



Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

April 30th 2024 at 1:30pm
Minutes

April 30, 2024 MPC MEETING

Members Present: Karen Jarrett - In person
Travis Cole - In person
Laureen Boles - In person / On line
Jay Melder - In person
Wayne Noha - In person
Dwayne Stephens - In Person
Tom Woiwode - In person
Jeff Notrica - In person
Traci Amick - In person
Joseph Welch - On line
Michael Kaigler - In person
Stephen Plunk - In person
Joseph Ervin - In person

Members Absent Coren Ross

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, Executive Director
Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning
Brad Clement, Senior Planner, Development Services
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant II, Development Services/Current Planning

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 R-2/EO to B-N/EO | 202 Shipyard Rd | Z-0923-000412](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin - Aye

Tom Woiwode - Aye

Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[2. Map Amendment request to rezone from TR-2 to TC-1 | 1421 W. Gwinnett St | 24-001759-ZA](#)

Motion

Item removed from the final agenda

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[3. FLUM Amendment request to rezone from TR-2 to TC-1 | 1421 W. Gwinnett St | 24-001813-ZA](#)

Motion

Item removed from the final agenda.

Vote Results (Voting)

Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Not Present
Travis Coles	- Not Present
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Not Present
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Not Present
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Stephen Plunk	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Not Present
Michael Kaigler	- Not Present
Traci Amick	- Not Present

[4. 1860 Ft. Argyle Rd. | Specific Development Plan | SP-0324-000458](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[5. Text Amendment | Zoning Ordinance -Article 7, Section 7.8.10\(b\) Hotel Development Overlay District | 24-000559-ZA](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[6. Text Amendment | Zoning Ordinance -Article 7, Section 13-1 Hotel Development Overlay District | 24-000558-ZA](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye

Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[7. Map Amendment | request to rezone from TR-2 to TC-1 | 1100 East 31st Street | 24-002022-ZA](#)

Motion	
Item removed from the final agenda.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	
Second: Wayne Noha	
Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- 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

[8. Approval of the April 9, 2024 Meeting Minutes](#)

 [4-9-2024-mpc-meeting-minutes.pdf](#)

Motion	
Approval of April 9, 2024 Meeting Minutes.	
Vote Results (Approved)	
Motion: Travis Coles	

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[9. Major Subdivision | Hamilton I and Hamilton II of Eastern Wharf | 401 Upper East Avenue | File No. 23-004726-SUBP](#)

🔗 [Staff report.pdf](#)

🔗 [PLAT.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the proposed Major Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

Show the signature of a Georgia Registered Land Surveyor and the owner of each lot on the Final Plat.

Approval by the Chatham County Health Department and the City review departments including the City Engineer.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

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

Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

VIII. Old Business

[10. MAP Amendment | Nine \(9\) Parcels on East Broad St, Gwinnett St, and East Bolton St | 23-001408-ZA | item was remanded back from City Council.](#)

- 🔗 [TC-2 Development Standards.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Arch Site Plan and Elevations 3.1.24.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Color Renderings.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [EX1 GDP PLAN.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Gwinnett Street Apartments S-PD 3.1.24.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Gwinnett Street Apartments Markup_1.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [PUBLIC COMMENT combined.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [McCorkle Exhibit for 4-23-24 special called meeting.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report 23 Apr 24_.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [fpca-presentation-planning-commissionn2024_0423.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff Report. Mr. Morrow stated the Applicant is requesting that the MPC review of an amended application to rezone approximately 1.38 acres located at the southeast corner of the intersection of East Broad and East Gwinnett Streets from TC-2 (Traditional Commercial -2) to S-PD (Small-Planned Development). The proposed development consists of a 4-story mixed-use building with up to 185 apartments and up to 10,000 sf of commercial space. The development proposes underground parking within the building. The proposed PD Ordinance is based on a modified TC-2 use schedule, as well as modified development standards including increased building footprint, increased dwelling unit density, and reduced off-street parking requirements.

Surrounding this area, are single family homes and duplexes, a small PD identified as Park and Broad in the vicinity. There is an electrical substation, a railroad track that runs behind there. The Zoning Board of Appeals heard a petition to consider a Height Variance in association with proposed redevelopment for the theater site that is located on the north side. The zoning map for the subject parcel is TC-2 but in context with parcels that are in TN-1, Light Industrial Restricted, Downtown Residential and Traditional Residential One. The front of the parcels designated as traditional commercial in terms of future land with the expectation that the rear would be less dense single family residential. The Downtown Historic district is on the Northside and the subject parcels are adjacent to the Victorian districts. According to

SAGIS, the subject parcels are in the East Side neighborhood. Dixon Park, Beach Institute, and Victorian in the vicinity. The Petitioner is requesting 185 dwelling units on approximately 1.38 acres. The proposal also includes up to 10,000 square feet of commercial use on the 1st floor. There are requested exemptions for the first 2500 square feet of any nonresidential use with credit for bicycle and motorcycle spaces. Reductions within the current zoning ordinance do exist for the Victorian and Thomas Square neighborhoods. However, this parcel is not located in either of those districts. The current zoning ordinance does also permit credit for off-street parking for the addition of bicycles, motorcycle, and moped spaces. The current version of this development is proposed to be 4 stories up to 49 feet in height. It is proposed to have zero development up to the lot line and at least 185 off-street parking spaces are proposed to correspond to each of the requested dwelling units. The Petitioner has eliminated the fifth story and connected the buildings across East Gwinnett Lane. There is now proposed to be building footprint over that with the amenity space within the middle. There is two way access via Bolton. Cars would enter the garage at this location there and would be a full access entry to the site. They have eliminated the automated parking system and shortened the buildings to ensure that there is adequate fire access. There were no changes to the previous Off-street parking or use standards.. To provide some context, as to Staff's concerns, there are comparable multifamily developments that are located within the area. The present Petitioner is also the developer of the Starland North and South developments. One at 155 dwelling units per acre and the other at 120, relative to others that are also in the downtown area. Some of these are within D-C and others within the vicinity in at 42 dwelling units an acre. Presently this development is at about 134 units an acre, with a total request of 185. TC zoning districts require 435 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit, approximately 100 dwelling units. That is probably not going to be achieved given the restrictions on height and the restrictions on building footprint that are in the zoning ordinance.

Staff evaluated all of the rezoning standards as well as those required for PUDs. It is a comparable development that could be achieved to that in the TC-2, although that requested is a bit more intense, it does address the need for housing units though none are proposed to be affordable. There are concerns regarding the ability to avoid exacerbation of stormwater conditions. That is a condition that could be addressed during the Specific Development Plan review. The Petitioner did not take the opportunity to address those further after SPR. In terms of compatibility, the proposed density is incompatible with its surroundings. It will place strain on the available off-street parking for existing residents. There is inadequate detail regarding plans for loading and deliveries, both small and large. The increase in intensity will make the area less safe for pedestrians, both those who are young and those who are experiencing mobility issues either due to age or disability. In terms of resource protection, the destruction of a former historic church on this site led to the City's creation of policy for documentation of historic resources. In accordance with that, the City Manager's recommendation required or suggested to the Board the documentation of historic assets and reclamation of building materials for any historic structures that are currently on the site. MPC staff has suggested particular design related recommendations to ensure the compatibility of the proposed development with those that are in the area. These types of requirements are not uncommon for parcels situated close to a historic district.

In reviewing the zoning criteria, there were four noted deficiencies which are required by the ordinance. The first being that this is a request to achieve more desirable development standards, more so than a need to create unique development standards to achieve a particular development purpose. Staff acknowledges that some type of development is to be anticipated at this location, but there was nothing unique in terms of a narrative or a proposed market concept to justify the need for a PUD to permit this style of development. The maximum number of trips that was to be generated was not submitted. Development conditions, there were parcels that are within the scope of the project, but that had been identified not within the scope of the rezoning. The closure and sale of the public lane has not been discussed with Staff and Staff is unsure of where any intent on the part of City Council to close the lane and to make it available to the Petitioner as part of the development. The status of any such agreement is unknown. There was no general utility plan provided. Staff does acknowledge that this is something that would commonly happen during the specific development plan review. Nonetheless, there were concerns that were expressed by City reviewers that were not addressed even at this juncture during the review. Staff does recommend approval of the Petition with the following conditions:

1. The public right-of-way and City-owned property indicated on the GDP as not within the scope of the rezoning shall be included in the application and rezoned if the other subject property within the

scope is also approved for rezoning.

2. Reduction of density so that the maximum residential unit count permitted shall not exceed 138 dwelling units (100 du/ac).
3. The required off-street parking space for each dwelling unit shall be assigned to the tenant of the residential unit and available at all times for their exclusive use.
4. If privileged parking treatment is desired for commercial uses at this location, allowances for uses permitted in the S-PD shall be in accordance with those applicable to the Victorian and Streetcar Parking Reduction Area as outlined in Sec. 9.3.7 of New ZO.
5. The proposed structure shall be built in accordance with the provided elevations and perspectives submitted with the application.
6. The façade of the structure shall be clad at least 70% brick.
7. Any use of stucco shall meet current ordinance requirements.
8. Areas where fiber cement siding is proposed for exterior finishing shall be demonstrated on elevations/perspectives and approved by MPC during final master plan review.
9. All proposed fences or walls shall be identified on the forthcoming final master plan presented to MPC along with proposed height and materials to be used.
10. Wall, marquee and projecting sign placement and area shall be permitted accordance with the submitted sign plan found in "Exhibit B" of the S-PD ordinance. All other aspects of signage shall be guided by relevant portions of Sec. 9.9 of New ZO.
11. The S-PD document shall be modified in accordance with the attached MPC Staff markup.
12. The portion of E. Gwinnett Lane adjoining the existing church shall remain open.
13. Floor plans shall be submitted and approved as part of the final master plan review to determine unit-type distribution and associated trip generation.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, asked for further explanation of the reason for including the design standards in the conditions versus including them in the SP document.

Mr. Morrow stated the Petitioner has written a number of standards that both MPC and City Staff found to be conflicting and unclear. The purpose of requesting these within the nature of the actual approval itself, the expectation is that what would be built is what we are seeing through this process and not something that is to be developed based on a future design or redeveloped overtime. A future subdivision simply would not make a lot of sense, considering you're granted a density based on what we're seeing, and Staff expects to see the development be consistent with what's approved by the Board and City Council as this moves forward.

Mr. Melder asked where else has the condition around parking been used? Has this ever been used to assign to the parking unit?

Mr. Morrow said no.

Mr. Melder asked if this was creating a solution that's causing additional problems with parking? Are we going to create a condition where you're going to have around 130 or 180 parking spaces where a number of them won't be used because they're assigned to units that don't use a vehicle?

Mr. Morrow stated the approach that the zoning ordinance uses currently to assign parking is that one space is required for each dwelling unit, with the exception of accessory dwelling units.

Mr. Melder said the cap on the units, if approved, wouldn't change necessarily the mass and height of the building. What is the purpose of the reduction in the unit count?

Mr. Morrow stated the Intensity of use is a major concern here as there is 10,000 square feet potentially proposed of commercial use that is largely unaccounted for. To add this number of residential units in an area where you have single family and duplexes in the general area is extremely intense.

Mr. Melder asked if the cap on the units doesn't change the scaling, just increases the number of bedrooms per unit, are you avoiding the impact or not?

Mr. Morrow stated that this is part of the missing information with the petition. Looking at the type of distribution, seeing the bedrooms, and what the intended uses are. We currently do not have that level of detail to understand.

Mr. Robert McCorkle, Agent for the Petitioner, stated what's on the table in front of you is an apartment building that is four stories tall that has ground floor retail and restaurant space with three stories apartment building above it. It is consistent with what exists all over the edges of downtown Savannah outside of the Historic Districts. East Broad creates a border along the Historic Districts of our City on the east side, similar to the way the Montgomery Street and MLK Quarter does on the West. Over the last 10-15 years, the City has chosen the MLK Montgomery corridor as a location for additional density in the City to try to meet its housing demands. It's outside of the Historic and Landmark Districts. It's outside of the height map and in an area that has traditionally needed redevelopment. It has lots of empty lots, lots of derelict uses, and lots of smaller lots that are available for recombination for a larger scale project. It has been a huge success in the area along the MLK, Montgomery St. Corridor. There are now four story and five story apartment buildings that rundown the Montgomery MLK corridor from Liberty St. all the way back to 35th street. Most of these are located immediately adjacent to one story and two-story residential buildings and one story and two-story commercial buildings and directly across the street from historic neighborhoods. There has been a lot of development down the Montgomery corridor. There is a two-story residential immediately next door to a four-story apartment building, retail on the bottom residential up top. Another four-story apartment building running down the area this is sitting at the intersection of Montgomery and Abercorn. Looking down, there is a four-story apartment building. On the left there's a four-story apartment building on the right, and just to the backside of this, there's another approved four-story apartment building for 85 units on a solid block that has been approved for entitlements immediately passed that will be constructed soon. All of this has accomplished a rejuvenation of the area that's led to additional apartments being built to additional retail and commercial being built. I don't think it would be difficult for anyone to argue that development down an almost identical quarter to the one that we are in has been a positive to the city. We believe the East Broad corridor is set as a mirror. We have lots of empty/ vacant lots. It is located outside of any historic districts, outside of the height map. There are some undesirable uses in the area. We have a significant amount of industrial property zoned immediately adjacent to us. And we have projects like the one across the street, which is great. It's soon to be developed, the theater has been sitting there derelict and empty for many decades.

There is a project going up across the street from us, they were granted a variance through the Zoning Board of Appeals for a four-story multifamily project that has a height of 47 total feet. The permitted uses they could get on the site were about 100 units on the site if they build it out. They have a historic theater in the middle of site which restricts what they can do around it. I'll just note with that site there were no floor plans for that site. There were no elevations for that site, provided there were blocking plans provided as far as how the buildings would be, no elevations, no floor plans, no designated parking area or requirements, no building material requirements, no requirements as far as what that building was specifically going to look like. Other than it be consistent with the site plan and that it be consistent with the height that was shown on the plan on the blocking plans.

Our site consists of nine parcels, 1.38 acres. We have very few neighbors. We have the benefit of natural buffers and trees and industrial properties around us. We are not located in historic district. Currently on the site there are four duplexes which are not affordable housing. They are regularly rented units, half are vacant. Notices have been sent out and these structures will be removed from the site. These are not contributing structures that would be protected by the City. City Staff has requested that we document the buildings and materials prior to tearing them down and to preserve all materials that exist inside of the buildings which we have agreed to do.

There are several vacant buildings in this area. Neither our project nor the ones around us have access directly on Gwinnett. Behind us is a railroad tract that is heavily wooded and zoned Industrial. On the other side of the train tracts there is new residential construction being built. On the sides of us, there are derelict industrial properties that have sat for some time and are covered in graffiti. The Georgia Power substation is directly to the south of us. They do not use any parking or any other use. Our site

has a significant amount of on street parking spaces that are available. This site has two different CAT routes, there are three bus stops in the immediate vicinity. It is in walking distance to grocery stores, an elementary school, middle school, and several churches.

We began meeting with MPC Staff in December of 2022. We originally applied for DX since it was similar to the property on the west side of the city. We believe it provided flexibility to essentially expand downtown into areas that needed redevelopment. MPC Staff asked us to do an SPD for the purposed of finding middle ground between DX standards, which are basically none, and the TC-2 which exists on the site. Over the course of 10 months, we had several Staff and neighborhood meetings. We were on the agenda for this Board 5 times. This is now our third public hearing on the matter. We have done a lot of work making several revisions to the project after working with MPC Staff, City Staff, and members of the public from the neighborhood meetings. We feel this project is very much in line with the other projects in the area. There is no indication of a negative impact of the density to the streets we are using. East Broad is intended to have additional traffic on it. We have moved the traffic out of the lane and will provide adequate to park every unit. We need this density to address policy concerns that exist in our City. I am unaware of this Board or the City ever requiring approval of interior floor plans of apartment units in a multifamily development. I have never heard of controlling how parking spaces are assigned to individual units. The ordinance in Savannah requires that you have one space per unit, which we will provide. There are no design requirements on this site. It is not subject to review. We voluntarily included facade design standards in the SPD that was submitted. If we tie the SPD to the Conceptual elevations, if we change anything, we will have to rezone the property to change the terms in this. Our SPD already has to come back to the Commission, it is written in the ordinance. We will be back before the Commission with a definitive project as to what it will look like when it is time.

Mr. Melder asked why shouldn't you be held to specific design standards?

Mr. McCorkle said we included design standards in our SPD document. What's being asked of us is that we be tied to specific conceptual elevations. Those elevations are conceptual. They are shown what can be done within the parameters that we laid out in our SPD. But our project, just like every other project, is zoned even every other SPD in the City has just that, design standard guidelines parameters to work within. I'm unaware of any projects that are tied unless they're subject to historic review, that are tied to specific site plans. What we have is conceptual, it's going to change. If we tie it to it and then we change the windows or we change to 60% brick, we would have to start this process back over, reapply the rezone and come back through the process again.

Mr. Melder said It is about holding that concept which is being sold to the community as the thing that's actually going to be built. There's some value in that. I certainly understand your point that it is just a concept plan and things change. So, how do we build in those design standards and what in your estimation in the design standards that were included in the SPD petition that didn't necessarily meet MPC staff's idea of good materials or meeting a certain design element? Where do you think your petition fell short and where can it be strengthened?

Mr. McCorkle said we did not receive over the course of this process, specific feedback on the design standards that we provided to the MPC over the last year. If you look at the standards that we provide, we base them on the other historic facade standards that exist in the districts that are across the street from us. There are provisions in there about horizontal divisions in the buildings, about building blocking and other things like that, we took from those ordinances. We specifically limited the materials to brick, stucco, and a couple of others, and eliminated others. If there's an issue with the materials that we've listed, then I think addressing those issues is fine. We haven't seen any specific comments like that. I'm unaware of any project being tied to the conceptual elevations that are being presented in every project outside of historical review, there's going to be some change of it over the time of the process. I'm happy to listen to adding framework requirements about differing materials or anything else other than that we've shown these site plans to all the surrounding neighborhoods. As of right now, that's what we expect the building to look like. If that does in fact change to some degree, we don't want to be in a position where we have to rezone the property.

Mr. Joseph Ervin, Board Member, stated it is my understanding that the MPC sets the conditions. When I see something that says city conditions that has not come before us initially, it broadsides me. I don't know what discussions have taken place between you and the City or anyone else. That doesn't sit well with me. We set the pace as I understand it. You are presenting something that I and I assume the

other Board members have not seen yet, I would like an explanation as to why.

Mr. McCorkle said this body is a recommending body and can recommend whatever it chooses. You have a list of recommendations from staff. All we are trying to do is propose what would be those conditions. It is ultimately up to you to decide what those conditions will be. The conditions that are listed in black here were worked out with City Staff over a process of a few months after we left MPC the last time. I do not know what was sent back from the City to the MPC Staff in advance of reconsideration of this hearing today. I do not control what gets sent back to you from the City. I understand the concern. We were sent back here from City Council for reconsideration, those conditions were attached to what was sent to City Council for approval. I assumed what came back, looked the same.

Mr. Ervin said when I am seeing something for the first time and being asked to make a decision on it the first time. I am concerned about the City conditions that I am seeing for the first time. I cannot make a decision one way or the other when seeing something new. It appears there are City conditions saying you can do this before it even comes to me which says conversations outside of here have happened.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board Member, stated when this left MPC last time, prior to going to City Council, it was recommended for denial. A lot of the changes that we had requested initially, happened post this body and before City Council. So, for your client, it would have been wise to change those things prior to our vote instead of passing us and going on to City Council in a morphed format. City Council sent this back to us because what they were being presented was not what we were presented, and our recommendation was based off of. As far as density, I understand the shape and size of the building is going to be the same, when you convert something into lower density, you can only make a bedroom so small. All of those units will have a certain amount of living space. There should be floor space. 435 square feet for a unit is pushing towards tenement housing instead of actual livable spaces. I want to clarify what we're looking for is some kind of idea of what these spaces are going to be. While we want to build more housing, we also want to make them livable for the people who will reside in.

Mr. McCorkle said the condition listed here were on the staff report that went to City Council in the last City Council meeting. They were attached and included in public packets. This project will have a mix of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units. There is a specific Master Plan this will have to be provided which will be half a million dollars' worth of engineering and architectural design to get through that process. This process for an SPD is bifurcated on purpose. Today we're just creating an SPD that has a framework of what it will look like. If it's approved, we go back to specific development plan which will determine how many one bedroom, how many two bedrooms, how many three bedrooms, what all of those things are going to look. When we apply for that, it will come back here to this Commission for a public hearing to have that discussion about what that looks like. From a zoning standpoint, at this stage, I am unaware of there ever being requirements for approvals of floor plan layouts for units or a distinction of a specific unit, mix in a multifamily development in order to obtain approval of the zoning for multifamily.

Mr. Lauren Boles, Board Member, stated there were a number of deficiencies in the packet that was submitted to us. You said you were going to put this on the screen because it wasn't in the packet. We are having this discussion because these things were left out of the packet. We are seeing this for the first time. How much community engagement have you had? Specifically, I would like to know who was not included. Were there communities that were not included? How would you characterize the overall community engagement and the responses that you have received?

Mr. McCorkle said we are located in the Eastside neighborhood. As the City has had issues with communication with representatives from Eastside. We reached out over a period of 18 months. We have had numerous public hearings; signs have been on the property for a year and a half. We have communicated vial emails, phone calls. I am unaware of us receiving a response from the neighborhood we are located in. My understanding is from the failed hearing last week, there was a representative here from three of the neighborhoods on the eastside. Apparently, they met on site with my client and Alderman Leggett shortly after that meeting. We have had a meeting with the Victorian Neighborhood Association, I believe they sent a letter of support, Forsyth Alliance Group was there as well.

Ms. Boles stated the city is in need of housing. Do you know what percentage of the other apartments in the area are affordable housing?

Mr. McCorkle said he is unaware of any of them being affordable housing developments or even a

percentage of affordable housing.

Mr. Melder said just to clear things up, the City does not have conditions. The conditions that were written in black were recommended conditions that I added to the petition when it went before City Council several weeks ago. There has been no approval, explicit or implicit, to any of these conditions. The new petition, the revised petition, was sent back to MPC so that this Board could hear it so that staff could review the changes that were made subsequent to the last review that MPC made last fall.

Ms. Melanie Wilson, Executive Director/CEO, said a few of the conditions in black are conditions that we discussed that needed to be added. MPC Staff has spent well over a year trying to get the applicant to make these changes before it even came for review. The list of detailed conditions that are on there were made based on the information that was given. The goal was to try to put something together with the petitioner that everyone could support.

Ms. Jarrett said, you mentioned Mr. Elder did not have to do anything for his project across the street that we are asking you to do. Were you aware that Mr. Elder did not ask for a zoning change?

Mr. McCorkle said they asked for a zoning variance.

Ms. Jarrett said yes, they asked for a zoning variance that came before the ZBA. The first time they came before the Board, they were turned down because they had not interacted with the community well enough. The second time, they were granted their four-stories, but they did not get that on the entire site. They got their four stories in the back of the site. He did separate the buildings. He's got 10,000 square foot building footprints. He followed the TC requirements. He has units that reflect the TC requirements. That's why he didn't have to jump through the hoops that we're asking you to. On the Montgomery corridor, are you aware that there is an enterprise development zone there or there was at the time that the three- and four-story buildings were proposed there?

Mr. McCorkle said for part of that corridor there was at one time an additional story allowed, yes. That does not extend the entire length of where the buildings are now.

Ms. Jarrett said one of those projects brought to us a pattern book showing the materials to be used and the way it will be done. It is not unprecedented for the board to ask something like that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Hundsrucker, President of Forsyth Park Community Alliance, stated he supports the 13 recommendations made by MPC Staff. He states what is missing is the respect for historic resources.

Ms. Ellie Isaacs, Director of Preservation for Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they are adamantly opposed to the development at this location.

Ms. Mary Anne Gojdies, stated she is opposed to the project.

Mr. Andrew Jones, Chairman of the Oglethorpe Plan Coalition, stated the project will destroy multiple historic buildings associated with the historic African American Community. The buildings are restorable, and it is affordable housing, they need to be restored not torn down.

Chantel Morton stated she is opposed to the project.

Mr. Ed Perch stated the project is massive and out of scale for the neighborhood.

Mr. Michael Higgins stated he is opposed to the project.

Mr. Tony Riley stated he is opposed to the project.

Mr. McCorkle stated this has been a long process. We have tried to get a product that was satisfactory to everyone. We have no intention of destroying the neighborhood. This project is a good multifamily site because of its location and accessibility. We believe the project will help revitalize the area.

Mr. Noha stated it is his understanding that the petitioner is not in agreement with Staff's

recommendations as presented.

Mr. McCorkle stated yes. We are fine with some of the conditions, but the ones related specifically tying the project itself to the conceptual site plans and the reduction in density, we are not.

Mr. Noha stated this question is for the City Manager. Should these conditions be approved, it then goes to City Council, and they can alter or take away those conditions, correct?

Mr. Melder stated yes.

Motion

Approval of the amended application to rezone the subject property with the following conditions and modifications to the proposal:

1. The public right-of-way and City-owned property indicated on the GDP as not within the scope of the rezoning shall be included in the application and rezoned if the other subject property within the scope is also approved for rezoning.
2. Reduction of density so that the maximum residential unit count permittee shall not exceed 138 (100du/ac).
3. the required off-street parking space for each dwelling unit shall be assigned to the tenant of the residential unit and available at all times for their exclusive use.
4. If privileged parking treatment is desired for commercial uses at this location, allowances for uses permitted in the S-PD shall be in accordance with those applicable to the Victorian and Streetcar Parking Reduction Area as outlined in Sec. 9.3.7 of New ZO.
5. The proposed structure shall be built in accordance with the provided elevations and perspectives submitted with the application.
6. The facade of the structure shall be clad at least 70% brick.
7. Any use of stucco shall meet current ordinance requirements.
8. Areas where fiber cement siding is proposed for exterior finishing shall be demonstrated on elevations/perspectives and approved by MPC during final Master Plan review.
9. All proposed fences or walls shall be identified on the forthcoming final Master Plan presented to MPC along with proposed height and materials to be used.
10. Wall, marquee and projecting sign placement and area shall be permitted accordance with the submitted sign plan found in "Exhibit B" of the S-PD ordinance. All other aspects of signage shall be guided by relevant portions of Sec, 9.9 of New ZO.
11. the S-PD document shall be modified in accordance with the attached MPC Staff markup.

12. The portion of E. Gwinnett Lane adjoining the existing church shall remain open.

13. Floor plans shall be submitted and approved as part of the final Master Plan review to determine unit-type distribution and associated trip generation.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Joseph Ervin

Second: Tom Woiwode

Joseph Ervin	- Nay
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Nay
Wayne Noha	- Nay
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Nay
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Nay
Traci Amick	- Aye

[11. Text Amendment 5.4 \(I-L\) | 100 Old Lathrop Ave | 24-000624-ZA | item was remanded back from City Council](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_April 2024.pdf](#)

🔗 [Indoor Sports Facility Definition.pdf](#)

🔗 [Indoor Amusement Definition.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning presented the Staff report. Mr. Morrow stated this is a petition to amend Article 5, Section 5.4, Principal Use Table, to permit 'indoor amusement' uses as a 'limited' use in the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district. Section 8.4 for any associated use standards that are to be proposed to permit indoor amusements as limited

uses in the IL zoning district. The recommendation that went to City Council was for the inclusion of indoor amusements, indoor sports facilities and theater, cinema, performing arts uses, all of those are still within the scope of this request. This has been requested to be a special use that is sent to City Council. In Section 3.10.8, the review criteria for special use permits. In addressing the previous concerns that we had identified into any future language, the things that Staff had an interest in considering were minimization of interaction of passenger and commercial vehicles in areas that cater principally to commercial traffic. Minimizing exposure of the general public to hazardous chemicals and or activities and avoidance of establishing nuisance generating activities in what is an incompatible location, whether through light noise, traffic volumes generated or other means. Previously we had minimized these concerns through ensuring that anything that would be allowed to do this without Board review would be in a building that was by itself and met all of those other criteria. The context is a little bit different as it moves forward. In an effort to simplify the process for applicants who are seeking to establish indoor amusement or other similar uses within the scope within a light industrial context Staff had looked at the inclusion of a Site Plan requirement in the interest of ensuring that all matters when they are brought forward. Because these are built establishments, these are going to be structures that are already existing, they're in some sort of a context already, whether they be cited individually or in concert with other uses. Again, this is to add these three uses, and these are the special use specific criteria that we're interested in that this be conducted indoors, that a site plan be submitted and items one through 6 are items that are included on the GDP as part of section 3.8.4. This is a list of things that it would be prudent for the Board to consider as we are looking at whether or not the proposed use is appropriate. Again, if someone proposes to construct something that is ancillary, an accessory structure of some sort to be used in association with the proposed haunted house or something of that nature. Location of any proposed screening, fences for walls and also the location and counts of all proposed parking. Those are things that if we have those details going into it. If you know that variances are going to be needed because most of these facilities do not include adequate parking, this should include a GDP that rather than giving a petitioner zoning and they're requiring them to come back at a subsequent review either by the ZBA or by this Board through a GDP approval, to bring that plan forward so all of these things can be approved or moved forward together.

MPC staff does recommend approval of this revised amendment to make this a special use with conditions.

Mr. Robert McCorkle, Attorney for Petitioner, stated this was previous approved as a limited use and that for the most part they agreed with Staff's conditions. We understand the need to show a Site Plan in connection with a variance for parking or access issues. Adding a Site Plan requirement in connection with the application itself, is adding an extraordinary requirement on this particular use that is different than other Special Uses. We will be required to submit a Site Plan before we can get a building permit. My concern is this is going to delay the process. We prefer it be removed for expedience purposes. We will come back with a Site Plan just like all other uses in the City.

Mr. McCorkle asked, isn't part C saying if we require variances, we need to provide a GDP and B requiring us to provide a GDP automatically pursuant to 3.8?

Mr. Morrow stated if no variances to standards were required, this would not snag anyone. As long as the petition does not require variances, condition C would not slow them down. This is a subtle difference, it is a conceptual plan as opposed to a GDP. These are two separate processes. There is a zoning action versus an actual Site Plan.

Mr. McCorkle stated, that he would ask that the word conceptual is inserted in front of the word Site Plan on B. It will be clearer then. It was confusing reading it. If we could call that Conceptual Site Plan, we would support staff recommendations.

Mr. Stephen Plunk, Board Member, asked if Staff would be ok with adding the word Conceptual.

Mr. Morrow said yes.

Motion

MPC Staff recommends denial of the requested text amendment to permit 'indoor amusement' uses in the I-L zoning district as a limited (L) use.

Alternatively, Approval of the following text amendments:

To permit 'indoor amusement', indoor sports facility, and theatre/cinema/performing arts; uses as a Special Use (S) in the I-L zoning district in Section 5.4, Principal Use table, with the following use-specific standards to be included in Article 8, Section 8.5, Commercial Use Standards for Limited and Special Uses:

Section 8.4.52-4 Indoor Amusements | Indoor Sports Facilities |

Theatre/Cinema/Performing Arts

In the light industrial (I-L) zoning district, the following shall apply:

All activities shall be conducted indoors.

A site plan shall be submitted and approved with the petition including the following:

Existing zoning of all parcels within 100ft; of the property line

Land uses and structures within 100ft; of the property line

Existing rights of way and points of ingress/egress to the property

Footprints of existing and proposed buildings/structures to be used in association with the request

Location of any proposed screening, fences or walls to be constructed in association with the proposed use

Location and counts of all proposed parking

Where variances to development standards of Article 9 are required, a site plan meeting the requirements of a GDP in Sec. 3.8.4.a shall be submitted and approved concurrently through the Special Use process.

The Planning Commission recommends denial of the requested text amendment to permit 'indoor amusement' uses in the I-L zoning district as a limited (L) use.

Alternatively, The Planning Commission recommends approval of the following text amendments:

To permit 'indoor amusement,' 'indoor sports facility,' and 'theatre/cinema/performing arts' uses as a Special Use (S) in the I-L zoning district in Section 5.4, Principal Use table, with the following use-specific standards to be included in Article 8, Section 8.5, Commercial Use Standards for Limited and Special Uses:

Section 8.4.5* Indoor Amusements | Indoor Sports Facilities |
Theatre/Cinema/Performing Arts

In the light industrial (I-L) zoning district, the following shall apply:

- a.All activities shall be conducted indoors.
- b.A conceptual site plan shall be submitted and approved with the petition including the following:
 - 1.Existing zoning of all parcels within 100' of the property line
 - 2.Land uses and structures within 100' of the property line
 - 3.Existing rights of way and points of ingress/egress to the property
 - 4.Footprints of existing and proposed buildings/structures to be used in association with the request
 - 5.Location of any proposed screening, fences or walls to be constructed in association with the proposed use
 - 6.Location and counts of all proposed parking
- c.Where variances to development standards of Article 9 are required, a site plan meeting the requirements of a GDP in Sec. 3.8.4.a shall be submitted and approved concurrently through the Special Use process.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Wayne Noha

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[12. Map Amendment Request to Rezone R-2/EO to P-R-A/EO | 9965 Ferguson Ave & 10001 Bethesda | Z-0823-000406](#)

[📎 Staff Report .pdf](#)

[📎 Application.pdf](#)

🔗 [Site Plan.pdf](#)

🔗 [Development Standards for R-2 \(Table 1\).pdf](#)

🔗 [RE_ Request for rezoning _Donald E. Dyches, Jr property ID is 10518-04002.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning presented the Staff report. Mr. Morrow stated this is a petition to amend Article 5, Section 5.4, Principal Use Table, to permit 'indoor amusement' uses as a 'limited' use in the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district. Section 8.4 for any associated use standards that are to be proposed to permit indoor amusements as limited uses in the IL zoning district. The recommendation that went to City Council was for the inclusion of indoor amusements, indoor sports facilities and theater, cinema, performing arts uses, all of those are still within the scope of this request. This has been requested to be a special use that is sent to City Council. In Section 3.10.8, the review criteria for special use permits. In addressing the previous concerns that we had identified into any future language, the things that Staff had an interest in considering were minimization of interaction of passenger and commercial vehicles in areas that cater principally to commercial traffic. Minimizing exposure of the general public to hazardous chemicals and or activities and avoidance of establishing nuisance generating activities in what is an incompatible location, whether through light noise, traffic volumes generated or other means. Previously we had minimized these concerns through ensuring that anything that would be allowed to do this without Board review would be in a building that was by itself and met all of those other criteria. The context is a little bit different as it moves forward. In an effort to simplify the process for applicants who are seeking to establish indoor amusement or other similar uses within the scope within a light industrial context Staff had looked at the inclusion of a Site Plan requirement in the interest of ensuring that all matters when they are brought forward. Because these are built establishments, these are going to be structures that are already existing, they're in some sort of a context already, whether they be cited individually or in concert with other uses. Again, this is to add these three uses, and these are the special use specific criteria that we're interested in that this be conducted indoors, that a site plan be submitted and items one through 6 are items that are included on the GDP as part of section 3.8.4. This is a list of things that it would be prudent for the Board to consider as we are looking at whether or not the proposed use is appropriate. Again, if someone proposes to construct something that is ancillary, an accessory structure of some sort to be used in association with the proposed haunted house or something of that nature. Location of any proposed screening, fences for walls and also the location and counts of all proposed parking. Those are things that if we have those details going into it. If you know that variances are going to be needed because most of these facilities do not include adequate parking, this should include a GDP that rather than giving a petitioner zoning and they're requiring them to come back at a subsequent review either by the ZBA or by this Board through a GDP approval, to bring that plan forward so all of these things can be approved or moved forward together.

MPC staff does recommend approval of this revised amendment to make this a special use with conditions.

Mr. Robert McCorkle, Attorney for Petitioner, stated this was previous approved as a limited use and that for the most part they agreed with Staff's conditions. We understand the need to show a Site Plan in connection with a variance for parking or access issues. Adding a Site Plan requirement in connection with the application itself, is adding an extraordinary requirement on this particular use that is different than other Special Uses. We will be required to submit a Site Plan before we can get a building permit. My concern is this is going to delay the process. We prefer it be removed for expedience purposes. We will come back with a Site Plan just like all other uses in the City.

Mr. McCorkle asked, isn't part C saying if we require variances, we need to provide a GDP and B requiring us to provide a GDP automatically pursuant to 3.8?

Mr. Morrow stated if no variances to standards were required, this would not snag anyone. As long as the petition does not require variances, condition C would not slow them down. This is a subtle difference; it is a conceptual plan as opposed to a GDP. These are two separate processes. There is a zoning action versus an actual Site Plan.

Mr. McCorkle stated that he would ask that the word conceptual is inserted in front of the word Site Plan on B. It will be clearer then. It was confusing reading it. If we could call that Conceptual Site Plan,

we would support staff recommendations.

Mr. Stephen Plunk, Board Member, asked if Staff would be ok with adding the word Conceptual.

Mr. Morrow said yes.

Motion

Approval of the request to rezone the identified property, 9965 Ferguson Avenue with PIN# 10470 01001 and 1001 Bethesda with PIN# 10504 04005 from R-2/EO (Two-Family Residential – Environmental Overlay) to P-R-A (Planned – Residential – Agriculture) with the condition that it be contingent upon the acquisition of the unopen right of way from the County. The ‘planned’ R-A plant nursery in this specific instance is recommended to have the following conditions:

- 1. There shall be no retail sales on site (employee use only).
- 2. There shall be no deliveries or operation of heavy equipment between 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m.
- 3. All work vehicles, trailers and heavy equipment shall be parked in identified parking areas; other equipment shall be stored indoors or in vehicles/trailers. Landscape materials shall be stored in identified storage areas.
- 4. There shall be a 15-foot buffer with an opacity of at least 85% surrounding the site. A privacy fence 6’ in height shall be placed within the 15’ setback. The buffer shall be landscaped where it adjoins improved right-of-way.
- 5. No composting activity shall be permitted. Debris shall not be permitted to accumulate, and any stored material piles shall not be of a height visible from the rights-of-way or adjoining properties.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

IX. Regular Business

[13. Variance for Development Plans | 1511 Staley Ave | 24-002024-ZA](#)

🔗 [EX - Internal Circulation.pdf](#)

🔗 [Exhibit 1 -C400 - SITE PLAN.pdf](#)

🔗 [Exhibit 2 - CITY OF SAVANNAH COMMENT.pdf](#)

🔗 [1511 STALEY AVE_24-002024-ZA_VARIANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANS.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report 24-002024-ZA 1517 Staley Avenue .pdf](#)

🔗 [Combined public comment.pdf](#)

Mr. Brad Clement, Development Services Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report. He stated that the Petitioner requests approval of a Site Development Plan for a vehicle terminal with a variance to permit gravel versus the required asphalt/concrete impervious surface type. The gravel area will be common to both the interior site circulation lanes and storage areas where the vehicles awaiting transit will be stored. As mentioned, it is located at 1517 Staley Ave not 1511. The Light Industrial restricted district is established to accommodate industrial properties that were developed prior to 1960 and which are typically located adjacent to or within residential areas. The zoning district exists to accommodate uses that were pre-existing, and so it is rare that we see new uses moving into this area, redevelopment of existing uses, repurposing of buildings as they exist. The parcel shows a bunch of trees with a telecommunication tower located to the rear of the lot. This would be new development in an otherwise light industrial restricted zoning district. The site plan that was proposed requires a variance. It would essentially be a screened fenced yard area comprised of gravel surface. This Site Plan as proposed meets both the use and the pervious surface type which requires the variance. City Staff had determined that the use is appropriate based on the zoning. It is a by right use. We're looking at the site plan as proposed with the dependent various variance for your approval. The other caveat based on the restricted part of the light industrial is that the ancillary storage function of the use. May not exceed more than 20% of the site. That is one of the restrictions on the zone. We understand the outdoor storage is necessary. That's what is required for the site to function as it is proposed, but it may only consume 20% of the site. Outdoor storage by right is not allowed in this zoning district. The MPC staff, looking at the proposed use tied to the site plan as presented with the variance recommends denial of that site development plan and the variance not based on the identified use that was accepted by the city, but the functioning of this plan as presented with the variance asked.

Ms. Karen Jarrett, Chairwoman, asked if it was roll on roll off storage.

Mr. Clement stated, yes at a massive scale but it exists as a vehicle terminal. Part of that other thing that is not written in the ordinance is the typical intermodal transit, either from truck to rail, rail to truck, boat to land to truck, that's also absent from the site plan as it was presented. When you think of what a vehicle terminal does, how it works, things that are required for it to function in that capacity, it was not presented as part of this site plan. When I say roll on, roll off, that's language that I introduced to get you thinking about vehicle terminals, what they look like and how they function.

Mr. Scott Barnson, Petitioner, stated he is the engineer on the project representing the owner of the property. The intent for the property is to serve as a temporary location. The vehicles will come in, be inspected, there's no building on site, so there will be no employees on site. They already have a location in Garden City. The intent is when vehicles are dropped in, the employee will come from Garden City, check the vehicle in, make sure everything is signed off and any necessary paperwork and then go back to the office. Up to 50 vehicles was discussed is being stored here. Regarding the outdoor storage percentage, we sent an internal circulation plan that only shows 15% external. We were just here for the use of the gravel instead of pavement. We had previously sent the Site Plan in for grading in January of 2023. It was originally denied because it was listed as a laid-out yard. The owner provided more information stating the use and how we operate. After discussing that with the MPC staff it was determined that the vehicle terminal was an acceptable use at that time, and we were allowed to proceed with getting grading plans for the site which were approved in April 2023. So now that he's finished clearing and the grading, he just wants to finalize the site.

Mr. Dwayne Stephens, Board Member, asked what the intended path of traffic was.

Mr. Barnson stated it hasn't been provided to him yet. The site that the owner owns, and the employees will be coming from is in Garden City off of Telfair Road and there may be some travel back and forth from that site to Telfair.

Mr. Stephens stated it is a major concern as to where the intended traffic is coming from and going to. The access is relatively limited. You either have to go all the way down Stale to Montgomery to get back

to I-516 or you go through neighborhoods. Either one presents an issue.

Mr. Joseph Ervin, Board Member, asked what the hours of operation would be.

Mr. Barnson said currently in Garden City it is 7am to 5pm. This is not a site that will have employees. There is no building shown on that location.

Mr. Ervin asked how many trucks per hour.

Mr. Barnson stated that has not been clarified yet.

Mr. Ervin stated that passing through a residential neighborhood, he would not want that disturbing him from 7am-5pm.

Mr. Michael Kaigler, County Manager, asked if the issue is the impervious lot and it being paved or not?

Mr. Clement said yes. There is another exhibit that is included in the Staff Report that shows the internal circulation. Both Traffic Engineering from the Cty and MPC Staff, based on the perceived intensity of the stated use, would require that to be paved. Per the ordinance, the entire lot would be paved. The application was given to staff with the designated use approved by the City as a vehicle terminal. I included the language of how vehicle terminals are defined by the ordinance and how they're intended to be used, which is what is tied to the Staff recommendation of denial for the requested variance.. You are seeing both the site plan and the variance as submitted.

Mr. Stephens asked if the current zoning allowed the current use by right.

Mr. Clement stated yes.

Mr. Jarrett asked if the vehicles delivering the cars will be large car carriers.

Mr. Barnson stated there may be some larger carriers. The owner is expecting to have two car carriers as well.

Ms. Jarrett stated if there is even a possibility of larger, the driveway needs to be changed because cannot have those large trucks going into the other lane to turn into this facility or coming out and turning into the other lane to get on the road. This is a busy road.

Mr. Stephens stated we cannot infringe upon people's rights, but we are starting to run into a proliferation of these car carrier yards. They are bottlenecking traffic everywhere. Staley Avenue is two lanes, one in each direction. It will choke that street down.

Ms. Jarrett stated for this use is going to be approved the driveway would need to be redesigned.

Mr. Barnson stated they could increase the radius and put a 40-foot driveway at that location that should help.

Mr. Clement stated those comments were also made by Traffic engineering in the SPR meeting. When permits to finish this out are received, those requirements exist. Also, if the variance is denied, he will have to resubmit and show where those paved areas are.

Mr. Noha asked how many trip counts were going to be on this property per day.

Mr. Barnson stated they have not done a traffic study. The plan is to limit to 50 cars on site per day.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Glenda Jones, Vice President of Liberty City Richfield South Over Community Improvement Association, stated the lot was cleared off a long time ago. The lot already has gravel on it and is not wide enough for even a tow truck to traverse. We are concerned about gravel kickbacks. There is a derelict cab to an 18-wheeler that has already been sitting there for 18 months. Staley Avenue cannot

afford to be bottlenecked. This community does not want to have this type of business here.

Ms. Anna Walker, representative for Growing in Grace Church, stated thank you for hearing our request for denial of the petition. Staley Avenue is sometimes used as a detour when there is an accident on I-516. This will just make the traffic even worse. There are a lot of elderly people in this area. The derelict cars that are already there, give our community a derelict appearance. The noise these heavy truck poses are present when bringing in, releasing, and loading cars waiting to be transferred out. The possibility of oil and other fluids contaminating the gravel surface that's currently there. Most importantly, our street is not able to hold the weight of constant coming and going of industrial vehicles. Trucks of this kind tend to park along soft shoulders of the road while waiting to enter the premises, which also causes damage to the side of the road. We do not want any additional business that does not bring any positive attributes to the appearance, the tranquility, or the value of our neighborhood. They are asking that these concerns be addressed if this request comes up again.

Ms. Rose Brown, Growing in Grace Church, stated they are very opposed to this project.

Ms. Donna Myers stated the gravel does not stay in place. There is a great concern for flooding in the area. Children walk this road to go to and from school and this is a danger to those children. Please deny this request.

Dr Estella Shabazz, Mayor Pro Tem and Alderwoman for the 5th District, asked for clarity on what is being approved today, a Site Plan, a Variance, or both.

Mr. Clement stated when these applications are submitted it is a Site Plan that is tied to a variance. It indicates there are some dependencies for the functioning of the Site Plan that require that variance.

Mr. Ervin asked, are you saying that irrespective of what we do this plan will be as it is? Or are you saying we're simply looking at this from a standpoint, whether it's gravel or whether it's pavement?

Mr. Clement stated the variance is a request for just gravel. The City has accepted the use as a by right use. If you find that there are dependencies on the Site Plan for that use based on the variance asked, you may deny the variance and send the application back for further review and adjustment to reflect what your findings may be.

Ms. Melanie Wilson, Executive Director/CEO, stated you can either support the recommendation made by Staff or make a different recommendation to support the variance to allow them to put gravel down. They're asking to deviate from what their requirements are in the ordinance. City Staff looked at what the proposed use was and approved the use. If you find that that use is more intense than what the application is here for, you can deny it, send it back for another determination, or even send it to the Board of Zoning Appeals to see if they concur with the fact that this is a different use. The zoning is an old legacy zoning district. The Board can recommend denial if they choose, and let the applicant know they need to revisit how the property will be used. If the Board agrees that the use is appropriate, then the decision would be whether or not he should use gravel versus asphalt/concrete which is what the standards reflect.

Mr. Ervin asked if the property was zoned for the use that is being asked of today.

Ms. Wilson stated based on the application submitted, yes. This is part of the legacy zoning, the issue, is what is being proposed consistent with those uses that are identified. Again, if you agree that the use is allowed, the question is, do you want that use to move forward with gravel or asphalt. Asphalt is the requirement, and the gravel is the variance.

Mr. Stephens stated the point that he wanted to raise is the Site Development Plan and the variances are up for consideration, that is what we need to be ruling on.

Mr. Jeff Notrica, Board Member, stated the neighborhood also has the right to appeal this being a usable zoning.

Ms. Jarrett stated the definition for the zoning is this is Light Industrial restricted; it says in the Staff Report the IL-R District is established to accommodate industrial properties that developed prior to 1960

and which are typically located adjacent to and within residential areas. This district may also allow limited commercial light manufacturing and assembly research and development and small-scale warehousing and processing uses in order to promote economic viability and encourage employment growth.

Development must be operated in a clean and quiet manner, with all activities occurring primarily indoors and should not be a nuisance to nearby nonindustrial uses.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, stated he supported Staff's recommendation for denial. He asked if the reason for the variance that they're looking for an impervious surface so that they don't have to do any additional stormwater?

Mr. Clement stated no, the plan shows the stormwater detention to the rear of the property near the telecommunication facility, accommodated by their proposed gravel use. The stormwater impacts compact gravel and concrete are effectively the same with respect to runoff characteristics.

Mr. Melder asked why they want to have gravel instead of asphalt.

Mr. Clement stated it is less expensive.

Dr. Shabazz stated she just wanted to be clear and for our residents to be clear. That we have two situations here that's happening today. This is for the Site Development Plan and the variance to be voted on by you. If I am reading this Staff Recommendation correctly, it says the MPC staff recommends denial on Site Development Plan and the variance to allow for the alternative impervious surface, pervious surface type construction. I just want to be clear; this is what you all the Staff has denied for recommendation. The SDP and this variance for using gravel instead of asphalt. Is it correct, the community can come back and make some type of petition or come back to the Zoning Board of Appeals, or to MPC to deny this use of this parcel?

Ms. Wilson stated if the MPC recommends denial for this use, then the applicant, should they decide, could appeal that decision. If the Board decides to approve this case, then the neighborhood could appeal that decision. Both parties have the right to appeal. You have to appeal within 30 days with regards to the use. The neighborhood may want to have a conversation with regards with the Owner to see what other options that they can mutually agree to. With regards to how that property can be used, that might be more palatable to the to the Community, and it might be something that the applicant might agree to do.

Dr. Shabazz stated that is one thing the community wants to state on record, the applicant has not reached out to the Community. We would like for the applicant to sit down with us. The zoning as it states, the development must be operated in a clean and quiet manner with all activities occurring primarily indoors and shall not be a nuisance to nearby nonindustrial uses. This zoning use does not fit this property. It's going to be a total nuisance to the community. It is going to be outdoors instead of indoors. The other point I want to make, these 18 Wheelers trying to back into these small entrances to these. We do not want this to take place. We want everybody to deny it and this and the property owner needs to come and talk with our community so that all can come to some type of consensus regarding the property.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board Member, stated he thought that we may need to look at a text amendment to change this from a check mark to a limited use in the I-L-R because it seems to me that there's a lot of I-L-R's adjacent to neighborhoods that really need to have a closer look and to suspend this kind of uses in those spaces.

Dr. Shabazz stated the petitioner also stated the main operation is in Garden City. Who is going to sit and wait for someone to come from Garden City meanwhile having four or five trucks backed on Staley Avenue.

Mr. Ervin stated primarily in African American communities we suffer from zoning ordinances that date back that allow these uses in our community. Part of what his concern is, it's going on for far too long. It's time for us to make some changes because we deserve the same rights as people on the landings, to have quiet communities that are not interrupted by large trucks. I grew up in that area, this is a problem.

Ms. Laureen Boles, Board Member, stated they needed to take a closer look at what a best use for this site would be. She asked what does the Future Land Use Map require.

Mr. Clement stated Residential.

Mr. Barnson stated the owner stated he was only expecting four to five vehicles per day. The Site is cleared because we obtained a clearing and grading permit from the City after it being classified as a vehicle terminal. The City Engineer signed off on that mid-April 2023. There are no vehicles on site. There has been gravel started to be laid but I stopped him until we obtain the second part of the permit. We can widen any driveways necessary to allow turning into the site. The reason for coming here today was to get approval to allow the use of the gravel. We are under the use allowed for outdoor storage. We are only at 15% right now. There is no building on site. Everything will be stored outside but within 15% of the site which meets the ordinance for the land use.

Motion

DENIAL of Site Development Plan and the Variance to allow for the for alternate pervious surface type construction. The City Traffic Engineering Review Team concurs with this determination (Exhibit 2).

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Michael Kaigler

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[14. Master Plan Amendment | 691 Highlands Blvd | 24-001942-PLAN](#)

🔗 [Density Approval 23-001033-PLAN March 2023.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

🔗 [HIGHLANDS MASTERPLAN AMENDMENT TRACT N-1_APPLICATION_SIGNED_4.2.24.pdf](#)

🔗 [HIGHLANDS MASTERPLAN AMENDMENT TRACT N-1_HIGHLANDS MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT 4.2.24.pdf](#)

🔗 [public comment combined.pdf](#)

Mr. Brad Clement Development Services Senior Planner provided the Staff Report. He Stated, the petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to the Master Plan for the Highlands Tract N 1

PUD. Tract N 1 was a single family attached or detached tract within the larger development which is the Godley Station located at the intersections of Highlands Blvd. and Morgan Lakes Industrial Blvd. near the city of Pooler and the City of Savannah jurisdictional boundaries. The proposed change amends only the map portion of the PUD and does not change any designated land uses or increase in previously approved density. During the course of the build out of the larger development, all dwelling units and the resulting density were calculated and allowed for. It is a by right per the PUD, that density may be transferred to a different tract as long as the use type is not changed. This is not a change to what exists in the development standards, it is a change of what had previously been designated for Tract N 1. The light beige color on the map went from light beige to dark brown, representing multifamily apartments. When it was approved originally in March of 2023 the density shifted but the map did not change. In the process of accepting their plats and Site Plans moving forward Staff caught something that didn't match. This this entire process is to update the Master Plan with the development standards and the map. That is the purpose for this request to change the color on the map. This is in fact, in 20 years. Over those 20 years residential tracts have converted to commercial, large tracts that were previously part of the PUD had fallen out completely and became incorporated into Pooler. That total density number over 20 years has stayed what was originally approved. There are approximately 830 dwelling units less than what had been previously approved, even with the density shift and the change to apartments. Because of that, MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested Master Plan amendment, bringing the associated density into alignment with the Master Plan as identified. There have been several calls asking about this zoning change. This is a PUD, not a by right, zoning or otherwise, through the ordinary zoning ordinance process. It is done through a plan amendment, which is what you're seeing here.

Mr. Neil McKenzie, Coleman Company, said we're here today to officially assign the use of multifamily to Tract N, a 28-acre portion of the tract to allow more housing options in the Highlands area. As mentioned, this is part of the north Godley PUD. Multifamily, Single family detached, and attached are all used by right in this PUD. In March of last year, I did submit an amended plan that transferred some of the units from Tract L & M to Tract N to create a maximum cap of the density on Tract N of 520. That shift in the density was approved. Part of that application was a Master Plan that showed apartments on the 28-acre portion to the west and townhomes on the 31-acre portion to the east. In subsequent fashion, we have had a plat come to MPC that was carving out the multifamily portion of this and that is where all this came up. In terms of density, similar to other tracts in this PUD C2 and E, they're 12 per acre. This portion of Tract N that we have on this new Master Plan is also 12 per acre. In context of the larger Master Plan, this is one of the most westernmost parcels of the Highlands. The completion of this tract will build the Highlands out. This has been a 20-year project. This multifamily portion will round out the Highlands and we feel like it's at a good spot next to the Industrial, there is a 200-foot buffer between the Industrial and Tract N and Tract M. We have the density, and it fits with the neighborhood and is an allowed use in the PUD.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Barb Stuck, stated she is a homeowner in the Highlands area. The community is very unhappy with the amount of density in this area. She stated this was not the amount of density that was originally approved for this area. She stated the concern for traffic and schools. She stated they feel these should be single family homes in this area.

Cathy Sheridan, Homeowner in Tract L, stated she was very unhappy with the changes. She stated there was no notice of the change that happened back in March. She stated the people that were within 300 feet were notified but no one else. The traffic is horrible. It takes 45 minutes to drive 6 miles to the Publix due to the traffic on Benton Boulevard. To drive on Morgan Lakes Boulevard, you risk your life. Trucks park on both sides of the road waiting for the gates to open to get into the warehouses. There just is not enough room for the increase traffic this will cause.

Mr. Travis Coles, Board Member, asked for clarification regarding density.

Mr. Clement stated the way the density is measured across the entire development, which is how a PUD works, the density went down. Across the entire development the density that was approved for all of Godley Station North, went down.

Mr. Michael Johnson, 7th District Representative on the Savannah Chatham County Public

School Board, said he was unaware of any conversation taking place with the School Board regarding this. The issue is the fact that we have already rezoned and moved people around from these neighborhoods, year after year. We're treating our families and kids as yoyos when it comes to going from Godley Station to New Hampstead, back to Godley Station, and now we're going to have to do it again. This issue doesn't just affect traffic, it affects families, it affects kids, it affects the entire community, from the youngest 4-year-old to the oldest person who can live on their own. This small little area is going to feel it going up, they're going to feel how the growth of it is going up. We can't build schools as fast as you could build an apartment complex. With this amount of influx of people coming in and with the transient community that we have, it's going to affect the schools, it's going to affect the culture within the schools. It's going to affect the culture within this neighborhood. And it's also going to affect the fact that we're going to have to rezone again after we said we're going to do our best not to have to rezone. You're putting the school district, staff on the school district and those of us who try to work with the County and the cities and all the jurisdictions, this one area is the fastest growing in West Chatham County. I know we're 10,000 units under what we should have. However, we need to maybe pump the brakes, look at really where the growth needs to be, keep it as single families. Keep it to where these people can have a better quality of life.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, asked do you believe that we should consider, though, that the School Board, after 20 years of understanding the density of this tract, hasn't accounted for that density in their long-term planning?

Mr. Johnson stated he has been on the School Board for 8 years. I have been trying to get other school in West Chatham. There have been other priorities as a whole School Board. If it was up to me, Pooler would already have a high school and another middle school. Bloomingdale would have a high school and another middle school because of the growth I see in my fulltime job. The problem I see when it comes to long term planning, there are so many jurisdictions all competing for the same planning sources. I think people saw the growth, just not in the magnitude or quickness that it came.

Mr. Melder stated his is the kind of development if we're going to grow, we want to see. We want to see developments that are going to be planned for a long time that are going to be built overtime that are going to incrementally change the capacity so that we can build the infrastructure to grow up with it.

Mr. Leonard Caver, a resident of the Brookline community that is directly across the street. There is a corridor at a gridlock at the back exit of our community. This expansion is not realistic. This kind of growth will increase danger in traffic alone. We found out about this by word of mouth because one sign was put up over 300ft away. We had over 200 signed petitions within the past 7 days asking to denounce this.

Mr. Thomas East, a resident of Highlands in Cumberland Pointe stated that the traffic is a nightmare. Apartments put more people and cars in the area than single-family homes do. The schools are already overcrowded, and children will have to move.

Mr. Rick Gaylord stated the combined areas creates too much density in a smaller area. The traffic will get bottlenecked in that area.

Mr. Manny Zed stated this plan shows more homes in a smaller area. He stated it creates a concentration in just a small area, more homes in less area.

Mr. Andrew Wing, a resident of the highlands, stated he is petitioning against this plan. The area needs to stay in its original plan design with single family homes.

Ms. Eileen Swan stated she is a resident of the Highlands. She stated as residents are extremely unhappy with Landmark and the changes that they are making.

Mr. George Marshall stated he is a resident of the Highlands and was under the impression, like everyone else, these would be single family homes in this area. They are against the petition.

Mr. McKenzie stated effectiveness is the purpose of creating this PUD. When we created the density of the units on Tract N, we pulled from Tract L, M and N which are in the same area. The entitlement for the homes was there. We are just moving it to Tract N.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Boles asked if the concerns for community engagement notification could be addressed.

Mr. McKenzie stated when this came through before it was a minor change to the Master Plan since it was a by right use and density, so community involvement wasn't part of that process. Minor changes are done at a staff level.

Motion

Approval of the requested Master Plan amendment bringing the associated density into alignment with the Master Plan as identified.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk
Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

15. Map Amendment request to rezone from P-R-3-6 to PUD-M | 5011 Garrard Ave | Z-0324-000459

- 🔗 [Exhibit 1.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Exhibit \(PUD\).pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Application.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Exhibit 2.pdf](#)

Mr. Brad Clement, Development Services Senior Planner, provided the Staff Report. He stated the Petitioner requests approval of a Rezoning/Map Amendment and acceptance of a General Development Plan. The rezoning from P-R-3-6 (Multi-Family Residential 6 units per acre) to PUD -M (Planned Unit Development - Multifamily) mixed residential development including townhouses, flats, and apartments. The subject property consists of 3.175 acres of undeveloped land on two parcels. The lots are situated on the southern side of Veterans Parkway where Garrard Avenue crosses under the parkway near the access road leading to the Liberty Oaks Apartments north of the Villas of Garrard development. There's an in-depth explanation of the difference between what may be similar with planned residential

multifamily 6 units for this and the planned unit development multifamily and the County Ordinance. There are some differences as it relates to mixing residential uses and densities of those uses. It is unusual that an area of only 3.1 acres would be a PUD. The minimum is 3 acres, so it's just above that. This is easier for a single developer to come in and develop the whole thing at once with the mix and multitude of uses. These properties are not currently served by any water or sewer. For any development of any significant density that would be a requirement. He has sent secured a letter of the availability of water and sewer which would be provided by City of Savannah. That is not a utilities agreement negotiating will have to happen before a Master Plan is accepted and all other artifacts are produced. Today is merely a conversation about potential rezoning to a PUD classification. There are no PUD documents on record today. The petitioner has concepts of what he intends to do.

Mr. Pat Shay, Architect for the Petitioner, stated his client asked them to look at the two lots and come up with a strategy of how to redevelop them. Currently they are abandoned former single-family homes. The area is predominantly single-family homes. There is a neighboring development in the area built out that are townhomes and further down the road an entrance to an apartment complex. He stated he started working with the idea of having a couple of relatively small apartment buildings in the back of the development, create a private street, but make it more like a complete street along the spine. Take townhouses that were really patterned after urban rowhouses and sort of deconstruct them a little bit so that they're in in pairs, but the townhouses are multi-story in the front on the private street frontage and then in the back, they have little carriage houses with private garages with single studio apartments above them. These are those missing middle sized apartment buildings. But they also would allow enough space leftover for some common green space in the back. There's also a pond on this side, and it is a County drainage easement. Then each of the townhouses would be able to have private courtyards between the townhouse and the carriage house. That gives private green space associated with each of the townhouses. The reason that I wanted to use the PUD instrument in order to do this was because it allows more flexibility in terms of how you locate things within the property and would allow a concept like this one to be possible.

This plan has 14 townhouses, 14 carriage houses, 14 units each in each of the apartment buildings. Parking requirements would be townhouses have two parking spaces; carriage houses have 1.25, studio apartments within the apartments have 1.25, 1-bedrooms within the apartments 1.5, and we have 8 two-bedroom apartments with 1.75. The 87 required parking spaces and 88 provided within the Site Plan. When I do these layouts, what I find is that we end up with something that looks like a parking lot with some small buildings. I worked very hard to try and figure out a way to get an urbane level of density but do it in a way that would be very nicely compatible with a relatively suburban neighborhood. We also had discussions with Chatham Area Transit, they were excited about this as a legitimately transit oriented development. Garrard Avenue is on one of the better lines of Chatham Area Transit bus line 25. There is a bus stop here that has just been converted to both inbound and outbound. This plan would provide a net density of 27 dwelling units per acre which is less than what the PUD-M allows, which is 40.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lawrence Rogers expressed concern regarding flooding in the area. The Townhomes caused flooding across the street when they were built. He stated there needs to be an outlet for the water before anymore development.

Mr. Shay stated there is a topographic survey for the area, and this is way above the flood plain. It sounds like the ditch in the back is not doing its job. We have talked to a civil engineer to work on stormwater and drainage.

Mr. Clement stated there are no conditions attached to this report because if approved, with the PUD, if you do not like the way it looks when it comes back, you can deny it.

Ms. Amick asked for clarity if this is 3.175 acres. Current zoning is allowing for 6 units per acre (20). The PUD density based on what is shown you are going from 2 to 87 dwellings. Is that what we are approving today?

Mr. Clement stated the Petitioner does not have approval for water usage set by Savannah Utilities yet. He will need to get that approval before moving forward and determining exact density.

Mr. Morrow stated this is slightly different because this is an inbuilt PUD, an older ordinance in the County. When we hear PUD under the City's current standard. It is more like having an idea about what you want to do and creating a set of standards. That is why we are careful when we see PUD in the City. This has a clear set of standards that if we go through the ordinance right now, we can see that it already has a framework. This is something that will come back to you. And if there are concerns and it doesn't meet any of those specified criteria for the PUD M, then we will absolutely identify those and say this is where it misses the mark.

Ms. Jarrett asked if it will hurt the applicant if we ask him to do more research/exploring and come back with something a little more concrete.

Mr. Shay stated he could not agree to come back to the point where there is an SPD unless he knows that this concept is generally acceptable. If you believe that if I come back with a development density of 87 dwellings. And you believe that that's not going to be acceptable, then just vote it down. And let's just stop talking about how we want to have more housing in Chatham County or how we want to be able to do all this stuff, you know, and just say what we say. We say what you believe. This is within the framework of a rather strict framework within the County Zoning ordinance for a PUD M and that's what we would like to. We would like to get your affirmation that we're headed in the right direction or else, it'll just stay to abandoned houses.

Motion

Approval of the requested Zoning Map Amendment and acceptance of the proposed General Development Plan as they are consistent with and satisfy the requirements of Section 4.5.61.b General Development Review Process. Furthermore, staff finds the rezoning of this parcel is consistent with the surrounding property uses.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jeff Notrica

Second: Stephen Plunk

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[16. Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment| 4801 Meding St | 24-000287-ZA](#)

🔗 [Wilson Brown MPC Review of the Fairgrounds RFP Submittals 12112020.pdf](#)

🔗 [THE LEGACY_CONCEPT PLAN 2024.01.10.pdf](#)

🔗 [Press Release.pdf](#)

🔗 [Application_Jan 2024.pdf](#)

🔗 [DRI Additional Information Form #3547.pdf](#)

🔗 [DRI Initial Information Form #3547.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_V2.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, provided the Staff Report. He stated this is a petition to amend the Future Land Use Map for the former Fairgrounds site at 4801 Madding St. This is a 66.5-acre site. The City has a very strict consistency requirement. The expectation is that in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, this is going to be a Planned Development. Based on the information provided by the City, we understand that we are to expect approximately 400 additional homes supporting work force expansion. The future mixed-use development will feature recreation, housing, film studios, commercial uses including 25 single family homes, 6 townhouses, 6 duplexes, 147 small scale apartment houses, and 216 apartments which translates to approximately 6 dwelling units per gross acre.

The Roberts Engineering preliminary report shows generally what is the anticipated layout for this site. This is the creative exchange. It currently exists as senior housing development. Many of these are also variations of housing. It is anticipated that this is going to be mixed use in addition to housing. Everything identified in yellow is the recreation uses. Where the intent of the proposed development is known, allowance to the PD designation is ideal as customized regulations are meant to account for unique and specific development constraints and objectives. We have heard repeatedly that this is the largest contiguous piece of land left in the city. It is City owned. This is more or less consistent with the Plan 2040 designation for urban core and consistent with the Planned Development designation. Most importantly, there was a Council work session where this was described. On that basis, Staff is making a recommendation of approval.

Mr. Jeff Notrica, Board Member, asked how many acres of high ground and how many units.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager, stated 47 acres of high ground and 400 units total, max. This is something that has been talked about over the last 12 years, called the Fairgrounds Project. City Council approved a development agreement last week. There was another public workshop session on that development agreement, all of the phases and all of the housing. That was held just last Thursday. There was a public workshop session a year before that, in 2022, when the purchase and sale agreement was also approved that delineated all of these land uses. The land use is also our verbatim and what the winning proposal was in 2021, which spells out the exact acreage and the uses for the development. The one Georgia grant the City of Savannah received from the state of Georgia, the Department of Community Affairs. That application was first submitted in January of 2024. We received the Grant award four months later. We're very excited to have that award and to be able to provide \$2.5 million for the development of workforce housing. I want to note that in the Development Agreement, it states that all 400 units that would be allowed on the site shall be affordable housing and it spells out. The affordability of all those housing for every unit that is produced 37 1/2% of all units will be available only for households making 40% or less of area Median income. 25% of all lease units for households making between 40% and 60% of area median income. And 37 1/2% of all leased units only available for households making between 60% and 80%. That's one of the most deeply attainable housing that we've been able to create in the city of Savannah. There will also be homes for sale. Nearly 110 homes for sale on this site. All of the homes for sale will be made available and only available to households making at or less than 80% of the area median income. And if that household is sold, it would have to be sold to a qualified home buyer not making more than 80% of the area median income and not spending more than 30% of their household income on that monthly housing bill to include the mortgage, the insurance, and the property taxes. There is a stipulation that all houses are owner occupied and there is no student housing on the site. All leased units are for low-income housing allowed for the low-income housing Tax Credit Project for apartments for senior citizens, which is age restricted to 55, which will be single bedroom. many of them, all of the other leased units will be two- and three-bedroom units. The City is very proud of that Development Agreement very proud of this project. Thank you, Dr. Shabazz.

Motion

MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested FLUM amendment for the 66.5 acre parcel at 4801 Meding Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Stephen Plunk

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

[17. Amendment to Future Land Use Map from TN-1 to TC-1 | 1201 Abercorn St,115 E. Duffy St | 24-002111-ZA](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

🔗 [1201ABERCORN_PAGE 1 AND 2 OF REVISED APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [FLU MAP 24-002111-ZA.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, provided the Staff Report. He stated the next three petitions are all connected. The first item is going to be a look at the Future Land Use Map. The second one is going to be a request to amend the zoning map along with a noted reduction in available parking and a special use request for allowance of accessory alcohol sales and a banquet hall. All three petitions will be presented together. The first one, the Future Land Use Map amendment from Traditional Neighborhood to Traditional Commercial. We can see the existing FLUM indicated for Traditional Neighborhood use.

The first one contains a contributing historic resource in the local Victorian district, and a parcel that is proposed to be used as parking to be exclusively used in association with the new use. The designation according to Plan 2040 is for urban core, it anticipates commercial mixed-use civic institutional or short-term rentals. Transportation is interconnected street grid, multimodal transportation. These are in town uses that are consistent with urban dense land use. Specifically, this is requested to go to a traditional commercial designation business areas and close proximity to downtown. Commercial uses should be compatible with the character and scale of adjacent neighborhoods most often found along collectors and arterials, emphasizing walkability, limited on-street parking and multi-tenant retail. Again, this is a proposal to redevelop an existing church that is a contributing structure in the Victorian district. Currently it has been vacant for a while, so the applicant is proposing to redevelop this and turn it into a

commercial use. Staff does recommend approval of the request to amend the FLUM.

The second item is a request to amend the zoning map, assuming that the Future Land Use Map amendment is approved, that strict consistency requirement from T-N 1 to TC-1. And then the Special Use permit considerations to allow accessory alcohol sales within a restaurant and based on the provided floor plan. Staff is including evaluation for use as a banquet hall. It is smaller than the proposed restaurant use. It's the second story, but because it's there, we wanted to point that out for consideration at this point. This is in the T-N 1 zoning district, there is TC-1 zoning in the area. Staff's primary interest at this point is in identifying the way that the site itself should be appropriately situated. Things that are considered in the future should be brought back to this Board for consideration of any reconfiguration of the site itself. Things that would be permitted by right that are requested, theater, cinema, performing arts, bank, catering establishment again, this is proposed to be a restaurant. The banquet hall and ancillary alcohol sales require a Special Use. The noted use is for a restaurant with a small banquet hall upstairs. The proposed Site Plan and one of those processes we tried to integrate this time simply because it makes sense to allow the Board, given its authority to approve Site Plans, to look at consideration of the fact that only seven off street parking spaces would be created through allowance of this use. If it is determined by the Board that this is inappropriate, chances are the rezoning itself would likely not be appropriate, nearly anything other than a very small number of the uses that you've seen here could reasonably be configured to work on this site. Staff is recommending a recombination of this so that those parking spaces would always be tied to this commercial use.

So again, asking your consideration that any future use in essence be limited or approved. In view of the fact that only these seven off street parking spaces would be available. It's our understanding this is intended to be about a 150-seat restaurant. The Tax Assessor says the total structure contains about 6400 square feet. The second -floor plan we were provided, the banquet hall space that was identified. The banquet hall is defined by the ordinances, a facility available for lease by the general public for parties or events. It includes the kitchen facilities that are associated with such use. Because this is in the Victorian and Streetcar District, there are certain benefits that are associated with that. The first 3000 square feet of any nonresidential use in the district is parking exempt. Beyond that, there is a further parking reduction for eating and drinking establishments. MPC staff recommends approval of all three of the requested amendments and also your consideration of approval of the directly proposed restaurant and banquet hall uses that you have seen based on the site plan and floor plans that have been submitted connected to the rezoning, a recombination plat for the subject parcels be submitted upon approval by rezoning and then development be consistent with the plan reviewed and approved in association with the rezoning petition. And then finally, for the special use accessory alcohol sales and association with the restaurant banquet hall that these uses be nontransferable.

Mr. Joshua Yellin, Attorney for the Applicant, stated because this is a historic site, this will be a historic credit tax deal. The former church will be preserved. It will be rehabilitated. We have attended the neighborhood meeting, there was very positive support for this project. The development team is all local.

Ms. Brianna Paxton, Project Manager for 1201 Abercorn LLC, stated we is just closed on this building recently. I want to give you brief background on this building. It was constructed in 1887 and for the Duffy Street Baptist Church. There have been a lot of changes on the building from 1887 and 1911 because it got hit really hard by that 1896 hurricane in Savannah. There was lost a good portion of the building. It was rebuilt and reclad in brick that was done at the design of Witchover and Eichberg. Witchover helped design the railroad buildings at Georgia Railroad yards. A lot of those brick buildings might seem familiar, and Eichberg, of course, designed Savannah City Hall. This building served the Duffy Street Baptist Church until around 1927, and that congregation moved to form the Bull Street Baptist Church. And this property was purchased and the Asbury United Methodist, a black congregation, moved into this property in around 1927. That congregation had formerly been in different locations since the 1870s. The Asbury Congregation was well known in the black Community Doctor and Virginia Kyle were members there as well as SL White, who started the first black Boy Scout troop in Savannah. This building has a lot of history in its years. The property was listed to the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation's places in peril in 2020 because there's a hole in this roof of the northeast bell tower or several other deferred maintenance concerns. The congregation did work with Historic Savannah at that point, and Landmark Preservation and did a whole assessment of the building and started down fundraising efforts, but ultimately made the tough decision at the end of 2023 to decide to sell the property. The new property owners, two of them live within a 5-minute walking distance of this

building. That was part of their designs on being able to purchase this to be able to do something productive with it in the neighborhood. I do want to share some more current photos. The back is the photo on the right, just sharing that that property to the rear that will be reconfigured for parking and there is lane access there. Here are some interior shots where the sanctuary as you walk in is in pretty good shape, but as soon as you walk to the right, some of these ancillary spaces have faced harder conditions from that water infiltration, as I was mentioning with the holes in the roof. The applicants have been working with the church. They have been able to take out carefully some stained-glass windows that had been installed in the 1970s to move to their new location. The new property owners are taking out some of the pews and holding them in storage for the congregation to be able to utilize in their new location.

Mr. Yellin stated we are adding seven parking spaces, the church now, we estimate probably upwards of 300 seats in it with 0 parking. We are doing the best we can with the restraints of the site, to add parking. There will be challenges to the parking. The developer could have carved this up into two smaller restaurants, or into fifteen different office spaces, each space being less than 3000 square feet. We know for certain those people would park on the street. We are trying to provide the parking that we can with the space that we have available. The banquet hall is not intended for a more private space. We support Staff's recommendation for the rezoning, the Special Use, and Variances that are shown on this site.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Ellie Isaacs, Director of Historic Preservation for Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they were in full support of the zoning change and rehabilitation of Asbury United Methodist Church.

Mr. Edward Urioste, stated he is in support of this project.

Motion

Approval of the request to amend the FLUM to reflect Traditional Commercial use.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Stephen Plunk

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

- 🔗 [1201ABERCORN_PAGE 1 AND 2 OF REVISED APPLICATION.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [ZONING MAP 24-002007-ZA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [TC Uses and Dev Standards.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [TN Uses and Dev Standards.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

See minutes from the previous item (FLUM).

Motion

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

A recombination plat for the two subject parcels shall be submitted upon approval by Council.

Development shall be consistent with the GDP reviewed and approved in association with this rezoning petition. Future redevelopment of the shall require MPC approval of a new GDP.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Stephen Plunk

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

19. Special Use Request to allow accessory alcohol sales in restaurant withing TN-1 | 1201 Abercorn St/115 E. Duffy St | 24-002006-ZA

- 🔗 [1201ABERCORN_SPUSE_APP.4.5.2024.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [ZONING MAP 24-002006-ZA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

See minutes from the previous item (FLUM and MAP Rezone) Items were presented together.

Motion

MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested Special Uses 1) to permit ancillary alcohol sales and 2) to permit use as an event venue with following condition:

1) The Special Use Permit shall be nontransferable.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Stephen Plunk

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Coren Ross	- Not Present
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Not Present
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Not Present
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye
Traci Amick	- Aye

X. Presentations

XI. Other Business

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.