

MOBILE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 2002 - 2:00 P.M.
AUDITORIUM, MOBILE GOVERNMENT PLAZA

Members Present

Robert Frost, Chairman
Wendell Quimby, Vice-Chair
Victor McSwain, Secretary
Stephen Nodine
Ann Deakle
John Vallas
Terry Plauche

Members Absent

Victoria L. Rivizzigno
Norman Hill (S)
James Laier (S)

Staff Present

Laura J. Clarke, Director
Urban Development Department
Richard Olsen, Planner II
Margaret Pappas, Planner II
Jennifer Henley, Secretary II

Others Present

David Daughenbaugh, Urban Forestry
Jennifer White, Traffic Engineering
Beverly Terry, City Engineering
Pat Stewart, County Engineering

Mr. Frost stated the number of members present constituted a quorum and called the meeting to order.

The notation *motion carried unanimously* indicates a consensus, with the exception of the Chairman who does not participate in voting unless otherwise noted.

EXTENSION:

Case #SUB2001-00307

Dog River View Subdivision

East side of Dog River Road, 300'+ North of Dog River Lane.
3 Lots / 1.7+ Acres
Request for a one-year extension of previous approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Mr. Plauche to grant a one-year extension of previous approval for this subdivision.

The motion carried unanimously.

GROUP APPLICATIONS:

Case #ZON2002-02505

Charles J. Browning

Southeast corner of Moffett Road and Bear Fork Road.
The request for a change in zoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential, to B-2, Neighborhood Business, for a retail store was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed subdivision and structure.

(Also see Case #SUB2002-00271 – **Browning Place Subdivision** – Below)

Mr. Ty Irby was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Norman Figures was present and stated that this was the third or fourth time this particular issue had come before the Commission. The last time they were before the Commission, the applicant had falsely brought a document to the staff saying that the neighbors had agreed to the proposal. However, Mr. Figures said that he had not signed such a document. He had spoke with the neighbors again when he found out that this was being brought back up. The neighbors had been shocked that the applicant would try

December 5, 2002

again to rezone this property from R-1 to B-2. Mr. Figures said that this area had always been a residential community. He stated that this site was adjacent to the entrance to the Robert Trent Jones Golf Course where they had just started selling lots for new homes to be built. He was unsure if the new residents that were moving in were even aware of this proposed rezoning. He pointed out that this property was only 1.3 acres in a highly traveled congested area. The property was formerly used for the "black school". Had he known that this property was for sale, his family would have bought the property and kept it residential. He commented that there were a lot of elderly people living in the area. He said that this was a blue-collar area and they were all vehemently opposed to this. He pointed out that everyone in the area had well water. He said that the area was just beginning to pick up and some churches had recently opened in the area. He did not think they needed a diesel truck stop in their community.

Mr. Frost inquired where the new residences were being built.

Mr. Figures said that it was directly across the street at the Robert Trent Jones Golf Course. He stated that there was some City-owned property nearby that was supposed to be used for a fire station in the future. They were hoping that the fire station would be built.

Mr. Nodine commented that this site was in District 7, which he represented. He said that this was a heavily traveled road. He mentioned a traffic accident that had occurred there where a woman was killed. He said that people often exceeded the speed limit there. He knew that there were plans for several more residences in the immediate area. Mr. Nodine said that he certainly heard their concerns and he felt that having this development at this particular juncture would pose a serious traffic hazard and a threat to the surrounding residential community.

Mr. Figures said that there was an elderly woman living directly across from the subject property who had lived in the area for over 60 years. He did not think it was fair to her to allow this.

Mr. Nodine did not think that the subject property would ever be used residentially. He inquired if they could compromise and go ahead and allow the applicant to move forward with the rezoning application if there were some way to ensure that a traffic signal would be installed so there was easier access to Bear Fork Road.

Mr. Figures said that he was not opposed to the subdivision aspect of this, but they did object to the rezoning of the property to commercial.

Mr. Alfred Figures was present in opposition. He asked that the Commission members take the time to visit this site, particularly during peak traffic times. He said that it was impossible to cross the road on foot and it was difficult for them to get out of their driveways. He felt that the situation was very hazardous. He did not think there was any need for retail in the area. He thought that if this were approved it would put the safety and welfare of the residents in jeopardy.

Mr. Irby said that he was the real estate broker in this case. He stated that the staff was very familiar with this situation as they had been before the Commission on several occasions pertaining to this site over the last 4-1/2 years. He further stated that the Figures had cost the applicant several thousand dollars in fees and he had lost 3 or 4 buyers for the property. Mr. Irby said that the rezoning was approved the last time subject to an application for a two-lot subdivision. The subdivision was only to clear-up an issue with the existing driveway. He said that the driveway and part of the Figures' house encroached onto the applicant's property. They had tried to resubdivide the property as required. One of the Figures brothers lived in the house and had signed the subdivision application. Mr. Irby said that they had been unaware that someone else needed to sign the application. Therefore, he did not feel that they had falsified anything as had been mentioned. He thought that when the rezoning was approved previously, Mr. McSwain had made a comment that this was obviously a commercial site or obviously not residential. Mr. Irby said that it was on a corner and it did not adjoin the Robert Trent Jones Golf Course entrance; it was across the street and further west. Immediately across

December 5, 2002

the street was the Mobile County Sheriff's Posse facility. He said that there were several churches, Ford Lumber Company, mobile home dealerships, and a lot of other businesses in the vicinity. He did not feel that this would ever be desired as a residential piece of property. He felt that the issue of the traffic signal should be up to the Traffic Engineering Department. They would work with them in any way they could. He said that the application was not for a diesel truck facility, as had been mentioned. The purpose of the site was for a retail flooring store.

Mr. Frost recalled that the first application was for a diesel facility.

Mr. Irby said this was correct. The rezoning had already been approved in the past. They had tried to give the Figures the driveway, but they had been unwilling to work with them.

Mr. Vallas inquired if there would be drive by customers coming in or if it would mainly be contractors.

Mr. Irby said that it would be contractors.

Mr. Vallas inquired if the applicant would be agreeable to restricting access to Moffett Road until such time as a traffic signal was installed. He did not think this property should be zoned R-1, but he could also understand the concern about traffic on Moffett Road.

Mr. Irby felt that accessibility was very important to potential buyers. He was unsure if the buyer would agree to this. He said that the staff had already placed a limitation on curb cuts and the applicant was willing to work with Traffic Engineering.

In discussion, Mr. Nodine said that he would like for this application to be heldover so that he could meet with the Figures, the other residents and the applicant and address some of the issues. He felt that this was a serious traffic concern.

Mr. Frost inquired how long Mr. Nodine would need.

Mr. Nodine felt that a couple of weeks would be sufficient.

Ms. Clarke said that if there was going to be any new information that would need to be included in the Commission's packet as a result of the meeting, she asked that the application be heldover until January 9, 2003.

Mr. Frost said that when the Commission had denied a previous rezoning application for this site it was going to be a fuel place. He remembered that there was a major concern that everyone in the area was on a septic system with wells and there was a potential for underground storage tank leaking. He thought that if this were rezoned commercially, that they might want to restrict it from any type of business dealing with fuel.

Ms. Clarke felt that this would be handled by the Board of Health.

A motion was made by Mr. Nodine and seconded by Mr. Vallas to holdover this application until the meeting of January 9, 2003.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00271

Browning Place Subdivision

Southeast corner of Moffett Road and Bear Fork Road.

1 Lot / 1.3± Acres

(For discussion see Case #ZON2002-02505 – **Charles J. Browning** – Above)

A motion was made by Mr. Nodine and seconded by Mr. Vallas to holdover this application until the meeting of January 9, 2003.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW PLANNING APPROVAL APPLICATION:

Case #ZON2002-02476

Wellington Street Baptist Church

1308 Mobile Street (Northeast corner of Mobile Street and Chastang Street).

The request for Planning Approval to allow the expansion of an existing church in an R-1, Single-Family Residential District was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed parking, existing building, and proposed additions.

The applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Quimby and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this plan subject to the following conditions:

- (1) approval of the off-site parking variance by the Board of Zoning Adjustment;
- (2) the parking facility be permitted and constructed simultaneously with the building addition;
- (3) the two parking spaces located on the sanctuary site be limited to handicap use only, and signed appropriately;
- (4) the provision of buffering where the site abuts residential properties;
- (5) both sites be brought into full compliance with landscaping and tree planting requirements;
- (6) provision of sidewalks along all street frontages, or the granting of appropriate waivers; and
- (7) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

Case #SUB2002-00272

Baker Estates Subdivision

South side of Airport Boulevard, at the Southern terminus of Flave Pierce Road, 1,970'± East of Walter Smith Road.

46 Lots / 22± Acres

This application was heldover prior to the meeting.

Case #SUB2002-00269

Burgett-Riverview Subdivision

2279 Burgett Road (South side of Burgett Road at Riverview Avenue, continuing through to the West side of Riverview Avenue, 250'± South of Burgett Road).

3 Lots / 4.7± Acres

Mr. Jerry Byrd of Byrd Surveying, Inc., was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff's recommendation for a holdover.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Frost and seconded by Mr. Plauche to holdover this application until the December 19, 2002, Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant to include the remainder of the property and additional property owner information for notification; or to provide the staff with documentation, in this case a deed prior to 1952, illustrating the subdivision of a parcel of the parent tract. This information would be required by December 9th.

December 5, 2002

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00264

Cottage Hill Auto Mall Subdivision

3256 Cottage Hill Road (North side of Cottage Hill Road, 240'± West of Sledge Drive).

1 Lot / 0.9± Acre

Mr. Frank Dagley of Frank A. Dagely & Associates, Inc. was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Quimby and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the development is limited to one curb cut to Cottage Hill Road, with the size, location and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering; and
- (2) placement of the required 25-foot minimum building setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00270

Hamilton Commercial Park Subdivision

2850 and 2860 Hamilton Boulevard (North side of Hamilton Boulevard, 520'± East of Bellwood Drive East).

1 Lot / 11.7± Acres

Mr. Jerry Byrd of Byrd Surveying, Inc., was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Quimby and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the development is limited to two curb cuts to Hamilton Boulevard, with the size, location and design to be approved County Engineering;
- (2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lot that is developed commercially and adjoins residentially developed property shall provide a buffer, in compliance with Section V.A.7. of the Subdivision Regulations; and
- (3) placement of the required 25-foot minimum building setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00267

Hill Estate Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lot 2

East side of Erdman Avenue, 110'± North of Garrow Avenue, continuing through to the South side of the Illinois Central Railroad Tracks; and to the West side of Withers Avenue, 213'± North of Howells Ferry Road.

2 Lots / 5.5± Acres

Mr. Marshall McLeod of Marshall A. McLeod, P.L.S., L.L.C., was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

December 5, 2002

A motion was made by Mr. Quimby and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 2 is denied access to Withers Avenue; and
- (2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that there will be no further subdivision of Lot 1 until Erdman Avenue is improved to city standard or has frontage to an improved right-of-way.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00265

M.K.H. Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 1-4

South side of Forest Ridge Road South, 1,450'± South of Overlook Road, extending through to University Boulevard.

6 Lots / 2.3± Acres

Mr. Matt Orrell of Polysurveying Engineering - Land Surveying was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Quimby and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this subdivision subject to the following condition:

- (1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating the site is denied direct access to North University Boulevard.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00273

Madden-Cochran Subdivision

Northwest corner of North Conception Street and State Street.

2 Lots / 0.7± Acre

Mr. M. Don Williams of M. Don Williams Engineering was representing the applicant and stated that this was a two-lot subdivision to reorient a lot. There was an existing lot on the corner of North Conception and State Streets that ran parallel to State Street. They were swapping some property with the Waterfront Rescue Mission. The lot would be reoriented 90 degrees. He had a concern regarding the staff condition requiring placement of a 5' setback along all street frontages. He felt that this request was redundant and that the Zoning Ordinance did require the 5' setback on those yards. The house had not been designed yet for the corner lot. When the house was placed there the Architectural Review Board would have to give their approval, so it would have to go back to them. He said that they would also have to get approval from the Board of Zoning Adjustment if they decided to build to the property line. He stated that he had represented another application a few months ago for the Mobile Area Mardi Gras Association (MAMGA). The original MAMGA subdivision from the 1960s showed a 25' setback on the plat, however, the proposed float barn was closer to the property line than that. Therefore, they had been forced to come back in and record another subdivision without that setback shown. If a 5' setback was placed on the plan for the subject property it would have to stay there until they re-recorded it. If they were to get a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the setback they would have to come back before the Commission so they could re-record the plat and this was something they wanted to avoid if possible.

Mr. Frost inquired if they were asking for zero setbacks.

Mr. Williams said that they did not want to have to indicate a setback line on the record plat. It was his understanding that if they were to include the 5', a fence would be subject to that as well. He had driven through the surrounding neighborhood and there were

December 5, 2002

several fences that were on the property line, including the Richard's DAR House, which was City-owned property.

Mr. Frost inquired if he were saying that the 5' setback was acceptable, but that he did not want it on the plat.

Mr. Williams replied no. He said that at some point there would be a house constructed on the site that would encroach into that setback. They would be subject to the 5' setback anyway under the Zoning Ordinance, but if it were not on the plat they would be free to petition the Board of Zoning Adjustment for a variance.

Mr. Olsen said that the Subdivision Regulations required a 25' setback from all street frontages.

Mr. Frost inquired if they could waive that and move the setback to 5'.

Mr. Olsen said that they could do this and it would correspond with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. In the past, if there was a setback issue such as this on the final plat, the applicant went to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. If the variance was granted they could put a copy of the letter of decision from the Board and place it in the Subdivision file and consider it taken care of. If he remembered correctly on the MAMGA application Mr. Williams had referred to there was more involved than just the 25' setback; it was also combining multiple parcels into one and a rezoning. Because of that the applicant had been told that they would have to re-record the plat.

Mr. Frost inquired if the Commission had the authority to override the Zoning Ordinance and bring this to a zero-lot line.

Mr. Olsen replied no. They could waive the setback on the final plat.

Mr. Frost inquired if they should make the setback subject to Board of Zoning Adjustment approval.

Mr. Olsen said this would not be necessary as the staff would require them to go to the Board of Zoning Adjustment regardless of the 5' setback being shown on the plat or not. However, it could be used as an argument for the variance if the setback was not shown.

Mr. Frost clarified that if they were to eliminate staff condition #2 and not require the 5' setback on the plat, the applicant would still be subject to this setback because of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Olsen said this was correct.

Mr. Williams said that they were more than willing to go before the Board if need be, but they did not want to come back before the Commission if possible.

Mr. Olsen said that they would not be required to come back before the Commission if the Board granted a variance.

Mr. Williams said that if the 5' setback was shown and the plat was recorded, would the staff just ignore the setback if the Board granted them approval?

Ms. Clarke inquired if they intended to record the plat before they knew whether or not they were going to put a house on the site.

Mr. Williams said this was correct. He stated that the Waterfront Rescue Mission wanted to move forward with their parking lot.

Ms. Clarke said that she understood the fact that they did not have a plan for the home. She inquired if the Waterfront Rescue Mission would be adhering to the 5' setback from State Street. She said that because of the greenspace and tree requirements along the street frontage, they did not want to see a zero-build of asphalt and parking bumpers

December 5, 2002

abutting State Street and using that as an excuse for getting out of required landscaping and tree planting.

Mr. Williams said that they would not have a problem with a 5' setback on the Water Front Rescue Mission lot. They would be providing a greenbelt there and he thought some trees would be required as well. The only way they could do that was to provide a 5' setback.

There was no one present in opposition.

In discussion, Mr. McSwain inquired if they could do what Mr. Williams was requesting.

Mr. Frost felt that they could. He thought they could remove staff condition #2, so the 5' setback would not be on the plat, but it would not exempt them from the Zoning Ordinance and they would still have to abide by the 5'. He inquired if they should require a 5' greenspace.

Ms. Clarke said that based on the Commission's past practices, she could not recall any plat that had been allowed to be recorded in the last 10 years that did not have a designated setback. She noted that on most of the subdivision recommendations, if the applicant had not already put the standard 25' setback on the plan, it was included as a condition to make sure it was clear-cut. She recommended that they leave it in. She wanted to stress that the condition would in no way prohibit them from obtaining a variance if they decided to apply for one. Even though the setback would be on the final plat, a letter from the Board of Zoning Adjustment could be recorded or attached to the file. They could also allow them to re-record the plat without having to come back before the Commission if they obtained a variance.

Mr. Quimby said that there were already a lot of zero-lot line structures in the area.

Ms. Clarke said that there were a lot of non-conforming structures in the area, but for all new construction the 5' setback had been typically adhered to. If there was a waiver of that requirement it was done by the Board. They did not want to prevent them from getting a variance, but they needed to go before the Board and let them decide.

A motion as made by Mr. Quimby to waive Sections V.D.3. and V.D.9. of the Subdivision Regulations and approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) placement of a note on the final plat stating that driveway number, sizes, location and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and conform to AASHTO standards; and
- (2) placement of a 5' setback along all street frontages.

Mr. Quimby thought that they would not have a problem obtaining a variance if and when they decided to put a house on the lot. He felt that leaving in the condition would protect them from the parking lot issue.

Mr. Frost said that if they didn't put something in there about the greenspace they might build in that area. He inquired if they would be allowed to build up to the property line if the Board granted them a variance.

Ms. Clarke said this was correct. However, it was her understanding that the only potential variance would be for the corner property and there was not intent on the part of the Waterfront Rescue Mission to build zero-lot line. The staff would certainly not advocate a variance for the parking lot. It would be new development and they would be requiring the typical greenspace and trees. This was certainly a part of town that needed that.

The motion was seconded by Mr. McSwain.

The question was called. The motion carried unanimously.

December 5, 2002

Case #SUB2002-00268

Pine Valley Subdivision

East side of Schillinger Road, 160'± South of Adobe Ridge Road South.

2 Lots / 58.8± Acres

Mr. Don Coleman with Rester and Coleman Engineers, Inc., was representing the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Willie Norman of 7681 Adobe Ridge Road South was present and inquired if the lots would be used for single-family or multi-family dwelling units.

Mr. Frost said that this was in the County and therefore, they had no authority over how the property was used.

Mr. Coleman said that the applicant was proposing storage warehouses.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Ms. Deakle to waive Section V.D.3. of the Subdivision Regulations, and approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 50-feet from the centerline of Schillinger Road;
- (2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 1 is limited to one curb cut to Schillinger Road, with the size, location and design to be approved by County Engineering;
- (3) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 2 is limited to two curb cuts to Schillinger Road, with the size, location and design to be approved by County Engineering;
- (4) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lot 2 is denied access to Adobe Ridge Road South and Ridgeline Drive;
- (5) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that if any property is developed commercially and adjoins residential property, a buffer in compliance with Section V.A.7. of the Subdivision Regulations, will be provided;
- (6) the developer obtain any necessary federal, state, and local environmental approvals prior to development; and
- (7) the placement of the 25-foot minimum building setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00266

Scott Place Subdivision

North side of Johnson Road South, 150'± East of Scott Plantation Drive South (Northwest corner of Johnson Road and future March Road Extension).

17 Lots / 8.6± Acres

The applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- (1) dedication of the necessary right-of-way to provide 50-feet from the centerline of March Road Extension, a planned major street;
- (2) placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lots 1, and 4-8 are denied direct access to the proposed March Road Extension;
- (3) placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lots 3 and 15 are denied direct access to Johnson Road;
- (4) placement of an note on the final plat stating that Lots 16 and 17 are limited to one curb cut each to Johnson Road; and

December 5, 2002

- (5) placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lots that are developed commercially and adjoin residentially developed property, must provide a buffer, in compliance with Section V.A.7. of the Regulations.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2002-00274

Sterling Place Subdivision

2604 Dauphin Street (North side of Dauphin Street, 100' ± West of Alexander Street).

1 Lot / 1.2± Acres

The applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

Mr. Ken Ketterer of 9 Alexander Street was present and stated that he wanted some information. He said that the existing apartment complex was built almost to the property line. He commented that the staff had recommended provision of a buffer. He inquired what type of buffer would be required.

Mr. Olsen said that it would require a 6' high wooden privacy fence.

Mr. Ketterer said that there was currently a chain link fence located there. He inquired how long it would be before the chain link fence was taken down and the privacy fence was installed. He said that he had experienced people jumping the chain link fence and coming into his yard and he was concerned what would happen if the chain link fence was removed and there was a long period before the new fence was erected.

Mr. Olsen said that the new fence would be required prior to the recording of the final plat, but they had up to a year to record the plat. He stated that this was really the only thing they could do.

Mr. Frost said that it would all depend on what the applicant's time frame was in needing to record the plat.

Mr. Ketterer said that it was an existing apartment complex. He inquired if a fence was already required because of that.

Mr. Frost said that he was unsure why the applicant was requesting the subdivision. It was his understanding that they were trying to clean-up the metes and bounds legal description and create a legal lot of record. He did not know if they were trying to sell the property to someone else. If they weren't planning on doing anything further with the property, they would have up to a year.

Mr. Ketterer was concerned about the sidewalk along Dauphin Street in front of this property. He inquired if this was something that the Commission could require them to repair.

Mr. Frost said that they could not require this under the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Olsen said that the only way they would have to repair the sidewalk was if they redeveloped the site and it was 50% or more than what was existing now.

Mr. Ketterer inquired why the applicant would want to clean-up the metes and bounds description.

Mr. Frost said that they were technically not in compliance with the Regulations by having carved out a metes and bounds description. Since the 1950s the City had required legal lots of record and this was not the case with this site. He said that usually people did this because they were planning to do something with the property or to sell it.

A motion was made by Mr. McSwain and seconded by Ms. Deakle to approve this subdivision subject to the following conditions:

December 5, 2002

- (1) the provision of a buffer in compliance with Section V.A.7. where the site adjoins R-1 property; and
- (2) the placement of the 25-foot minimum building setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW SIDEWALK WAIVER APPLICATION:

Case #ZON2002-02504

Young Impressions, Inc.

4550 Higgins Road (North side of Higgins Road, 400'± East of Cypress Business Park Drive).

The request to waive construction of a sidewalk along Higgins Road was considered.

The applicant was present.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Mr. McSwain to approve this request.

The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

New Call for Public Hearing: January 9, 2003

Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Sign Ordinance to allow Sandwich Board Signs in the Loop Area.

Mr. Frost called for a Public Hearing to be held on January 9, 2003, for consideration of a proposed amendment to the Sign Ordinance to allow Sandwich Board Signs in the Loop Area.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: March 20, 2003

/s/ Victor McSwain, Secretary

/s/ Robert Frost, Chairman

jh