



**METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

*"Planning the Future - Respecting the Past"*

M E M O R A N D U M

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 19, 2019  
**TO:** THE MAYOR AND ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH  
**FROM:** METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
**SUBJECT:** MPC RECOMMENDATION

**PETITION REFERENCED:**

**PETITION TO REZONE PROPERTY**  
**PETITIONER – Robert McCorkle**  
**PROPERTY OWNER – DSCD Holdings, LLC**  
**CITY ALDERMAN DISTRICT 3 – Hall**  
**COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICT 2 – Holmes**  
**1119/1123 E. 68th St. and 0/1110 E. 69th St.**  
**PINS: 2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011**  
**SITE AREA: 0.83 Acres**  
**FILE NUMBER: 19-006044-ZA**

**MPC ACTION:**

**Approval** of the request to rezone Parcels **2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011** from the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts to the O-I district. Staff further recommends **approval** of a Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map amendment to change the classification of Parcel 2-0114-14-10 from Residential - Suburban Single-Family to Commercial - Neighborhood; reference file 19-006127-CPA

**MPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval** of the request to rezone Parcels **2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011** from the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts to the O-I district. Staff further recommends **approval** of a Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map amendment to change the classification of Parcel 2-0114-14-10 from Residential - Suburban Single-Family to Commercial - Neighborhood; reference file 19-006127-CPA

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** 7 + Vice Chairman

Ellis Cook, Vice-Chairman  
Thomas Branch  
Travis Coles  
Karen Jarrett  
Lacy Manigault  
Tanya Milton  
Wayne Noha  
Lee Smith

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

<b>APPROVAL</b> Votes: 8	<b>DENIAL</b> Votes: 0	<b>ABSENT</b>
Cook Branch Coles Jarrett Manigault Milton Noha Smith		Ervin Monahan Parker Suthers Woiwode Welch

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

---

### November 19, 2019 REGULAR MPC MEETING

#### **Title**

REZONING MAP AMENDMENT | 1119 and 1123 E. 68th St./ 0 and 1110 E. 69th S. | RSF-6 and B-N to O-I | Robert McCorkle as agent for DSCD Holdings, LLC | 19-006044-ZA and 19-006127-CPA

#### **Description**

A request to rezone four (4) parcels from existing RSF-6 (Residential Single-Family) and B-N (Neighborhood Business) zoning classifications to the O-I (Office – Institutional) zoning classification. Note that this rezoning request falls under the standards and procedures of NewZO.

#### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends **approval** of the request to rezone Parcels **2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011** from the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts to the O-I district. Staff further recommends **approval** of a Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map amendment to change the classification of Parcel 2-0114-14-10 from Residential - Suburban Single-Family to Commercial – Neighborhood; reference file 19-006127-CPA.

#### **Contact**

#### **Financial Impact**

#### **Review Comments**

#### **Attachments**

- 📎 [Staff Report 19-006044-ZA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Exhibit A - Maps.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Exhibit B- Streetview and Pict. .pdf](#)
- 📎 [Exhibit C - Previous Zoning Ordinance.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Application.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: November 19, 2019**

**SUBJECT: PETITION TO REZONE PROPERTY**  
**PETITIONER – Robert L. McCorkle**  
**PROPERTY OWNER – DSCD Holdings, LLC**  
**CITY ALDERMAN DISTRICT 3 – Hall**  
**COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICT 2 – Holmes**  
**1119/1123 E. 68th St. and 0/1110 E. 69th St.**  
**PINS: 2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011**  
**SITE AREA: 0.83 Acres**  
**FILE NUMBER: 19-006044-ZA**

**Matt Lonnerstater, MPC Project Planner**

**REPORT STATUS: Initial Report**

**REQUEST:**

A request to rezone four (4) parcels from existing RSF-6 (Residential Single-Family) and B-N (Neighborhood Business) zoning classifications to the O-I (Office – Institutional) zoning classification. Note that this rezoning request falls under the standards and procedures of NewZO.

**PROPERTY:**

The property under consideration for this rezoning request consists of four parcels totaling 0.83 acres in area located on E. 68<sup>th</sup> St. and E. 69<sup>th</sup> St. between Waters Ave. and Sanders St. Refer to **Exhibit A – Maps**. Two of the parcels (PINs -005 and -011) are split-zoned between the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts. The other two parcels (PINs -006 and -010) are zoned RSF-6. Per the application, the petitioner requests the O-I (Office – Institutional) districts to enable the construction/expansion of an office or medical office use.

Three of the four parcels are presently vacant. However, parcel -005 is improved with a one-story single-family residence. Refer to **Exhibit B – Streetview and Pictometry**.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. **Public Notice:** As required by the Savannah Zoning Ordinance, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property were sent notices of the proposed rezoning on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. Public notice was also posted on the site.
2. **Existing Zoning and Development Pattern:** Existing land uses and zoning districts surrounding the subject site include:

Location	Land Use	Previous Zoning	NewZO
North	Single-Family Res.	B-N/R-6	B-N/RSF-6
South	Single-Family Res.	R-6	RSF-6
East	Church	R-6	RSF-6
West	Office /Retail	PUD-IS-B	B-N

Under the previous Zoning Ordinance, Parcels -005, -006, and -011 were zoned PUD-IS-B; this district permitted medical offices as of right. Parcel -010 was zoned R-6. Refer to **Exhibit C- Previous Zoning**.

3. **Existing RSF-6:**

Under NewZO, the subject property is primarily zoned RSF-6, Residential Single-Family.

- a. **Intent of the RSF-6 District:** The intent and purpose of the RSF-6 district is, *“to allow single-family detached development on varying lot sizes which are indicated by the number (suffix) following the district name [...]. A limited number of nonresidential uses are allowed that are compatible with single-family residential uses”*
- b. **Permitted Uses:** The permitted uses for the RSF-6 district are attached in **Table 1** at the end of this report. Permitted uses include, but are not limited to single-family detached residential, personal agriculture, parks, police/fire substations, schools, and places of worship.
- c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the RSF-6 district are attached in **Table 2** at the end of this report.

4. **O-I District**

The petitioner is requesting that the entirety of the subject property be rezoned to O-I, Office-Institutional.

- a. **Intent of the O-I District:** The intent and purpose of the OI district is, “to allow office uses as well as a limited number of other uses that are compatible with an office environment. The OI district is intended to be located in close proximity to Nonresidential districts and may be used as a transition between such areas and Residential districts.”
  - b. **Permitted Uses:** The list of permitted uses for the O-I district is attached in **Table 1** at the end of this report. Permitted uses include, but are not limited to, upper-story residential, general office, medical office, pharmacies, banks, event venues, places of worship, and personal services shops.
  - c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the O-I district are attached in **Table 2** at the end of this report.
5. **Land Use Element:** The Chatham County-Savannah Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map designates parcels -005, -006, and -11 as Commercial-Neighborhood and parcel -010 as Residential-Suburban Single Family; refer to Exhibit A – Maps and the figure below.

*Future Land Use Map*



The Comprehensive Plan defines these classifications as follows:

**Commercial – Neighborhood:** Nodal and strip business areas that are within predominately residential areas and are developed at a scale and intensity compatible with adjacent residential uses.

**Residential – Suburban Single Family:** Areas identified for single-family detached residential dwellings at a density not to exceed five (5) units per gross acre.

The block to the north of E. 68<sup>th</sup> St. is planned for Neighborhood Commercial closer to Waters Ave. and Suburban Single-Family closer to Sanders St. The block to the south of E. 69<sup>th</sup> St. is primarily planned for Suburban Single-Family uses.

6. **Environmental Features:** Per SAGIS, the subject property is located in Flood Zone X which indicates areas of minimal flood hazard. There do not appear to be any wetland features on-site.
7. **Public Services and Facilities:** The subject parcel is served by City of Savannah water and sewer and is serviced by the Savannah Police Department and Fire & Emergency Services Department.
8. **Transportation Network:** The property has frontage along E. 68<sup>th</sup> St. and E. 69<sup>th</sup> St., paved roads with 45 ft.-wide rights-of-way. The nearest bus route is along Waters Ave. (Route 27).

#### **REVIEW STANDARDS FOR REZONING APPLICATIONS:**

Per Section 3.5.8, the following standards govern the exercise of zoning power by the City of Savannah:

*a. Suitability and Community Need:*

- i. *Whether the range of uses permitted by the proposed zoning district is more suitable than the range of uses that is permitted by the current zoning district.*
- ii. *Whether the proposed zoning district addresses a specific need in the county or city.*

**MPC Comment:** The block face in which the subject parcels are located are book-ended by office, retail and institutional uses; refer to **Exhibit B**. Therefore, the interior of the block face may be better suited for office-type uses than detached single-family residential uses. The O-I district permits a range of uses that are compatible with both the adjacent office, institutional, and residential uses.

**b. *Compatibility:***

- i. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.*
- ii. Whether the zoning proposal is compatible with the present zoning pattern and conforming uses of nearby property and the character of the surrounding area.*
- iii. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal.*

**MPC Comment:** The O-I district permits a list of uses that are consistent with the adjacent office and institutional uses to the east and west and compatible with the single-family uses to the north and south. The OI district is intended to be located in close proximity to Nonresidential districts and may be used as a transition between such areas and Residential districts.

- c. *Consistency:*** *Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, such as a redevelopment plan or small area plan.*

**MPC Comment:** A majority of the subject property is planned for Neighborhood Commercial Uses. The O-I district is consistent with the Commercial-Neighborhood future land use designation.

- d. *Reasonable Use:*** *Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable use as currently zoned.*

**MPC Comment:** The existing RSF-6 district permits reasonable residential use of the property.

- e. *Adequate Public Services:*** *Whether adequate school, public safety and emergency facilities, road, ingress and egress, parks, wastewater treatment, water supply and stormwater drainage facilities are available for the uses and densities that are permitted in the proposed zoning district.*

**MPC Comment:** The subject property is served by adequate transportation networks and public services.



**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Recommend approval of the petitioner's request as presented (with or without conditions) and subsequently recommend approval of a Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map amendment.
2. Recommend denial of the petitioner's request.
3. Recommend denial of the petitioner's request and recommend approval of an alternative classification.
4. Continue the matter to the next meeting date or to a certain date.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

The petitioner is requesting to rezone a total of four (4) parcels totaling 0.83 acres from the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts to the O-I zoning district. Per the application, the petitioner requests the O-I (Office – Institutional) district to enable the construction/expansion of an office or medical office use.

As depicted in **Exhibit C- Previous Zoning**, much of the subject property was zoned PUD-IS (Planned Unit Development – Institutional) under the previous Zoning Ordinance; this district permitted institutional and professional office uses similar to those permitted in the O-I district. Staff finds that the requested O-I district is compatible with adjacent office, institutional, and single-family residential uses and is consistent with the Commercial – Neighborhood future land use classification. Further, staff finds that the rezoning request is in substantial compliance with the rezoning review standards contained in Section 3.5.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

As such, The Planning Commission recommends **approval** of the request to rezone Parcels **2-0114-14-005; -006; -010; and -011** from the RSF-6 and B-N zoning districts to the O-I district. The MPC further recommends **approval** of a Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map amendment to change the classification of Parcel 2-0114-14-10 from Residential - Suburban Single-Family to Commercial – Neighborhood; reference file 19-006127-CPA.

**Table 1: Use Comparison**

<b>RSF</b>	<b>OI</b>
Single-family detached	Continuing care retirement community
Agriculture, personal	Upper story residential
Community garden	Agriculture, personal
Park, general	Community Garden
Library/community center	Park, general
Police/fire station or substation	Library/community center
Child/adult day care home	Museum
School, public or private (K-12)	Post office
All places of worship	Police/fire station or substation
Personal care home, registered	Child/adult day care center
Golf course	Child/adult care center, 24 hour
Retail consumption dealer	School, public or private (K-12)
Dock, private	All places of worship
Dock, residential community	Office, general
Marina, residential	Office, medical
Watercraft launch/ramp	Office, utility/contractor
Utilities, major	Art/photo studio; gallery
Utilities, minor	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

**Table 2: Development Standards Comparison**

	<b>RSF-6</b>	<b>O-I</b>
<b>Minimum Lot Area</b>	6,000 sq. ft.	--
<b>Minimum Lot Width</b>	60 ft.	--
<b>Front Yard Setback</b>	20 ft.	15 ft.
<b>Minimum Side Yard Setback</b>	5 ft./10 ft.	10 ft.
<b>Minimum Rear Yard Setback</b>	20 ft.	20 ft.
<b>Maximum Height</b>	36 ft.	40 ft.
<b>Maximum Building Coverage</b>	40%	--
<b>Maximum Density</b>	--	