



## Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

### FEBRUARY 28, 2023 MPC MEETING

Members Present: Dwayne Stephens, Chairman  
Travis Cole, Secretary  
Laureen Boles  
Shedrick Coleman  
Jay Melder  
Wayne Noha  
Jeff Notrica  
Joseph Ervin  
Tom Woiwode  
Michael Kaigler

Members Absent Elizabeth Epstein  
Karen Jarrett  
Joseph Welch  
Malik Watkins

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director of Compliance and Operations  
Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services  
Melissa Paul-Leto, Senior Planner  
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant

#### I. Call to Order and Welcome

#### II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

#### III. Approval of Agenda

#### IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

[1. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 22-004383-ZA | Albion Street | Special Use Permit for Place of Worship](#)

#### Motion

Item removed from the final agenda.

#### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin - Not Present

Tom Woiwode - Aye

Travis Coles - Aye

Joseph Welch - Not Present

Shedrick Coleman - Aye

Karen Jarrett	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Not Present
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- Aye

[2. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT | Accessory Dwelling Units| 22-005883](#)

**Motion**

Item removed from the final agenda.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles  
 Second: Wayne Noha

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

[3. MAP AMENDMENT | 343 Buckhalter Road | Rezone from R-A-CO to I-L | 23-000304-ZA](#)

**Motion**

Item removed from the final agenda.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles  
 Second: Wayne Noha

Joseph Ervin	- Not Present
--------------	---------------

Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye
Joseph Welch	- Not Present
Shedrick Coleman	- Aye
Karen Jarrett	- Not Present
Dwayne Stephens	- Aye
Wayne Noha	- Aye
Jeff Notrica	- Aye
Laureen Boles	- Aye
Elizabeth Epstein	- Not Present
Malik Watkins	- Not Present
Jay Melder	- Aye
Michael Kaigler	- 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 Items Requested to be Withdrawn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

## VIII. Old Business

### [4. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 1800 East 63rd Street | Rezone from RSF-6 to RMF-2 | File no. 22-004421-ZA](#)

- 📎 [Staff Report 4421 rev.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Context Aerial.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Concept Plan ver 1.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Maps Combined.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Street Sections.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Contour Exhibit.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Pre Truman Parkway Aerial Image.pdf](#)

**Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services**, said, the petitioner is requesting to rezone the subject parcels to the Residential Multifamily designation (RMF-2-20) with the intent of developing the property as apartments on the east side of the Truman Parkway and north of Reuben Clark Drive. The proposed density is 20 units per acre. The hearing was continued from the January 17th meeting so that a neighborhood meeting could be held. The meeting was held on February 21st with approximately 30 attendees. The property is currently zoned RSF-6 (Single Family Residential), the applicant is requesting the RMF-2 (Residential Multifamily) zoning district. The site is undeveloped and has been the subject of proposed rezonings in 2000 and 2003 which proved unsuccessful. Additionally, a 2013 rezoning request resulted in a conditional approval by the Planning Commission but was withdrawn prior to a hearing by City Council due to unresolvable development issues. The petitioner originally applied in September to rezone the PIN 20104 30014 only but continued the hearing for the purpose of finalizing an option on the adjacent property so that it could be included on the request.

The proposed primary access is from Reuben Clark Drive. Reuben Clark Drive is a public / private section of road that extends from DeRenne Avenue, adjacent to Jenkins high school, and bridges the Truman parkway. It then crosses through Memorial Hospital and intersects with Waters Avenue. The only portion of the road that is public right of way is where it extends from Derenne Avenue to the subject property. The portion that bisects the subject property, the bridge, and the portion that traverses through Memorial Medical Center is private. The primary use is for access to the hospital, including emergency services. However, the entire road operates as if it is public. Currently the only other intersecting street is a service road into the high school. The applicant intends to access the subject properties at two locations on either side of the private section of the road near the top of the hill. The area has access to the City's public water, sewer, and stormwater systems. There is a major utility easement that bisects the property. This impacts the buildable area and would be a factor in any design layout of buildings, access drives and possibly infrastructure. The applicant has been in discussion with Georgia Power regarding the relocation of some of this infrastructure. The proposed zoning will allow a development pattern that is dissimilar to properties in the immediate vicinity. The adjacent properties are small scale single family residential dwellings. Although there will be some separation between the uses by existing vegetation. The easternmost portion of the development will likely interact visually with the neighborhood. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as Residential General and Conservation. This split designation is likely due to the stormwater impacts created by the higher grades around the parcel.

The subject property, historically, abutted the Casey Canal. The canal basin separated the nearby neighborhoods from the neighborhoods to the west and the property which includes Memorial Hospital. The construction of the Truman Parkway rerouted the canal and Reuben Clark drive was constructed to provide additional access to the hospital. The developers of the residential subdivisions east of the subject property appear to have recognized the fact that the areas closer to the canal would be difficult to develop. The succeeding years did not result in any development in the area, apparently due to the perceived difficulties.

While there are clear challenges and significant redevelopment costs associated with this site, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed zoning, which is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, is appropriate; and that it is the developers responsibility to meet the standards of the City of Savannah development review process.

One of the things that was discussed in depth at the previous meeting, was the general development pattern, the context being primary single family residential along with some institutional uses including the schools that are on that side. The other major issue was related to access to the property. This proposal includes, 165 unit, 5 story building at the curve of Reuben Clark Drive adjacent to the neighborhoods to the south which are single family and potentially the realignment of an existing major power line that runs through the property and a second building right at the bridge going over the Truman Parkway. We did spend some time at the previous meeting discussing the suitability of developing on this site. It was staff's position that the property is a unique property from the standpoint of trying to develop it based on its location, based on the topography, access to the property, and the adjacency of the single-family neighborhoods to the east and north. Staff's finding was this zoning classification at this density is not compatible with the area at large. Post, the neighborhood meeting on 21st, both on yesterday and today, staff did receive additional comments from neighbors via email. Those were not attached to the agenda because it was already published. We received 4 letters of objection between yesterday and today. Some of those individuals may be here to speak. They are expressing concerns about the environmental impacts of development on that site. Staff recommended denial at the initial meeting. That recommendation still stands.

**Mr. Robert McCorkle, Representing the petitioners Columbia Adventures**, said as Marcus mentioned the subject parcel is two properties. My client has them both under contract. Of those 21 acres, about 3 of them are developable. What we are proposing is an RMF-2-20 zoning district which will allow for construction of multi-family apartment project on the site. At the last meeting, there was a lot of discussion about the difficulty of developing this site. there is a power line that does have to be shifted over. There are surrounding wetlands around the area that is to be developed. It is expensive land in general. We do not believe this property will ever be developed as single-family residential area because of the difficulty and cost of the construction. We do not believe as we mentioned at the last meeting, the complexity of the development of this property should render it permanently unusable. What we are asking this

Commission to make a recommendation for, is an opportunity to unlock the potential of this piece of property so it can be used to help and meet the housing crisis that our city is currently going through. We believe this property is in fact consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. My client has over 30 yrs of developing multi-family projects across multiple states and multiple types of complex situations. The property is in a great central location in our city. It is adjacent to Truman Parkway, it has access to hospitals, schools, and public utilities. I imagine that an apartment complex in this location will be a prime location for someone who works at the hospital where someone would want to live. There is a private road existing between the property and the hospital itself. When this item was tabled in January, it was tabled for the specific purpose of providing a neighborhood meeting. The MPC staff set up that meeting. Marcus, hand delivered to all the residents in the surrounding area, notices of the meeting. At that meeting, which lasted about an hour and a half, there were approximately 30 people there, we received some constructive comments. We tried to address some of those comments in our revised conceptual plan which was shown earlier.

There were several general comments that I would like to address today. One is that we will be putting traffic into the neighborhood, both driving and pedestrian traffic. That seemed to be one of the top two issues. As for driving, my client has gone to great expense and effort to get the southern parcel of these two parcels under contract from Memorial Hospital that includes the private road, Reuben Clark Drive, to make it a part of this development for this specific purpose of getting the traffic out of the neighborhood. As shown, Reuben Clark Drive runs all the way out to DeRenne. It will only provide access to our property and to the hospital essentially the way it is laid out. There is a large, divided entrance and exit onto DeRenne Avenue, two lane road, wooded on both sides. As for pedestrians, there was request made at the meeting about us having a fence or a wall. People will somehow find a way to go around whatever will be constructed there to keep people out of the neighborhood. These are public roads. I can't promise there will not be a single person that walks out of this development and into the neighborhood. I will say, the people who will live in this apartment complex, will be residents. All of the services for this apartment complex will be provided off DeRenne access through Reuben Clark Drive, our private road. We do not believe there is any real reason for individuals to be walking into the neighborhood. The second item I would like to address is, increase flood risk because of impervious services being constructed inside of the property. No matter what is developed on this property, they will be impervious services. It is worth knowing the low point and the outfall for this property as well as the neighborhood is west of this property, not going towards the neighborhood. We will be required to have substantial engineered infiltration and stormwater management infrastructure constructed in connection with what we do.

The city needs housing and apartments, it needs a mix of opportunities for residents beyond just single family. That is what we are here to offer, we think, with the addition of Reuben Clark Drive particularly, and given that this piece of property will essentially have private access off of DeRenne, we can do this in the right way.

**Mr. Travis Coles, Vice Chair**, said, on the rendering, which is similar to the one presented at the last meeting, it shows an area buffering along the eastern part of the property. That buffer does not exist. There are no trees there, that is on private property, adjacent to the property you are talking about developing. Is there a reason why that is still being represented on this?

**Mr. McCorkle** said we are not trying to represent specifically what is trees and what is not trees or what may be bushes or what is grass or what, this is just a rendering of where this is greenspace around the edge of the property. Some of this is not on our property, which was also pointed out by the owners. The only thing we are showing as far as trees, are trees we intend on planting and lining on the property.

**Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member**, asked for clarification regarding emergency access for the property.

**Mr. McCorkle** said we do not know whether the city will require us to have emergency access there or not at this point. If we can have the property without having to have an emergency access, we will not put one on there. We will not know until we go through the site plan process.

**Lynne Strickland, Member of the public**, said, if this property could be rezoned the area, that would be a better solution. If this area is developed, we are going to have flooding like you won't believe. We have had flooding in this area in the past. This is where the Casey Canal used to run. We see a problem with the wetlands that are already there, if this is developed. To say the other 18 acres would be affected by these 3 acres being developed, I believe, is just trying to pull something over on the City of Savannah.

The property they are trying to develop backs right up to the properties on 63rd and Springhill. There is a buffer everywhere but there. As far as the emergency access, that is only a proposal and if, there is nothing guaranteed with that. Those things are not being addressed properly. We already have Savannah State and other shops already in our neighborhood. I am not for a wall, fence, or anything because I am not for a 5-story building in the wetlands.

**Mr. Justin LaBrich, Member of the public,** said, I am a resident on 63rd street. I am not here to impede progress or growth in this city but, I am here to oppose the future rat factory that will be built at the end of my street. I understand the desirability of our neighborhood as profitable, but at whose expense? Ours, the residents, the citizens, the taxpayers. After a heavy rain, the immediate neighborhood, including myself, would be terrified that the rain will flood our houses because the wetlands can no longer do their job. I attended the meeting on July 21st, the same meeting where the developers did not show up, we were given a diagram of potential plans and nothing more. The lawyer, Mr. McCorkle, could not answer a simple question of how they plan to cram 254 units on 3 acres. Still unanswered. The map we have, looks promising if you are trying to make a buck, but if you are a citizen, it is an eye sore.

**Mr. Alex Wolfe, Member of the public,** said I live one block down the street from the proposed development. I did talk to a multi-family development architect about this development. He did not feel it was an appropriate use of this space. The lot is suitable for a single-family residence. It is developable for a single home, perhaps on stilts or something. You could safely put a house there and not impede on the flooding. The proposed development is out of scale with the neighborhood. Being five story, the next tallest building is only two stories. It would stand out. The proposed emergency access only, can easily disappear in the development process leaving that corridor open for traffic through the neighborhood causing congestion etc. Parking, this rendering is not appropriate for one-to-one parking. There are not enough parking spaces for the number of units they are proposing with a 5-story building. Parking would inevitably spill out onto the street. There is inadequate onsite turn around space for emergency vehicles if you look at that plan. I am not an expert, but my understanding is that you need a 100ft diameter turn around space for a firetruck and other safety stuff. This will cause increase traffic in our neighborhood and the surrounding streets. It will increase flood risks for the existing houses due to impervious services.

**Ms. Robin Gunne, Member of the public,** said I live on Armstrong Drive which is at the other end of 63rd street from where the proposed building on the current site plan will be developed. I am opposed to this development. We are here to discuss the rezoning of the property only today, not the Site Plan. The Site Plan can flex after this, no matter what happens today. The two main concerns I have are to the environmental concerns and incompatibility. Environmental, the road that is immediately to the east of this property, is called Springhill Road. It is a historic road. This parcel serves as a natural drainage retention area for not just the immediate houses, but in fact, the entire neighborhood. In addition to that drainage impact will only be increased as we continue to experience, across our community, sea level rise and changes the climate is going through right now. Secondly, environmentally that natural area, although most of this property is supposed to be designated as a natural area, prior to the construction, all of the power lines need to be moved. There is a substation immediately to the south of this property on the Jenkins High school property. Those power poles, by the time all the relocating and construction is done, so much damage will likely be done to the environmental impact, it will take decades to reestablish. Finally, on the incompatibility, I believe that we have a housing problem in Savannah. I do not believe that this parcel needs to solve that for the entire city. If there are three acres of developable land zoned single family, put three acres worth of single-family housing on those three acres and we will welcome those people into the neighborhood. There was one particular section that was immediately north of this property that was illuded to as being undevelopable by the developer's representative, right now on realtor.com, those three parcels are being marketed to be sold for single family development. In the description of that, it says, the adjacent property will be rezoned. They are saying it could be rezoned for multifamily and possibly those parcels could be multifamily as well. There is a lot of activity in our neighborhood, and we hope you will consider our position.

**Mr. Anthony Cooper, member of the public,** said being a neighborhood of single-family homes, the activities are those of single-family homes including children playing in the street, biking and walking traffic residents of those in the neighborhood as well as those going to school. Our neighborhood has one poorly built sidewalk that serves from DeLesseps to the school. Increase traffic which would be inherent with any other access point. It is the noise and light pollution being created by a 5-story directly next to the neighborhood as it rises much higher than the neighborhood and spill over into all the homes nearby

and within the block of the building. I live on 63rd st and during a heavy rain, the street flood every time. Two streets over, there is oftentimes standing water there.

**Mr. Oliver Casingary, Member of the public**, said I live on 60th street right in the bowl created by the hill. when my wife and I bought the property a year ago, we were in this nice little pocket of green neighborhood. Throwing up a five over one is not going to keep the vibe of our neighborhood. It will not keep the birds, foxes, and deer in our neighborhood. The only green the developers see is dollars, not nature. I do not want to have water flowing in my back yard because they have destroyed the trees. What the developers want to do is, put this up and distract the value of our neighborhood.

**Ms. Betsy Camryn, Member of the Public**, said I have lived in this neighborhood since I was 10yrs old. We don't have a problem with growth or building. We have apartments around us. The Caroline Apartments. We have some apartments on 52nd street. They are two story, brick, they fit in with the neighborhood. My sister lives on 62nd street, she will literally walk out her door, look down and see a five-story building. Right now, we see trees. We just came down Presidents Street and they are building that brand new hotel building; it is five stories tall. It is in downtown Savannah, why would you be building a five-story building in my neighborhood? How are they not going to destroy all the trees when they are building this thing? They are cramming this great big building on this little piece of land in our neighborhood. We don't have a problem with small buildings, just not a five-story building that is going to take over the whole neighborhood. They keep saying, two units to twenty units, how are you getting 250 apartments in 60 units? We do not have a problem with multifamily. These apartments are multi family. We have a problem with five stories of multifamily.

**Mr. Mark Falman, Member of the public**, said I live on 63rd street. Savannah like many places, might need affordable housing, but what they need more than anything, is affordable housing. This development is about money. Rezoning should not be allowed because this is entirely out of character for this neighborhood. Put there, what needs to be there. Development of this type will cause additional flooding down Costa Rica Street as well as the numbered streets west of Costa Rica. It will greatly add to the pollution run off of the oil and vehicle contamination into the canal. If this is ever rezoned, it should be what is best for the community. This is not affordable housing. At the neighborhood meeting, the plan said it was a six story. You walk anywhere in Chatham County, there are very few six story buildings. The developers took one story off, this is still a skyscraper over here. There needs to be a berm.

**Mr. McCorkle** said the word developer has become a bad word. Grocery stores wouldn't exist, houses wouldn't exist, almost every single time that someone has come in to build something, someone has been upset that something was going there. The question before us, do we believe that a multifamily project is appropriate on this site? My client has gone to great efforts to provide a private drive for this project that will not materially impact the neighborhood. There was a comment about my client not being at the previous meeting, that is correct. I was at the previous meeting. The date had changed from the previous meeting, my client had an out of the country trip that was previously planned otherwise would have been at that new meeting date. My clients do great work, I hope you will allow us to build there.

**Ms. Lauren Boles, Board member**, asked, Mr. McCorkle will you please address the issue about parking?

**Mr. McCorkle** said we do not anticipate any kind of a parking variance. At least on the current Site Plan, we are showing 195 units and 260 spaces. We will meet the parking requirements of the city. We do not anticipate having parking spilling out into the neighborhood. Particularly if we are asked to put up a fence and wall it off.

**Ms. Boles** asked, do you any anticipation of how high the buffer might be? Related to that, you mentioned that the site drops down, what does that look like?

**Mr. McCorkle** said, I am not an engineer or homebuilder. Many of the houses are single family and will be shorter than 25ft. The height of the neighborhood adjacent in the area is RSF-10 which is 40ft. The height on the piece of property rezoned would be 50ft. All we are trying to do is make the point, if it drops down 10 or 15 ft adjacent to it, ultimately, the maximum height of the two areas will be pretty much identical. I am not saying there is a 40ft tall house built immediately adjacent to this, but the maximum height we would be permitted, would essentially be even.

**Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager**, said, this is a passionate issue for the people that live nearby. All of your points are valid, you live in a beautiful neighborhood, you want to keep the character of the neighborhood that you purchased. the petitioner has some valid points as well. From my perspective, one of the comments from a resident was we are here to discuss zoning and not Site Plans or stormwater. The question is whether or not a multifamily zoning at this parcel, is appropriate given the zoning around it. People can disagree, staff has

recommended denial. As we continue to hear cases like this and as we continue to experience growth in our community, we are going to have to create the balance between single family homes, multifamily use and a variety of housing inventory. We are going to have to be able to define appropriateness a little clearer than we have been able to define it in the past just because we haven't had that growth and development. I do believe that you can have multifamily and single family co-exist appropriately next to each other in parcels. Remember this is a question about zoning and not a Site Plan or anything else.

**Mr. Wayne Noha, Board member**, asked staff, can you talk more about Future Land Use?

**Mr. Lotson** said specific to the subject property, a portion of it is designated as Residential General, the balance is designated as Conservation. Mr. McCorkle made the point that the likely reason for that, there are significant wetlands on these properties. The residential general classification is a classification that suggests that multiple housing types could be appropriate within that classification. Within Residential General you could have a mix of single-family, two -family, or multifamily on a property with a classification such as that. The Future Land Use Map is not as prescriptive as a zoning designation. It is intended to give some indication of what was deemed at the time the designation was created, could be appropriate on the site.

**Mr. Melder** asked, could you review again the reasons why MPC staff recommended denial as it relates to the appropriateness of zoning?

**Mr. Lotson** said one of the things that we often look at when we are talking about whether a zoning is appropriate or not, there are two broad areas, the identify criteria within the zoning ordinance which we evaluate for each case and then there is an evaluation of whether we feel the proposed change is compatible with the existing Land Use pattern. Which, frankly, is a little more difficult. The review criteria, and they are outlined in the ordinance, it starts with whether the range of uses permitted in the proposed zoning district is more suitable than the range of uses permitted in the district that has been requested. As it relates to those particular criteria, we found that it was not more suitable, the range of uses permitted in the multifamily zoning classification and that gets into some of the compatibility issues or concerns we saw when evaluating this particular site. Additionally, the criteria as to whether the proposed zoning district addresses a specific need in the county or city, we found the proposed zoning would allow residential housing inventory to be created which has been identified as a need in the city, however, we found in addition to that that multifamily development on that site may potentially have negative impacts on adjoining property owners. We went through other criteria related to compatibility, consistency, and reasonable use of the land as well. There was a lot of discussion about that as whether this property, under the current zoning, has reasonable use. When you look at that, you can say, on paper yes, it is zoned for single-family residential, that means someone could build a house on it or several houses potentially. The reality of that is, as discussed, every property is different as to what is actually takes to develop the site. This site is unique in that, there will be substantial cost associated with developing it, therefore single-family residential is less likely with that reality in hand. We did go through those criteria, we found that most of the criteria did not meet and therefore, our recommendation.

**Mr. Melder** asked, was there any level of multifamily that you believe MPC staff would have felt was appropriate at this site?

**Mr. Lotson** said, the only way I could answer that is, we only evaluated the petitioners request, which was the RMF-2 designation at 20 units per acre. We certainly could and would spend more time evaluating a different request if it was a different density or different zoning district, but we did not go into great depth considering those things because they would have been speculative. I think it is fair to say, a different zoning district and or different density certainly could be considered differently than what has been presented so far.

#### **Motion**

Approval of the Petitioners request to Rezone the property from RSF-6 (Single Family Residential) to the Residential Multifamily designation, RMF- 2 -20.

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

Motion: Joseph Ervin

Second: Shedrick Coleman

Joseph Ervin - Aye

Tom Woiwode - Aye



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

**IX. Regular Business**

[5. REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 11903 Middleground Road | File no. 23-000305-ZA](#)

[📎 Maps Combined.pdf](#)

[📎 Property Photo.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Report - 0305.pdf](#)

**Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services**, said the petitioner is requesting to rezone an approximately .76-acre parcel at 11903 Middleground Road from the current B-L (Limited-Business) zoning classification to an OI-E (Office Institutional - Expanded) zoning classification. The existing structure was constructed in 1980 as a single-family residence. In 2013, the property was rezoned from an R-6 (Single - Family Residential) zoning classification to an Institutional zoning classification, and in 2019 it was changed to the current B-L under the new Zoning Ordinance. Businesses have operated at the site. The adjacent properties on either side are also former residences that have been rezoned to business and office classifications. The subject property is a developed lot located on the west side of Middleground Road south of Dutchtown Road. The abutting properties on the north and south sides of the applicant’s property are developed as well. The property to the south is developed with a commercial building and zoned OI-T (Office Institutional - Transition). The property to the north is zoned B-N and the owner is in the plan review process to establish a convenience store / gas station on the site.

The proposed zoning is consistent with the zoning and land use patterns in the area. Rezoning this site to an OI-E classification will allow compatible uses and the continuation of clear development pattern that has been occurring over a number of years along Middleground Road. Based upon the existing zoning pattern and character of the area, as well as the review criteria, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the rezoning request as submitted.

**Mr. Gregory Polster, Owner of property**, said I have nothing further to add to this, thank you for your consideration on this matter and I will be glad to answer any questions.

**Motion**

Approval of the rezoning request as submitted. (Rezone approximately .76 acres parcel from the current B-L zoning classification to an OI-E zoning classification).

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Laureen Boles

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

**X. Presentations**

**XI. Other Business**

[6. Proposed Amendments to the 2023 MPC Meeting Calendar](#)

[📎 Proposed Calendar Revision 2023.pdf](#)

**Mr. Marcus Lotson, Director of Development Services**, said we, staff, are proposing a revision to the 2023 MPC meeting Calendar. Staff discovered an issue with the cut-off dates. That is a date where someone has to file an application with the City in order to be placed on an agenda for a corresponding meeting. Staff realized there was not enough time between the cut-off date and the meeting date in order for staff to make the necessary public notices and get those out. What staff is proposing is, to move back the cut-off date approximately one week. We are not proposing to change any meeting dates. All of the meeting dates that were adopted at the beginning of the year, will remain the same, the cut-off dates will move back one week giving staff the opportunity to make the timely public notices for zoning petitions and other items that come before this body.

**Mr. Coleman, Board member**, asked, how does this change the first meeting on March 21st for the persons who were already in the timeline?

**Mr. Lotson** said we got the notification that some items were submitted on the cut-off date, those applicants were notified that they would not be on the corresponding meeting that had been published. Their hearing would have to be moved by one meeting. That is why we wanted to have this on the agenda as soon as possible to correct that issue.

**Motion**

Approval of proposed amendments to the 2023 MPC Meeting Calendar.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Wayne Noha

Second: Travis Coles

Joseph Ervin	- Aye
Tom Woiwode	- Aye
Travis Coles	- Aye

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

**XII. Executive Session**

**XIII. Adjournment**

***The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.***