

Mobile Planning Commission Minutes

November 20, 2025 – 2:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Roll Call

x	Mr. John W. “Jay” Stubbs, Jr., Chairman	x	Mr. Matt Anderson (MD)
	Mr. Kirk Mattei, Vice Chairman	x	Mr. Nick Amberger (AO)
x	Ms. Jennifer Denson, Secretary	x	Mr. Josh Woods (CC)
x	Mr. Harry Brislin, IV	x	Mr. Kenny Nichols (S)
	Mr. Larry Dorsey	x	Ms. Ellie Edwards (S)
x	Mr. Chad Anderson		
(S) Supernumerary (MD) Mayor’s Designee (AO) Administrative Official (CC) City Council Representative			

Staff: Jonathan Ellzey, George Davis, Victoria Burch, Emma Hope, Stephen Guthrie, Logan Anderson, Bert Hoffman, Shayla Beaco

Adoption of the Agenda.

Motion to adopt by Jay Stubbs. Second by Matt Anderson. Adopted.

HOLDOVERS

1. SUB-003478-2025

Location: 4595 Commerce Boulevard South & 6137 Todd Acres Drive
Subdivision Name: Todd Acres Industrial Park Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lot A, Resubdivision of Lots 5 & 6
Applicant / Agent: Charles D. Tisher, Jr., PE, Clark Geer Latham & Associates
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 5 lots, 241.7± acres

Charles D. Tisher of Clark Geer Latham & Associates was present for the application and in agreement with the suggested considerations.

Commissioners asked the applicant about the requirements of the Traffic Impact Study, specifically at Todd Acres Drive and Rangeline Road intersection.

Mr. Tisher stated that they had met with the Traffic Engineering and Engineering staff regarding required improvements noted in the Traffic Impact Study. Upgrades would occur along the same timeframe as the development.

Commissioner Amberger noted that the City was coordinating with the Alabama Department of Transportation regarding the scope and timing of the traffic-related improvements.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to approve by Jennifer Denson. Second by Harry Brislin. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Sections 6.C.3. (for lot width-to-depth ratio) and 6.C.4. (for no public street access) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the right-of-way widths of all public streets on the Final Plat, as depicted on the preliminary plat;
2. Revision of the plat to label the 25-foot minimum building setback line along all street frontages within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision;
3. Retention of the lot size labels in both square feet and acres on the Final Plat, or the furnishing of a table on the Final Plat providing the same information;
4. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
5. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating the updated Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
7. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

2. SUB-003475-2025

Location: 5070 Old Shell Road
Subdivision Name: The Cottages at Spring Hill Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: 195, LLC
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Subdivision of 7 lots, 0.57± acres

The applicant was not present for the meeting, however, prior to the meeting the applicant had submitted a request to holdover the application.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to holdover by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. Heldover until the December 18, 2025, meeting.

Josh Woods voted in opposition.

After discussion and at the applicant's request, the Planning Commission waived Section 10.C.3. of the Subdivision Regulations and heldover the application to the December 18th meeting.

NEW ITEMS

3. SUB-003517-2025

Location: 5906 U.S. Highway 90 West, extending to the North terminus of Kirk Road (Private Street)
Subdivision Name: OHM Base Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Michele Boner, InLine, LLC
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 1 lot, 4.97± acres

The applicant was present and in agreement with the suggested holdover.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to holdover by Jay Stubbs. Second by Kenny Nichols. Heldover until the December 18, 2025, meeting.

After discussion the Planning Commission heldover the request until the December 18th meeting, with any revisions to be submitted no later than Friday, December 5th, to allow the applicant to address the following:

1. Revise the plat to illustrate sufficient dedication to provide 30 feet from the centerline of Kirk Road, in compliance with Section 6.C.9. of the Subdivision Regulations;
2. Revise the plat to illustrate a right-of-way diameter sufficient to meet the requirements of the International Fire Code (IFC), as determined by the City Engineer, in compliance with Section 6.C.9. of the Subdivision Regulations;
3. If Kirk Road is privately maintained, submit documentation to the Planning and Zoning Department verifying its private status; and
4. Revise the plat to illustrate a closed-end street design that adequately accommodates fire apparatus maneuverability, as required by the IFC and determined by the City Engineer.

4. SUB-003473-2025

Location: 1608 Crestwood Drive
Subdivision Name: Crestwood B Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Joseph Mastroianni
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 1.05± acres

The applicant was present and in agreement with the suggested considerations.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Harry Brislin. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Sections 6.C.7. (for multiple street frontages), Section 6.C.2.(b)(2) (for lot width) and Section 6.C.9.(a) (for lot shape) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the right-of-way along Crestwood Drive on the Final Plat, as depicted on the preliminary plat;
2. Revision of the Final Plat to depict either the existing right-of-way width along University Boulevard and University Loop or dedication sufficient to provide 100-foot-wide rights-of-way, whichever is greater;
3. Retention of the lot's size in both square feet and acres, or the provision of a table on the Final Plat providing the same information, adjusted for any required dedication;
4. Revision of the Final Plat to illustrate a 25-foot minimum building setback line where each lot is at least 50-feet wide;
5. Revision of the Final Plat to illustrate the required 25-foot front yard setback along all street frontages, in compliance with Article 2, Section 64-2-10.E. of the UDC and Section 6.C.8. of the Subdivision Regulations, adjusted for any required dedication;
6. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
7. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
8. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
9. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

5. SUB-003525-2025

Location: 1615 & 1622 Mackie Avenue
Subdivision Name: Coffman - Turner Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: James H. Coffman, Jr.
Council District: District 3
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 1.81± acres

James Coffman, Jr., was present regarding the application. He stated that he and the adjacent owner that sold him the property agreed to provide land for a cul-de-sac, but that the plat before the Commission did not appear to be accurate in its depiction of property boundaries.

Zeke Hudson of Rowe Engineering was present regarding the application and stated the existing cul-de-sac is private. He also stated that they may have misunderstood their client regarding the plat and would revise the plat.

Commissioner Amberger noted that it appeared that the intent was to convert the private cul-de-sac to a City-maintained street.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to approve by Jay Stubbs. Second by Harry Brislin. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Section 6.C.3. (for lot width-to-depth ratio) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Dedication to provide 30 feet from the centerline of Mackie Avenue;
2. Dedication of the private easement cul-de-sac to the City of Mobile, as determined by the City Engineer;
3. Revision of the plat to illustrate the 25-foot minimum building setback line along Mackie Avenue and the cul-de-sac as measured from any required dedication;
4. Retention of the lot size labels in both square feet and acres, revised for any required dedication, or the furnishing of a table on the Final Plat providing the same information;
5. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating that no structure may be constructed or placed within any easement without the permission of the easement holder;
6. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
7. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
8. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
9. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

6. SUB-003445-2025

Location: 250 Tuthill Lane & 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9 Garden Trace (Private Street)
Subdivision Name: Garden Trace Subdivision, Resubdivision
Applicant / Agent: Earle W. Long, IV
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Subdivision of 9 lots, 13.3± acres

Casey Pipes of Helmsing Leach was present for the application and made the following points:

- The purpose of the application was to change the requirements regarding the provision of sidewalks and the vacation of easements that were conditions of the original approval of the subdivision;

- The revision would allow individual property owners to request a sidewalk waiver; and
- Requested that they be allowed to re-record the plat with the altered conditions rather than prepare an entirely new plat because the original CAD file has been lost and would require a substantial effort and expense to recreate.

There was discussion between staff, Commissioners and Mr. Pipes regarding amending the existing recorded plat versus preparing an entirely new plat, based upon a new survey. There was also discussion regarding whether the sidewalk issue could be resolved administratively rather than through the plat amendment process.

No one else was present regarding the application.

During the deliberation session, Commissioners discussed the request and determined that an “extinguishment document” would be sufficient to allow the re-recording of the plat with the requested modifications.

Motion to approve by Nick Amberger. Second by Matt Anderson. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of an “extinguishing document” regarding sidewalks and the vacated MAWSS easement, as discussed during the meeting, the contents and language of which are to be coordinated with Engineering and recorded in Mobile County Probate Court in lieu of preparation of a revised plat.

7. MOD-003487-2025

Location: 6710 Old Shell Road
Applicant / Agent: American Tower Corporation (Amanda Novas, TruNorthe, LLC, Agent)
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Major Modification of a previously approved Planning Approval allowing construction of a 150-foot-tall steel monopole telecommunications tower, to increase the height of the telecommunications tower from 150 feet to 172.1 feet.

Michael Bently on behalf of American Tower Corporation was present for the application and explained the request for the Commission. He agreed with the suggested considerations.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Commissioners and staff discussed the residential buffer requirement.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. Approved.

Josh Woods voted in opposition.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following Findings of Fact to support modification of the previously approved Planning Approval:

- a. The request is consistent with all applicable requirements of this Chapter;
- b. The request is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood;
- c. The request will not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property;
- d. Having considered the applicable factors, the request will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding neighborhood, or be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;
- e. The request is subject to adequate design standards to provide ingress and egress that minimize traffic hazards and traffic congestion on the public roads;
- f. The request is not noxious or offensive by reason of emissions, vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke or gas; and
- g. The request shall not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.
- h. Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Major Planning Approval Modification to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of Tower Height, Tower Setback and Tower Residential Buffer Variances by the Board of Zoning Adjustment;
2. Placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that any future development or re-development of the site may require additional PUD and Planning Approval modifications, subject to approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
3. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in this staff report;
4. Placement of a note on the revised site plan stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in this staff report;
5. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report;
6. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report;
7. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of the revised Modified Planned Unit Development site plan prior to its recording in Probate Court, and the provision of one (1) copy of the recorded site plan (hard copy and pdf) to Planning and Zoning; and,
8. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

8. MOD-003515-2025

Location: 560 Providence Park Drive East
Applicant / Agent: Clarence Ball, Ball Healthcare (David Dichiara, Kadre Engineering, LLC, Agent)
Council District: District 6
Proposal: Major Modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development amending a previously approved master plan, to allow construction of a multi-family residential building with 56 dwelling units, with shared access between multiple buildings sites.

Casey Pipes of Helmsing Leach was present for the application and in agreement with the suggested considerations.

No one else was present regarding the application.

During the deliberation session, Planning staff recommended that the Commission revise condition # 12 regarding dumpster placement to note that an application to the Board of Adjustment for a variance would be allowed.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. Approved. Harry Brislin recused from the application.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following Findings of Fact to support modification of the previously approved Planned Unit Development:

- a. The request is consistent with all applicable requirements of this Chapter;
- b. The request is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood;
- c. The request will not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property;
- d. Having considered the applicable factors, the request will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding neighborhood, or be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;
- e. The request is subject to adequate design standards to provide ingress and egress that minimize traffic hazards and traffic congestion on the public roads;
- f. The request is not noxious or offensive by reason of emissions, vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke or gas; and
- g. The request shall not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.
- h. Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Major Planned Unit Development Modification to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the lot size label in square feet and acres on the Final PUD Site Plan;
2. Retention of the 25-foot front yard setback along Cody Road South on the Final PUD Site Plan;
3. Revision of the site plan to depict curbing where vehicles could extend beyond the parking lot, or illustrate wheel stops where applicable;
4. Revision of the site plan to include bicycle parking in compliance with Article 3, Section 64-3-12.A.9. of the UDC, including required quantities and locations;
5. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to illustrate directional areas indicating traffic flow;
6. Provision of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that the site will comply with parking lot lighting standards under Article 3, Section 64-3-9.C. of the UDC, and that a photometric plan will be submitted at the time of permitting;
7. Retention of the sidewalk along Cody Road South on the Final PUD Site Plan unless a Sidewalk Waiver is approved by the Planning Commission;
8. Retention of the building's size in square feet on the Final PUD Site Plan;
9. Provision of building elevation drawings demonstrating compliance with Article 3, Section 64-3-6 of the UDC, or placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that the new building will comply with these standards;
10. Provision of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating the maximum allowable building height in the B-3 Suburban District is 50 feet;
11. Revision of the site plan to illustrate compliance with tree planting and landscape area requirements of Article 3, Section 64-3-7 of the UDC, or placement of a note stating that a landscape plan compliant with these requirements will be submitted at the time of permitting;
12. Provision of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating any dumpster placed on the property will comply with the placement and enclosure standards of Article 3, Section 64-3-13.A.4. of the UDC, or provision of a note stating curbside waste management will be utilized, or obtain approval of a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment;
13. Placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that any future development or re-development of the site may require additional PUD modifications, subject to approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
14. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
15. Compliance with all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
16. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report;
17. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report;
18. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of the revised Modified Planned Unit Development site plan prior to its recording in Probate Court, and the provision of one (1) copy of the recorded site plan (hard copy and pdf) to Planning and Zoning; and,
19. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

9. MOD-003524-2025

Location: 6151 Marina Drive South
Applicant / Agent: Chris Lieb, Lieb Engineering Company, LLC
Council District: District 3
Proposal: Major Modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development allowing multiple buildings on a single building site with shared access and parking between two building sites, to allow construction of a multi-family development with 178 dwelling units in multiple buildings on a single building site with shared access and parking between two building sites.

No one was present to represent the application.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Motion to holdover by Jay Stubbs. Second by Jennifer Denson. Heldover until the December 18, 2025, meeting.

After discussion the Planning Commission heldover the request until the December 18th meeting, with revised information due no later than Thursday, December 4th, to allow the applicant to provide additional information so that the Planning Commission can ensure the development will comply with UDC standards:

1. Revision of the site plan to include the number of dwelling units, both existing and proposed;
2. Revision of the site plan to include the number of parking spaces, both existing and proposed;
3. Revision of the site plan to include depiction of a sidewalk along Marina Drive South;
4. Revision of the site plan to illustrate compliance with the pedestrian walkway requirements of Article 3, Section 64-3-3 of the UDC;
5. Revision of the site plan to depict a residential buffer compliant with Section 64-3-8 of the UDC;
6. Revision of the site plan to either depict bicycle parking spaces or placement of a note stating that the site will provide bicycle parking in compliance with Article 3, Section 64-3-12.A.9. of the UDC;
7. Placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that the site will comply with parking lot lighting standards under Article 3, Section 64-3-9.C. of the UDC, and that a photometric plan will be submitted at the time of permitting;
8. Revision of the site plan to label the size of each building in square feet or provide a corresponding table with the same information;
9. Provision of building elevation drawings demonstrating compliance with Article 3, Section 64-3-6 of the UDC, or placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that each new building will comply with these standards;

10. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site will fully comply with tree planting and landscape area requirements of Section 64-3-7 of the UDC;
11. Placement of a note on the revised site plan stating that any future development or re-development of the site may require additional PUD modifications, subject to approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
12. Revision of the site plan to include the correct project name and property owner;
13. Revision of the legal description to include both Lot 1 and Lot 2 of the Grandview Apartments Subdivision;
14. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
15. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
16. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and
17. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

10. ZON-CUP-003505-2025

Location: 5330 Moffett Road
Applicant / Agent: Tammy Ceasor, Liz & Lamar Group Home
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Conditional Use Permit approval to allow a Community Residence for more than five (5) persons in an R-1, Single-Family Residential Suburban District.

The applicant was present for the application and agreed with the suggested holdover.

Motion to holdover by Jay Stubbs. Second by Nick Amberger. Heldover until the December 18, 2025, meeting.

After discussion the Planning Commission heldover the request until the December 18th meeting, with additional information to be submitted no later than Friday, December 5th, to allow the applicant to provide a site plan prepared by a registered professional illustrating compliance with the development standards of Article 3 of the Unified Development Code (UDC). The use of the adjacent property to the East should also be documented.

11. SUB-003444-2025 & MOD-003516-2025

Location: 3456 & 3500 Halls Mill Road, and 2390 West I-65 Service Road South
Subdivision Name: Radcliff-Ice Plant Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Ben M. Radcliff Contractor, Inc. & PM Properties, LLC
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 15.36± acres; and Major Modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development allowing multiple buildings on a single building site, to modify lot lines in coordination

with the proposed subdivision, and to remove an undeveloped portion of the site from the previously approved Planned Unit Development.

Jay Watkins of Maynard Nexsen was present for the applications and requested that Engineering requirements #1 and #2 from the Planned Unit Development comments be removed.

Staff agreed with the applicant's request.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Subdivision.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Section 6.C.3. of the Subdivision Regulations (for lot width-to-depth ratio) and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Revision of the Final Plat to depict dedication sufficient to provide 35 feet from the centerline of Halls Mill Road, in compliance with Section 6.C.9. of the Subdivision Regulations;
2. Revision of the Final Plat to depict the minimum existing right-of-way width or a dedicated 300-foot-wide right-of-way, whichever is greater, along West I-65 Service Road South;
3. Retention of the 200-foot-wide right-of-way for the Montlimar Creek Drainage Canal as illustrated on the preliminary plat;
4. Retention of the lot size labels in square feet and acres on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required dedication, or provision of a table on the Final Plat with the same information;
5. Retention of the 25-foot front yard setback along both street frontages on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required dedication;
6. Provision of a note on the Final Plat stating that no structures shall be constructed in any easement without consent of the easement holder;
7. Approval of the Major Planned Unit Development Modification;
8. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
9. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
10. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
11. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

Planned Unit Development Modification.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Jennifer Denson. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following Findings of Fact to support modification of the previously approved Planned Unit Development:

- a. The request is consistent with all applicable requirements of this Chapter;
- b. The request is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood;
- c. The request will not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property;
- d. Having considered the applicable factors, the request will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding neighborhood, or be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;
- e. The request is subject to adequate design standards to provide ingress and egress that minimize traffic hazards and traffic congestion on the public roads;
- f. The request is not noxious or offensive by reason of emissions, vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke or gas; and
- g. The request shall not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.
- h. Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Major Planned Unit Development Modification to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to label the size of each lot in both square feet and acres, adjusted for any required dedication resulting from the subdivision approval, or provision of a table on the Final PUD Site Plan with the same information;
2. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to illustrate the 25-foot front yard setback along all street frontages;
3. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to label each existing building with its size in square feet;
4. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to depict all other existing site features;
5. Provision of a table on the Final PUD Site Plan showing required and existing parking calculations;
6. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to illustrate any/all curbing and/or wheel stops;
7. Revision of the Final PUD Site Plan to depict any dumpsters or dumpster enclosures, or provision of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating curbside waste collection is utilized;

8. If any tree plantings or landscaped areas were required under prior approvals or permits, provide a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that the site will continue to maintain compliance with those applicable requirements;
9. Provision of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that any future development or redevelopment of the site may require additional modification of the PUD, subject to Planning Commission and City Council approval;
10. Completion of the subdivision process prior to recording the Final PUD Site Plan in Probate Court;
11. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report, amended as follows: *1. ADD THE FOLLOWING NOTES TO THE PUD SITE PLAN: a. Any work performed in the existing ROW (right-of-way) such as driveways, sidewalks, utility connections, grading, drainage, irrigation, or landscaping will require a ROW permit from the City of Mobile Engineering Permitting Department (251-208-6070) and must comply with the City of Mobile Right-of-Way Construction and Administration Ordinance (Mobile City Code, Chapter 57, Article VIII). b. A Land Disturbance Permit application shall be submitted for any proposed land disturbing activity with the property. A complete set of construction plans including, but not limited to, drainage, utilities, grading, storm water detention systems and paving will need to be included with the Land Disturbance permit. This Permit must be submitted, approved, and issued prior to beginning any of the construction work. c. Any and all proposed land disturbing activity within the property will need to be submitted for review and be in conformance with Mobile City Code, Chapter 17, Storm Water Management and Flood Control); the City of Mobile, Alabama Flood Plain Management Plan (1984); and, the Rules For Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Storm Water Runoff Control. d. A 25' riparian buffer may be required, during development, along the edge of anything considered by ADEM to be a water of the state. e. Any existing or proposed detention facility shall be maintained as it was constructed and approved. The Land Disturbance Permit application for any proposed construction includes a requirement of a Maintenance and Inspection Plan (signed and notarized by the Owner) for the detention facility. This Plan shall run with the land and be recorded in the County Probate Office prior to the Engineering Department issuing their approval for a Final Certificate of Occupancy. f. The approval of all applicable federal, state, and local agencies (including all storm water runoff, wetland and floodplain requirements) will be required prior to the issuance of a Land Disturbance permit. The Owner/Developer is responsible for acquiring all of the necessary permits and approvals. g. The proposed development must comply with all Engineering Department design requirements and Policy Letters;*
12. Compliance with all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
13. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report;
14. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report;
15. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of the revised Modified PUD site plan prior to its recording in Probate Court, and the provision of one (1) copy of the recorded site plan (hard copy and pdf) to Planning and Zoning; and,
16. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

12. SUB-003394-2025 & ZON-UDC-003511-2025

Location: 909 Government Street
Subdivision Name: Donnie Manning Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Donald Manning
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 0.40± acres; and Rezoning from Single-Family Residential Urban District (R-1) and Residential Business District (R-B), to Residential Business District (R-B).

Donnie Manning, the applicant, was present for the applications and in agreement with the suggested considerations.

No one else was present regarding the application.

Subdivision.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Harry Brislin. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Section 6.C.2(b)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations (for lot width) and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the right-of-way widths of Government Street (100 feet) and Church Street (50 feet) on the Final Plat;
2. Retention of the lot size labels in square feet and acres on the Final Plat, or provision of a table on the Final Plat with the same information, in compliance with Section 5.A.2(e)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations;
3. Retention of at least a five (5)-foot minimum front yard setback line along both street frontages;
4. Completion of the Rezoning process to eliminate the potential for split-zoning prior to signing the Final Plat;
5. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Compliance with all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
7. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
8. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

Rezoning.

Motion to approve by Harry Brislin. Second by Kenny Nichols. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following criteria prevail to support Rezoning of the property to R-B, Residential Business District:

- A) Consistency. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- B) Mistake. There was a mistake or error in the original zoning map; and
- C) Compatibility. The proposed amendment is compatible with:
 - (1) The current development trends, if any, in the vicinity of the subject property;
 - (2) Surrounding land uses;
 - (3) Would not adversely impact neighboring properties; or
 - (4) Cause a loss in property values.
- D) Health, Safety and General Welfare. The proposed amendment promotes the community's public health, safety, and general welfare.
- E) Capacity. The infrastructure is in place to accommodate the proposed amendment; and,
- F) Change. Changed or changing conditions in a particular area make an amendment necessary and desirable.
- G) Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Rezoning the property to R-B, Residential Business District, to the City Council, subject to the following condition:

1. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

13. SUB-003522-2025, MOD-003521-2025 & MOD-003523-2025

Location: 4568 Halls Mill Road
Subdivision Name: Covenant Academy of Mobile Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Melissa A. Hadley, Goodwyn Mills Cawood
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 18.8± acres; Major Modification of a previously approved Planning Approval allowing a church school and day care in an R-1, Single-Family Residential Suburban District, to allow expansion of a church school and day care in an R-1, Single-Family Residential Suburban District; and Major Modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development allowing multiple buildings on a single building site with shared access and parking between two building sites, to allow construction of an additional building on a multi-building site with shared access and parking between multiple building sites.

Melissa Hadley of Goodwyn Mills Cawood was present for the applications and made the following points:

- Access from Knob Hill Drive was not requested as part of the applications, and requested that access be removed;
- Noted that no development was proposed on the larger lot, which is already developed, whereas the proposed smaller lot is for the anticipated new development; and
- Explained the issues relating to curb-cuts to Halls Mill Road, where a total of two curb-cuts would be allowed.

Paul Pritchett and Jack Sawberger expressed the following concerns regarding the applications:

- Did not want the school campus to have access to Knob Hill Drive due to traffic concerns; and
- Wanted to know why a separate lot was required for the property for the proposed new construction.

In response to the concerns, Ms. Hadley stated that the subdivision of the property was to separate out a piece of the site for finance reasons associated with the proposed new construction.

Subdivision.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. Approved. Kenny Nicholas recused from voting.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Section 6.C.2(b)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations (for lot width) and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the right-of-way widths for Halls Mill Road and Knob Hill Drive on the Final Plat;
2. Provision of the lot size labels in both square feet and acres, or provision of a table on the Final Plat with the same information, adjusted for any required dedication;
3. Depiction of the 25-foot minimum building setback line along Halls Mill Road and Knob Hill Drive, as required by Section 5.C.2.(i) of the Subdivision Regulations and Article 2, Section 64-2-10.E. of the Unified Development Code;
4. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating that the proposed Lot 1-A should be limited to one (1) curb cut to Halls Mill Road, and proposed Lot 1-B should be limited to one (1) curb cut to Halls Mill Road;
5. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
7. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
8. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

Planning Approval Modification .

Motion to approve by Nick Amberger. Second by Matt Anderson. Approved. Kenny Nicholas recused from voting.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following Findings of Fact to support modification of the previously approved Planning Approval:

- a. The request is consistent with all applicable requirements of this Chapter;
- b. The request is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood;
- c. The request will not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property;
- d. Having considered the applicable factors, the request will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding neighborhood, or be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;
- e. The request is subject to adequate design standards to provide ingress and egress that minimize traffic hazards and traffic congestion on the public roads;
- f. The request is not noxious or offensive by reason of emissions, vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke or gas; and
- g. The request shall not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.
- h. Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Major Planning Approval Modification to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of the size labels in both square feet and acres;
2. Provision of the building sizes in square feet on the site plan;
3. Retention of the right-of-way widths along all streets on the site plan;
4. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site will comply with tree planting and landscape area requirements;
5. Revision of the site plan to depict a compliant residential buffer where the site abuts residentially zoned or utilized property;
6. Retention of a note on the Final Planning Approval site plan stating future development or redevelopment of the property may require approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
7. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of the revised Modified Planning Approval site plan prior to their recording in Probate Court, and the provision of copies of the recorded site plans (hard copy and pdf) to Planning and Zoning; and,
8. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

Planned Unit Development Modification.

Motion to approve by Nick Amberger. Second by Matt Anderson. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following Findings of Fact to support modification of the previously approved Planned Unit Development:

- a. The request is consistent with all applicable requirements of this Chapter;
- b. The request is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood;
- c. The request will not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property;
- d. Having considered the applicable factors, the request will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding neighborhood, or be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;
- e. The request is subject to adequate design standards to provide ingress and egress that minimize traffic hazards and traffic congestion on the public roads;
- f. The request is not noxious or offensive by reason of emissions, vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke or gas; and
- g. The request shall not be detrimental or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.
- h. Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Major Planned Unit Development Modification to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provision of the size labels in both square feet and acres;
2. Provision of the building sizes in square feet on the site plan;
3. Retention of the right-of-way widths along all streets on the site plan;
4. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site will comply with tree planting and landscape area requirements;
5. Revision of the site plan to depict a compliant residential buffer where the site abuts residentially zoned or utilized property;
6. Retention of a note on the Final PUD site plan stating future development or redevelopment of the property may require approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
7. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of the revised Modified Planned Unit Development site plan prior to their recording in Probate Court, and the provision of copies of the recorded site plans (hard copy and pdf) to Planning and Zoning; and,
8. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

14. SUB-003482-2025, SUB-SW-003519-2025 & ZON-UDC-003518-2025

Location: 7125 Bellingrath Road
Subdivision Name: Addition to First Baptist Church of Theodore Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: T.J. Debrow, Sr., First Baptist Church of Theodore
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 10.05± acres; request to waive the construction of a sidewalk along Bellingrath Road; and Rezoning from Single-Family Residential Suburban District (R-1) to General Business District (B-4).

Casey Pipes of Helmsing Leach was present for the applications and made the following points:

- Discussed the staff-proposed suggestion of requesting Office Distribution (B-5) or Commercial Warehouse (CW) zoning designations instead of General Business District (B-4), specifically as it relates to the proposed use of the site; and
- Noted that using one of the suggested zoning districts would require an update to the Voluntary Use Restrictions submitted with the application.

Commissioners, Mr. Pipes and staff discussed the case, including amending the Voluntary Use Restrictions.

Mary Walker and Angela Craig were present and expressed the following concerns regarding the applications:

- Requested more information regarding the difference between Commercial Warehouse (CW) and General Business District (B-4) zoning designations;
- Concerned about future drainage problems associated with the new development; and
- Concerned about the additional truck traffic on Bellingrath Road due to the lack of a center turn-lane and the numerous trains that frequently block traffic on Bellingrath Road, causing increased congestion.

Engineering staff explained stormwater compliance requirements to the Commissioners and the speakers.

Casey Pipes, in rebuttal, made the following points:

- There were no plans to widen Bellingrath Road for the proposed development;
- The development will be less intense than might otherwise be allowed; and
- No traffic study was prepared as part of the application.

During the deliberation session, Commissioners and staff discussed the rezoning request, comparing the initially requested B-4 to the suggested CW zoning district.

Subdivision.

Motion to approve by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Sections 6.B.9 (to waive right-of-way dedication) and 6.C.7. (for double frontage) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the 45-foot front yard setback along Bellingrath Road and the 35-foot front yard setback along Old Military Road on the Final Plat, consistent with the most recently recorded subdivision plat;
2. If any additional right-of-way dedication is required by the City Engineer, the Final Plat should illustrate a minimum 25-foot front yard setback along any affected street frontage, in compliance with Section 6.C.8. of the Subdivision Regulations;
3. Retention of the lot sizes in both square feet and acres on the Final Plat, consistent with Section 5.A.2(e)(4), adjusted for any required dedication;
4. Completion of the Rezoning request to eliminate the potential for any split-zoned lots;
5. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
7. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
8. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

Sidewalk Waiver.

Motion to approve by Nick Amberger. Second by Matt Anderson. Approved.

Josh Woods voted in opposition.

After discussion the Planning Commission approved the Sidewalk Waiver request.

Rezoning.

Motion to approve by Nick Amberger. Second by Harry Brislin. Approved.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following criteria prevail to support Rezoning of the property to CW, Commercial Warehouse District:

- A) Consistency. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- B) Mistake. There was a mistake or error in the original zoning map; and
- C) Compatibility. The proposed amendment is compatible with:
 - (1) The current development trends, if any, in the vicinity of the subject property;
 - (2) Surrounding land uses;
 - (3) Would not adversely impact neighboring properties; or
 - (4) Cause a loss in property values.

- D) Health, Safety and General Welfare. The proposed amendment promotes the community's public health, safety, and general welfare.
- E) Capacity. The infrastructure is in place to accommodate the proposed amendment; and,
- F) Change. Changed or changing conditions in a particular area make an amendment necessary and desirable.
- G) Benefits Consideration. In addition, consideration was given to the City's and the larger community's best interests and the need, benefit, or public purpose of the proposed request.

As such, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Rezoning the property to CW, Commercial Warehouse District, to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. Completion of the Subdivision process;
2. Compliance with the associated Voluntary Conditions and Use Restrictions, as revised for the CW, Commercial Warehouse District, zoning classification;
3. Compliance with all Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Urban Forestry, and Fire Department comments noted in the staff report; and,
4. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

OTHER BUSINESS

- **Review of Minutes from the following Planning Commission meetings**

September 19, 2024

October 17, 2024

November 21, 2024

December 19, 2024

Motion to approve by Jay Stubbs. Second by Matt Anderson. Approved.

Minutes approved: May 21, 2026


Jennifer Denson, Secretary


John W. "Jay" Stubbs, Jr., Chairman