion: Approval of Staff recommendation for the requested FLUM amendment to Traditional Commercial.

Motion

Approval of the requested FLUM amendment to Traditional Commercial.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jay Melder

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye

Michael Kaigler - Aye
Traci Amick - Aye

9. Map Amendment request to rezone from TR-1 to TC-1| 505 W. 36th | 23-005399-ZA

- 📎 [APPLICATION.pdf](#)
- 📎 [AERIAL MAP 23-005399-ZA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [TC Development Standards City of Savannah Code of Ordinances.pdf](#)
- 📎 [TR Development Standards City of Savannah Code of Ordinances.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Bus Routes.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Principal Use Table City of Savannah Code of Ordinances.pdf](#)
- 📎 [505 W 36TH ST Staff Report Photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [505 W 36TH ST Staff Report-abm.pdf](#)

Item 8 and 9 were presented together. See notes/minutes attached to item 8 for this.

Approval of Staff recommendation for the request to rezone to Traditional Commercial - 1 (TC-1) with the following condition:

1. The historic Kiah House shall be preserved.
2. The only TC-1 allowed use shall be a museum and appropriate apartments.

Motion

Approval of the request to rezone to Traditional Commercial - 1 (TC-1) with the following condition:

The historic Kiah House shall be preserved.
The only TC-1 allowed use will be a museum.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jay Melder

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye

[10. Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment| 2025 Texas Ave. | 23-005385-ZA](#)

📎 [APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [Combined Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [2025 TEXAS AVE plan..pdf](#)

📎 [2025 Texas FLUM Staff Report.pdf](#)

Mr. Morrow, Director of Development Services, presented the Petition for a combination of the Future Land Use Map Amendment and a request to Rezone. The Petitioner is requesting amendment of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) for the property at 2025 Texas Avenue from the designation of Residential – Suburban Single-family to Residential – Single-family. The amendment is requested in association with a proposal to rezone and subdivide the property for the purpose of developing a single-family home on the newly created vacant parcel. Per Section 5.7.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, rezoning to RSF-5 requires a FLUM designation of Residential Single-family.

The subject parcel is currently designated Residential – Suburban Single-family. This character area is identified by the Comprehensive Plan for single-family detached residential dwellings at a density not to exceed five (5) gross dwelling units per acre. This category permits certain nonresidential uses that are compatible with the residential character and scale of the neighborhood on a very limited basis. This designation corresponds with zoning districts: RSF-E, RSF-30, RSF-20, and RSF-10.

As the region grapples with a housing shortage and searches for strategies to support appropriate, contextually sensitive infill development, consideration should be given to whether an area that is east of the Truman, but still very much 'in town' is suitably designated for a suburban development pattern.

The Savannah Housing Action Plan identifies a number of goals and strategies for bridging the gap in housing supply and demand. Action item 5A.1 recommends preparation of a citywide planning document that identifies conditions and opportunities by neighborhood. It is Staff's contention that closer evaluation of this and similar neighborhoods for a more flexible and adaptive zoning schemes could yield desirable infill opportunities – either through reduction of the prevailing minimum lot size or through adoption of a more flexible traditional development approach with an eye toward future reuse of interspersed larger parcels. ADU provisions may also be adjusted as a means of accommodating additional units if a principally single-family configuration is genuinely the best fit.

The proposed amendment is a relatively minor adjustment to meet the consistency requirement of the Zoning Ordinance, as both designations support only development of detached single-family homes. The Residential Single-family FLUM designation is more consistent with the current and requested zoning of the parcel than the current designation. Future evaluation of the neighborhood more broadly should be considered to make the zoning and FLUM more consistent.

The Petitioners are small, local investors. Success in their initial project will allow them to continue to pursue additional single-family infill development projects.

MPC Staff has been informed of productive exchanges with neighbors and the district 3 Alderwoman regarding the request.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested FLUM amendment to Residential – Single-family.

[11. Map Amendment request to rezone from RSF-6 to RSF-5 | 2025 Texas Ave. | 23-005383-ZA](#)

📎 [APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [combined maps.pdf](#)

📎 [2025 TEXAS AVE plan..pdf](#)

📎 [RSF Standards.pdf](#)

📎 [2025 Texas Ave Staff Report.pdf](#)

📎 [2025 Texas_support.pdf](#)

Mr. Morrow presented Petitioner's rezoning request from RSF-6 to RSF-5. The subject parcel is currently zoned RSF-6, RSF stands for Residential Single Family and the numbers designate the minimum lot area. RSF-6 requires lots with a minimum frontage of 60' and area of 6,000 square feet. The request to rezone to RSF-5 to have 50' of frontage and 100' depth for the purpose of dividing into two lots. In essence will end up with two lots that are conforming to RSF-5 zoning district permitting the development of two single family homes.

The subject parcel consists of 0.241 acres (10,500 sf) and contains a one-story single-family home originally built in 1939. The dwelling is listed by the Board of Assessors as having 1,135 square feet of heated floor area and is legally non-conforming with regard to front and side setbacks.

The Petitioner also requested a meeting with the Avalon Neighborhood Association as is required by the Ordinance, but as of the writing of this report, no response was received. Mr. Morrow stated that adequate public services and facilities are available for the proposed development. Additionally, any needed improvements will be identified and addressed during the plan review and building permitting processes.

CAT bus stops are accessible to the west along Pennsylvania Avenue approximately 600 feet away and there are sidewalks along Pennsylvania Ave.

The rezoning request was filed concurrently with a request to amend the Future Land Use Map. At the time of the request, the subject parcel was designated Residential – Suburban Single-family. This character area is identified by the Comprehensive Plan for single-family detached residential dwellings at a density not to exceed five (5) gross dwelling units per acre. The Residential Single-family character area is envisioned as suitable for single-family detached residential dwellings at a density not to exceed eight (8) units per gross acre. This designation corresponds with zoning districts: RSF-6, RSF-5, and RSF-4. The requested FLUM designation is more consistent with the current zoning and development pattern in the area.

The subject parcel does have reasonable use as a single-family home. Additionally, an ADU could be developed on the property to create a second dwelling unit, though an ADU cannot be subdivided and sold.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone to Residential Single-family 5 (RSF-5).

Todd Rodenberg, Attorney for Petitioner Fiddler Investments thanked Mr. Morrow for a comprehensive prestation and asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Mr. Noha, asked a question for Staff, there appears to be a recombination of 3 lots, 18, 20 and 22 is that correct?

Mr. Morrow, said yes sir.

Mr. Noha, stated these would be lots of record, correct?

Mr. Morrow, said yes that is correct.

Mr. Noha, asked what would prohibit a homeowner from splitting out whatever lot is furthest from their home? Were these recombined into one lot, or just lots of record with one pin number?

Mr. Morrow, said this is an interesting circumstance trying to navigate the lots of record. There has been a process created by the Assessor's Office called Recertification of Existing Lots of Record. If it was determined that these lots were administratively combined, say for the purpose of a tax bill. The distinction to be made is that for tax purposes and not zoning purposes. The unique circumstance for certified lots is that people will come forward with a zoning related request with a tax combined or recertified lot. It did not go before the ZBA for receiving a variance, it was combined so the Petitioners would receive one bill, they did not come in and request this the structure built would need to address the

variances, if any variance were required.

Mr. Noha, stated that he has been through this before and it is costly in time and resources. Would it be easier to suggest the Petitioner take one of the 3 lots and not have to go through this process, if they were lots of record.

Mr. Morrow, stated on a case-by-case basis, he may offer that suggestion. Under this case, in the interest in trying to establish and promote the development of pattern of zoning, he wouldn't necessarily feel at liberty to tell them to go the other route.

Mr. Noha, stated today we have heard several times the Staff has guided the Petitioner in certain direction, he personally believes we should give the Petitioners that knowledge and opportunity.

Ms. Jarrett, asked Mr. Morrow if it was possible the Petitioner could go to the ZBA and ask for a variance on the lots?

Mr. Morrow, stated that if the structure they were going to build would be nonconforming, the Petitioner would need to approach the ZBA. However, what allows the nonconforming lot record to exist is because it was platted during a previous zoning ordinance or zoning regime.

Ms. Jarrett, stated she has seen them navigated that way a few times in the ZBA.

Mr. Noha, stated the County specifically has ordinance that speak to substandard lots of record and standard lots of record. Does the City have that?

Mr. Morrow, said the City and the County do both have those provisions.

Mr. Noha, asked who does the recertification?

Mr. Morrow, answered the MPC Staff receives a recertification Plat. At that point Staff evaluates and it has to bear the language 'this is a recertification Plat', and Staff would approve based on that.

Mr. Noha, asked the only thing that would prohibit the recertification is if there were documentation that recombined the lots legally at some point, correct?

Mr. Morrow, said correct.

Motion: Approval of Staff recommendation to rezone to Residential Single-family 5 (RSF-5)

X. Presentations

XI. Other Business

[12. Resolution for updating MPC Bank of America Authorizations.](#)

📎 [2023 Resolution for Bank of America Credit Authorizations .pdf](#)

📎 [Resolution to Authorize access to Bank of America Credit Cards_MWsigned.pdf](#)

Ms. Wilson, Requested approval to change the staff members on the Bank of America accounts to add herself, Pamela Everett, and Ashley Ward to the account.

Motion: Coles motioned to approve the resolution of updating the MPC Bank of America Authorizations. Noha seconded.

Motion

Approval for updating MPC Band of America Authorizations.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- 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
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

XII. Executive Session

XIII. 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.