



METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

"Planning the Future - Respecting the Past"

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: DECEMBER 10, 2019
TO: THE MAYOR AND ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH
FROM: METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MPC RECOMMENDATION

PETITION REFERENCED:

Petition to Rezone Property
Attorney Harold Yellin, Petitioner/Agent
Gail Waters, Owner
10614 and 10816 Middleground Road
Area: 3.67 Acres
Aldermanic District: 6 – Tony Thomas
County Commission District: 6 – James Jay Jones
Property Identification Number: 20752-01007 and 20752-01008
File No. 19-006079-ZA

MPC ACTION:

Denial of the petitioner's request to rezone the southernmost 1.8-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an O-I district based on findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **Approval** of rezoning both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an RMF-2-25 district.

MPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the petitioner's request to rezone the southernmost 1.8-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an O-I district based on findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **Approval** of rezoning both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an RMF-2-25 district.

MEMBERS PRESENT: 7 + Chairman

Joseph Ervin, Chairman
Travis Coles
Ellis Cook
Karen Jarrett
Tanya Milton
Wayne Noha
Linder Suthers
Joseph Welch

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE: Approve Staff Recommendation (8-0)

APPROVAL Votes: 8	DENIAL Votes: 0	ABSENT
Ervin Cook Coles Jarrett Milton Noha Suthers Welch		Branch Manigault Monohan Parker Smith Woiwode

Respectfully submitted,



Melanie Wilson
Executive Director

/jh

Enclosure

cc Mark Massey, Clerk of Council
Lester B. Johnson, Assistant City Attorney
Jennifer Herman, Assistant City Attorney
Beth Barnes, Department of Inspections





Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission

December 10, 2019 REGULAR MPC MEETING

Title

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 10614 and 10616 Middleground Road | From RMF-2-10 To O-I and RMF-2-25 | File Number 19-006079-ZA

Description

Attorney Harold Yellin, Petitioner/Agent

Gail Waters, Owner

10614 and 10816 Middleground Road

Area: 3.67 Acres

Aldermanic District: 6 – Tony Thomas

County Commission District: 5 – James Jay Jones

Property Identification Number: 20752 01007 and 20752-01008

File No. 19-006079-ZA

A request to rezone property identified as PIN 20752 01007 and 20752-01008, also known as 10614 and 10816 Middleground Road from an RMF-2-10 (Multi-Family Residential – 10 units per gross acre) zoning classification to an RMR-2-25 (Residential-Multifamily - 25 units per gross acre) zoning classification and an O-I (Office Institutional) zoning classification.

Recommendation

MPC staff recommends **Denial** of the petitioner's request to rezone the southernmost 1.8-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an O-I district based on findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **Approval** of rezoning both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an RMF-2-25 district.

Contact

Financial Impact

Review Comments

Attachments

📎 [Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Proposed Zoning Boundaries.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report-19-006079-ZA-MAP - 10614 and 10616 Middleground Road \(2\).pdf](#)

📎 [Pictometry.pdf](#)

📎 [View from SFR.pdf](#)



C H A T H A M C O U N T Y - S A V A N N A H

METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

"Planning the Future - Respecting the Past"

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: The Mayor and Aldermen, City of Savannah

FROM: The Planning Commission

DATE: December 10, 2019

SUBJECT: Petition to Rezone Property
Attorney Harold Yellin, Petitioner/Agent
Gail Waters, Owner
10614 and 10816 Middleground Road
Area: 3.67 Acres
Aldermanic District: 6 – Tony Thomas
County Commission District: 6 – James Jay Jones
Property Identification Number: 20752-01007 and 20752-01008
File No. 19-006079-ZA

Marcus Lotson, MPC Project Planner

REPORT STATUS: Initial Report

Issue:

A request to rezone property identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008, also known as 10614 and 10816 Middleground Road, from an RMF-2-10 (Multi-Family Residential – 10 units per gross acre) zoning classification to an RMF-2-25 (Residential-Multifamily - 25 units per gross acre) zoning classification and an O-I (Office and Institutional) zoning classification.

The petitioner initially requested that the subject site be rezoned to an RMF-2-25 classification and a B-N (Neighborhood – Business) classification. However, after requesting a continuance at the November 19th MPC meeting, the petitioner revised the petition to eliminate the requested B-N district in favor of an O-I district.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. **Public Notice:** As required by the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property were sent notices of the proposed rezoning on November 1, 2019. Public notice was also posted on the subject site near Middleground Road. Staff has not received any calls concerning this petition. No additional notification has been made.

2. **Existing Development Pattern:** The area surrounding the subject site is residential and includes a variety of housing types from predominantly single-family detached, single family attached, two-family residential, and multi-family residential.

However, the middle portion of this block, including the petitioned site, is occupied by single family detached houses.

3. **Site:** The subject property is comprised of two existing parcels with a combined area of 3.67 acres in size and is located on the east side of Middleground Road, approximately 100 feet south of Quail Forest Drive. The northern parcel is presently occupied by two residential structures and an accessory structure and is 0.91 acres in size. The southern parcel is occupied by a single-family residential structure. This parcel is mostly undeveloped with significant vegetation including mature trees and is 2.76 acres in size. The land uses and zoning districts surrounding the subject property include:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
North	Multifamily Residential	RMF-2-25
South	Vacant parcel	RSF-6 [1]
	Single Family Residential	RSF-6
	Single Family Residential	RSF-4 [2]
East	Undeveloped/City Utility Plant	C-P [3]
West	Middleground Road	
	Mobile Home Park	RMHP [4]
	Single Family Residential	RSF-6

[1] RSF-6 – Single Family Residential – 6 units per acre

[2] RSF-4 – Single Family Residential – 4 units per acre

[3] C-P – Conservation – Park

[4] RMHP – Residential Mobile Home Park

4. **Transportation Network:** The site has frontage and access on Middleground Road, an existing arterial roadway with a 110-foot right-of-way.
5. **Public Services and Facilities:** The property is served by the Savannah Police Department, Savannah Fire Department, and by Savannah water and sewer services.
6. **Chatham Area Transit (CAT):** The property is served by CAT. The route serving this site is Route 14 – Abercorn Local. There are multiple bus stops located along Middleground Road.

7. **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element:** The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as General Residential. The proposed RMF-2-25 zoning district is compatible with the General Residential land use designation. However, the proposed O-I zoning district is not compatible with the Future Land Use Map.
8. **Existing RMF-2-10 Zoning District:**
 - a. **Intent of the RMF-2-10 District:** “The RMF-2-10 district is intended to allow multi-family and other types of residential uses at a maximum density of 10 units per gross acre of land. All RMF zoning districts are intended to be placed on higher classification of streets and in close proximity to mass transit corridors, retail services and employment opportunities.”
 - b. **Allowed Uses:** The RMF-2-10 district is predominantly a residential district. In addition to all types of residential uses, a limited number of non-residential uses are permitted. A list of the permitted uses allowed within the RMF-2-10 district is attached (see Table 2).
 - c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the RMF-2-10 district appear in the attached table (see Table 1).
9. **Proposed RMF-2-25 District:**
 - a. **Intent of the RMF-2-25 District:** “The RMF-2-25 district is intended to allow multi-family and other types of residential uses at a maximum density of 25 units per gross acre of land. All RMF zoning districts are intended to be placed on higher classification of streets and in close proximity to mass transit corridors, retail services and employment opportunities.”
 - b. **Allowed Uses:** The RMF-2-25 district is predominantly a residential district. In addition to all types of residential uses, a limited number of non-residential uses are permitted. A list of the permitted uses allowed within the RMF-2-25 district is attached (see Table 2).
 - c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the RMF-2-25 district appear in the attached table (see Table 1).
10. **Proposed O-I District:**
 - a. **Intent of the O-I District:** “This district is intended to provide for office uses as well as a limited number of uses that are compatible with an office environment. The O-I district is intended to be located in close proximity to nonresidential districts and may be used as a transition between such uses and residential districts.”
 - b. **Allowed Uses:** This district is predominantly for office uses; however, a limited

number of commercial uses are permitted. A list of the permitted uses allowed within the O-I district is attached (see Table 2).

- c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the O-I district appear in the attached table (see Table 1).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. *Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would create traffic volumes, noise level, odor, airborne particulate matter, visual blight, reduce light or increased density of development that would adversely impact the livability or quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood?*

Yes No Requested O-I district

Yes No Requested RMF-2-25 district

MPC Comment: The O-I district permits uses that could detrimentally impact adjacent residential properties.

There are existing multi-family residential developments in the immediate vicinity. With proper buffering, the requested RMF-2-25 zoning district would not be detrimental to existing single family residential properties adjacent to the subject site.

2. *Will the proposed zoning district permit uses that would adversely impact adjacent and nearby properties by rendering such properties less desirable and therefore less marketable for the type of development permitted under the current zoning?*

Yes No Requested O-I district

Yes No Requested RMF-2-25 district

MPC Comment: As noted in Comment number 1.

3. *Will the proposed zoning district permit uses that would generate a type or mix of vehicular traffic on a street or highway that is incompatible with the type of land use development along such street or highway?*

Yes No Requested O-I and RMF-2-25 district

MPC Comment: Middleground Road was recently improved to a divided four-lane roadway that can adequately accommodate the traffic generated by allowable uses in both the O-I and RMF-2-25 zoning districts.

4. *Will the proposed zoning district permit uses that would generate greater traffic volumes at vehicular access points and cross streets than is generated by uses permitted under the current zoning district to the detriment of maintaining acceptable or current volume capacity (V/C) ratio for the streets that provide vehicular access to the proposed zoning district and adjacent and nearby properties?*

Yes ___ No X Requested O-I and RMF-2-25 districts

MPC Comment: As noted in Comment number 3.

5. *Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would require a greater level of public services such as drainage facilities, utilities, or safety services above that required for uses permitted under the current zoning district such that the provision of these services will create financial burden to the public?*

Yes ___ No X Requested O-I and RMF-2-25 districts

MPC Comment: The subject property is served by public utilities. The proposed zoning is unlikely to increase the burden on public services.

6. *Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would adversely impact the improvement or development of adjacent and nearby properties in accordance with existing zoning regulations and development controls deemed necessary to maintain the stability and livability of the surrounding neighborhood?*

Yes X No ___ Requested O-I district

Yes ___ No X Requested RMF-2-25 district

MPC Comment: The existing uses along this portion of Middleground Road are various types of residential. The requested O-I district permits uses which have the potential to adversely impact this established residential character. Further, rezoning the subject property to a non-residential district could have direct adverse impacts on the adjacent residential properties to the north, and south through increased noise, odor, and visual blight.

There are existing multi-family residential developments in the immediate vicinity and, with proper buffering, the requested RMF-2-25 zoning district would not be detrimental to existing single family residential properties adjacent to the subject site.

7. *Will the proposed zoning district permit development that is inconsistent with the comprehensive land use plan?*

Yes X No

Yes No X Proposed RMF-2-25 district

MPC Comment: The requested O-I district is not consistent with the General Residential designation planned for the subject site and immediate vicinity. The requested RMF-2-25 district is consistent with the General Residential designation planned for the subject site and immediate vicinity.

POLICY ANALYSIS:

The petitioner is requesting to rezone two parcels of land located on the east side of Middleground Road. The northern 1.9-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels is requested to be rezoned from an RMF-2-10 district to an RMF-2-25 district which is consistent with the General Residential Future Land Use Map designation and is compatible with the general development pattern in the area. Also, the requested density would allow for additional multi-family units which would help meet the housing demand without adversely impacting the existing residential developments located in the immediate and general vicinity.

The southern 1.8-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels is requested to be rezoned from an RMF-2-10 district to an O-I district. The proposed O-I district is not consistent with the General Residential Future Land Use Map designation and is not compatible with the existing residential land uses adjacent to the subject site or the residential uses located in the immediate and general area. There is no office and/or limited commercial zoning districts along Middleground Road from its beginning until its approximate intersection with Dutchtown Road, with one exception. The exception is the property located at the southeast corner of Middleground Road and Tibet Avenue, both of which are arterial roadways. The commercial uses at this location include a convenience store/gas station and a self-serve storage facility. The intent of the O-I district as defined in the Savannah Zoning Regulations, Section 5.15.1b., "The O-I district is intended to be located in close proximity to nonresidential districts and may be used as a transition between such uses and residential districts." The subject site is not adjacent to or in close proximity to existing non-residential uses and does not meet the intent of the requested O-I zoning district.

Zoning map amendments that are beneficial to the immediate and general area are encouraged to promote appropriate development. However, zoning map amendments that could adversely impact properties located within the immediate and general area should not be approved.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approval of the petitioner's request.
2. Denial of the petitioner's request.

3. Denial of the requested O-I zoning district for the southern 1.8-acre site.
4. Denial of the requested RMF-2-25 zoning district for the northern 1.9-acre site.
5. Approval of an RMF-2-25 zoning district for the entire area of parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008.
6. Approval of an alternative zoning district for both sites.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission recommends **Denial** of the petitioner's request to rezone the southern 1.8-acre portion of the combined area of both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an O-I district based on findings identified in the staff report. Staff further recommends **Approval** of rezoning both parcels identified as PIN 20752-01007 and 20752-01008 from an RMF-2-10 district to an RMF-2-25 district.

Table 1: Development Standards – RMF-2-10, RMF-2-25 and O-I Zoning Districts

Table 1: Comparison of Development Standards for the RMF-2-10 (Existing) and RMF-2-25 and O-I Zoning Districts (Proposed)			
	RMF-2-10	RMF-2-25	O-I
Minimum Lot Area	0 (stacked Townhouse) 5000 sq. ft. per single family lot Multi-family subject to maximum density	0 (stacked Townhouse) 5000 sq. ft. per single family lot Multi-family subject to maximum density	None-Non-residential 2,170 S.F. - Residential
Minimum Lot Width	20/50 ft.	20/50 ft.	-None
Front Yard Building Setback Parking Setback	20 ft. 15 ft.	20 ft. 15 ft.	15 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setback	5/7/10 ft.	5/7/10 ft.	10 ft.
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	20/25 ft.	20/25 ft.	0 ft./15 ft. – Non-residential 20 ft. - Residential
Maximum Height	50 ft.	50 ft.	40 ft.
Maximum Building Coverage	40/50 percent	40/50 percent	80 percent – Non-residential N/A - Residential
Maximum Density	10 units/gross acre	25 units/gross acre	N/A

Table 2

List of Uses for RMF-2
Single-family detached
Single-family attached
Two-family
Three-family/Four-family
Townhouse
Stacked Townhouse
Apartment
Child caring institution
Monastery/convent
Agriculture, personal
Community garden
Park, general
Library/community center
Police/fire station or substation
Child/adult day care home
Child/adult day care center
School, public or private (K-12)
All places of worship
Personal care home, registered
Personal care home, family
Personal care home, congregate
Community living arrangement
Golf course
Retail consumption dealer
Dock, private
Dock, residential community
Marina, residential
Utilities, major
Utilities, minor

Table 2

List of Uses Table for OI
Continuing care retirement community
Upper story residential
Agriculture, personal
Community Garden
Park, general
Library/community center
Museum
Post office
Police/fire station or substation
Child/adult day care center
Child/adult care center, 24 hour
School, public or private (K-12)
All places of worship
Office, general
Office, medical
Office, utility/contractor
Art/photo studio; gallery
Pharmacy
Services, general
Animal services, indoor
Bank
Business support services
Catering establishment
Funeral home; mortuary (not including crematorium)
Event Venue
Instructional studio or classroom
Personal service shop
Repair-oriented services
Retail consumption dealer (on premise consumption of alcohol)
Utilities, major
Utilities, minor