

Mobile Planning Commission Minutes
September 17, 2026 – 2:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE:

Roll Call

x	Mr. John W. “Jay” Stubbs, Jr., Chairman	x	Mr. Matt Anderson (MD)
x	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)
x	Mr. Larry Dorsey	x	Ms. Ellie Edwards (S)
	Mr. Chad Anderson		
(S) Supernumerary (MD) Mayor’s Designee (AO) Administrative Official (CC) City Council Representative			

Staff: Jonathan Ellzey, George Davis, Doug Anderson, Jim Rossler, Stephen Guthrie, Logan Anderson, Marie York, Shayla Beaco, Michelle French.

Adoption of the Agenda: Motion to adopt by Jay Stubbs. Second by Josh Woods. The Motion TO ADOPT the AGENDA passed unanimously.

NEW ITEMS:

1. SUB-003868-2026

Location: 5685 I-10 Industrial Parkway
Subdivision Name: PL Russell Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Byrd Surveying, Inc.
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 3.22± acres

The Applicant/Agent, Jerry Byrd, 2609 Halls Mill Road, Mobile, Alabama, was present and requested a holdover to the October Planning Commission meeting. There was no one else present regarding the application.

A Motion TO HOLDOVER was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Jennifer Denson. The Application was heldover until the October 15, 2026, meeting.

After discussion the Planning Commission heldover the request until the October 15th meeting to allow the applications for subdivision and rezoning to be considered concurrently.

2. SUB-003871-2026

Location: 310 & 312 South Dearborn Street
Subdivision Name: Dearborn Landing Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Ellis Foster, Eluxe Capital Ventures, LLC
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 0.15± acres

The Applicant/Agent, Zeke Hudson, 3502 Laughlin Drive, Mobile, Alabama, was present and discussed waiving Sections 6.C.2.(b)(2) and 64-2-5.E. of the Subdivision Regulations.

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. The Motion passed unanimously. There was no one else present regarding the application.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Sections 6.C.2.(b)(2) (for substandard lot width) and 64-2-5.E. (for substandard lot area) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Retention of the 50-foot right-of-way width along South Dearborn Street;
2. Retention of the 50-foot right-of-way width along Charleston Street;
3. Provision of 25-foot corner radius dedication where South Dearborn Street and Charleston Street intersect;
4. Retention of the lot sizes in both square feet and acres, or provision of a table on the Final Plat with the same information;
5. Illustration of the existing structures on Lots 1 and 2 on the Final Plat;
6. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating that future development or redevelopment will require full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances unless variances are granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment;
7. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
8. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
9. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report; and,
10. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report.

3. SUB-003865-2026

Location: 429 Lincoln Boulevard
Subdivision Name: Mobile Terrace Subdivision, Resubdivision of Lots 1-5, Block 2
Applicant / Agent: Linda Ellerby Allen
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Subdivision of 3 lots, 0.29± acres

The Applicant/Agent, Zeke Hudson, 3502 Laughlin Drive, Mobile, Alabama, was present and discussed waiving Sections 6.C.2.(a)(1) (for substandard lot area) and 6.C.2.(b)(2) (for

substandard lot width) of the Subdivision Regulations. There was no one else present regarding the application.

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Nick Amberger. The Motion passed unanimously.

After discussion the Planning Commission waived Sections 6.C.2.(a)(1) (for substandard lot area) and 6.C.2.(b)(2) (for substandard lot width) of the Subdivision Regulations and Tentatively Approved the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Revision of the plat to illustrate dedication sufficient to provide 25 feet from the centerline of Twelfth Street and Lincoln Boulevard;
2. Retention of the 25-foot corner radius at the intersection of Twelfth Street and Lincoln Boulevard, in accordance with Section 6.C.6. of the Subdivision Regulations, or as approved by the City Engineer and Traffic Engineering Director;
3. Retention of the lot areas, in both square feet and acres, on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required right-of-way dedication;
4. Retention of the 25-foot front yard setback along Lincoln Boulevard on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required right-of-way dedication;
5. Revision of the plat to illustrate a 25-foot front yard setback along Twelfth Street, adjusted for any required right-of-way dedication, unless a Setback Variance is approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment;
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;
9. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report; and
10. Full compliance with all other applicable codes and ordinances.

4. SUB-003835-2026

Location: 59 & 61 Bradford Avenue, & 1311 Azalea Street
Subdivision Name: Second Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Gregory Saad, Saad Development Corp.
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Subdivision of 6 lots, 0.76± acres

The Applicant/Agent, Jake Mosley, 5588 Jackson, Road, Mobile, Alabama, was present and requested a holdover on SUB-003835-2026 and SUB-003838, MOD-003841-2026 and MOD-003842-2026, to the October Planning Commission meeting.

A Motion TO HOLDOVER was made by Jay Stubbs. Second by Harry Brislin. The Applications were heldover until the October 15, 2026, meeting at the request of the Applicant. There was no one else present regarding the application.

Commissioner Woods and Staff discussed the requirement of stormwater studies and landscaping.

After discussion and at the applicant's request, the Planning Commission heldover the application to the October 15th meeting.

5. MOD-003856-2026

Location:	900 Paper Mill Road
Applicant / Agent:	Berg Pipe (Broughton & Associates, LLC, Agent)
Council District:	District 2
Proposal:	Major Modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development allowing multiple buildings on a single building site to allow the construction of a 3,000± square-foot building and a 12,432± square-foot building.

The Applicant/Agent, Jay Broughton, 314 Magnolia Avenue, Fairhope, Alabama, was present and discussed the previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD).

The following people spoke against the application citing crime prevention plan was not done, noxious odors, dust, smoke, gas emissions, air contaminates, no neighborhood meeting, polluting neighborhood properties, inappropriate fencing, ignoring community sensitivity, and constant pollution in the Africatown area.

- Ramsey Sprague, 58 St. Louis Street, Mobile, Alabama
- Joe Womack, 2816 Westmoor Court, Mobile, Alabama

Jay Broughton rebuttal: The requested modifications were within the existing footprint of the facilities. There were no expansions or new operations requested at this time and the modifications will only improve the operations that are currently on the property. There was no one else present regarding the application.

Commissioner Matt Anderson and Staff discussed the fencing and the regulations regarding a fencing buffer if needed.

Commissioner Mattei and Staff discussed that a community meeting was not required for a Major Modification or PUD, however, was required for a Planned Development.

Commissioner Nichols and Staff discussed that this property was in the Africatown overlay district as a whole but was not within the Africatown safety zone and the CPTED would be brought up during the permitting process.

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

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 include, at a minimum:
 - The total lot area in both square feet and acres;
 - The square footage of each existing and proposed building;
 - All streets along which the site has frontage, including the respective right-of-way widths;
 - The required 25-foot front yard setback along all public street rights-of-way;
 - Existing and proposed parking layout and traffic circulation;
 - Required, existing, and proposed parking data;
 - Zoning district information and other applicable site data;
 - The site's legal description or recorded plan reference;
 - A graphic scale and north arrow; and
 - All applicable notes and conditions of approval;
2. Identification of the height of each proposed building on the Final PUD Site Plan and compliance with the 100-foot maximum building height permitted in the I-2, Heavy Industry District;
3. Retention of the existing chain-link fence surrounding the manufacturing facility on the Final PUD Site Plan;

4. Placement of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that any new parking located across a street from residentially zoned or used property shall be screened from view in accordance with Article 3-7.A.3.1. of the UDC;
5. Placement of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that any new parking that constitutes a 25% or greater increase in the overall number of parking spaces shall comply with the applicable parking lot illumination standards of Article 3 of the UDC;
6. Illustration of any dumpsters and dumpster pads on the Final PUD Site Plan in compliance with the placement and enclosure requirements of Article 3, Section 64-3-13.A.4. of the UDC, or placement of a note stating that waste removal is provided through curbside service;
7. Placement of notes on the Final PUD Site Plan regarding compliance with previously approved landscaping requirements. Any proposed changes to previously approved landscaping shall be coordinated with the Planning and Zoning Department prior to approval of the Final PUD Site Plan;
8. Placement of a note on the Final PUD Site Plan stating that any future development or redevelopment of the site may require additional PUD modifications, subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council;
9. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
10. Compliance with all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
11. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report;
12. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report;
13. Submittal of the revised Modified PUD Site Plan to, and approval by, the Planning and Zoning Department prior to recordation in Probate Court, in accordance with Section 64-5-8.B.2(f) of the UDC, and provision of one (1) copy of the recorded site plan, in both hard copy and PDF formats, to the Planning and Zoning Department; and
14. Full compliance with all other applicable municipal codes and ordinances.

6. ZON-UDC-003861-2026

Location: East side of Cochrane Causeway, 650'± North of Battleship Parkway
Applicant / Agent: Tellier Kenny, Telcon, LLC
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Rezoning from Single-Family Residential Suburban District (R-1) to Heavy Industry District (I-2).

The Applicant/Agent, Tellier Kenny, Telcon LLC, 706 Monroe Street, Mobile, Alabama, was present and discussed the following issues:

- The rezoning request was consistent with the established industrial land use pattern within the Blakley and Pinto Island areas.
- Consistent with the City of Mobile's land use map
- Possible zoning discrepancy identified in prior historical zoning maps

There was no one else present regarding the application.

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Nick Amberger. Second by Matt Anderson. The Motion passed unanimously.

After discussion the Planning Commission determined the following criteria prevail to support Rezoning of the property:

- A) 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.
- B) Health, Safety and General Welfare. The proposed amendment promotes the community's public health, safety, and general welfare.
- C) Capacity. The infrastructure is in place to accommodate the proposed amendment; and,
- D) 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 I-2, Heavy Industry District, to the City Council, subject to the following condition:

1. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

7. ZON-UDC-003870-2026

Location: 5070 Old Shell Road
Applicant / Agent: Food Pak, Inc.
Council District: District 7
Proposal: Rezoning from Single-Family Residential Suburban District (R-1) to Neighborhood Business Suburban District (B-2).

Attorney Doug Anderson recused and left the meeting. Attorney Jim Rossler attended the remainder of the meeting.

Nick Amberger left during discussion of the application.

The Applicant/Agent, Mahin Ghavamian, 3638 Dawes Road, Mobile, Alabama, was present and discussed the following issues:

- Food Pac had been open since 1991
- Rezoning this property aligns with the City of Mobile's goals of fostering walkable businesses in the neighborhood
- The project would support the future of the neighborhood
- The property was underutilized and would transform it into a community asset

- Most neighbors and businesses in and around the neighborhood agree that updating this zoning assures that this property remains active
- The updated building would be modernized and adapted to the neighborhood demand
- They have a petition with almost five thousand signatures in support of the rezoning

Tim Spafford, Architecture & Design, 1263 Lake Circle West, Mobile, Alabama, discussed the following issues:

- Site layout was not accurate
- The property was listed as commercial, lot B
- The Staff report stated it was never zoned commercial, but it was labeled as commercial, intended to be commercial and still recorded as commercial with the survey
- They need a B-2 zoning to operate a grocery store
- Parking and landscaping would be followed
- The Right-Of-Way (ROW) in the front to Old Shell varies from 200 to 70 feet and they would be filing a variance and working the City Engineer regarding the ROW
- It was a mistake a long time ago when they annexed this area and labeled a commercial lot, but it was still in the middle of a residential and next to a park
- The other property where the business was presently located was grandfathered in as a non-conforming use, same as the adjacent, and the property to the east is the Maple Biscuit Restaurant
- A pleasant, nice look facility will be built, and a lot of the community supports her business
- They can meet the requirements of the B-2 with the site with no variances, if needed, including parking

Commissioner Woods and Mr. Spafford discussed the Board of Zoning Adjustment application variances that were filed because of the unusual layout of the property, along with the reduction of the building setback and relief on the frontage trees and landscape area in the Right-of-Way (ROW). Mr. Spafford stated the 8600 square foot building could be reduced to 6500 square feet. Commissioner Woods asked about the detention area for storm water and the position of the dumpster pad and if they could meet the B-2 requirements including the parking. Mr. Spafford stated it would be located in the back, and they could meet the requirements.

Commissioner Mattei and Mr. Spafford discussed lower options to the B-2 and asked if there was a specific reason the applicant was asking for a B-2 zoning.

The following people spoke in opposition to the rezoning application citing major traffic difficulties with the 18 wheelers, noise, dumpster issues, lower property value, Spring Hill Overlay plans, large commercial businesses in residential neighborhoods and safety concerns.

- Mr. Rick Smith, 307 Springhill Woods Drive, Mobile, Alabama
- Mr. Kyle Ankersen, 159 Border Drive West, Mobile, Alabama
- Linda St. John, 320 Avalon Street, Mobile, Alabama
- Thomas Meyers, 4270 Horloesther Court, Mobile, Alabama

Rebuttal by Mahin Ghavamian and Tim Spafford:

- 18-wheeler's only come every few months and will park in the front of the building
- The retention area was for the Engineering Department to figure out
- Can meet B-2 requirements
- Believe the zoning of R-1 was a mistake

Chairman Jay Stubbs mentioned the additional documentation submitted before the meeting took place which include a thirty-eight (38) person signed petition against the application, a Vicinity map with names and address of neighbors against the application, photos of 18-wheelers on the property, along with letters of support for the application.

Staff stated that the property was annexed in 1956, and the Subdivision was recorded in 1943, prior to being annexed.

City Attorney, James Rossler, discussed the following issues:

Under the law, the ordinance that the city adopts for reasoning is what governs restrictive covenants, statements and deeds. Statements on surveys do not trump the city ordinance that governs. There was no mistake in the rezoning, it was done, was advertised, everyone had an opportunity to comment on it. If the applicant admits there was a mistake, it is the applicant's burden to prove it. From a legal standpoint, he does not see any proof of that.

There was no one else present regarding the application.

A Motion TO DENY was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Josh Woods. The Motion TO DENY passed unanimously.

After discussion the Planning Commission denied the Rezoning request due to the following:

- A) Mistake. For a Rezoning, there was no mistake or error in the original zoning map; and
- B) Compatibility. The proposed amendment is not compatible with:
 - (1) The current development trends, if any, in the vicinity of the subject property;
 - (2) Surrounding land uses;
 - (3) It would adversely impact neighboring properties; and
 - (4) Cause a loss in property values.
- C) Capacity. The infrastructure is not in place to accommodate the proposed amendment; and,
- D) Change. There are no changed or changing conditions in a particular area to make an amendment necessary and desirable.
- E) 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.

8. SUB-003849-2026 & SUB-SW-003850-2026

Location: 2770 Government Boulevard
Subdivision Name: Roote Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: TowerCo, LLC (Baker Donelson Law Firm, Agent)
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Subdivision of 1 lot, 0.25± acres; and a request to waive the construction of a sidewalk along Government Boulevard.

The Applicant/Agent, Lily Dickinson, Baker Donaldson Law Firm, 1901 6th Avenue N., Birmingham, Alabama, was present and requested waiving Section 6.C.2.(b)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations due to the substandard width of the lot. There was no one else present regarding the application.

Subdivision: A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

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

1. Either dedication to provide 125 feet to the centerline along Government Boulevard or illustration that such right-of-way currently exists;
2. Retention of the lot's size in square feet and acres, or provision of a table on the Final Plat with the same information, adjusted for dedication;
3. Revision of the plat to accurately depict the 25-foot minimum front yard setback line along the entire frontage;
4. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
5. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all 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.

Sidewalk Waiver: A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

After discussion the Planning Commission approved the Sidewalk Waiver request.

9. SUB-003827-2026 (HOLDOVER), MOD-003883-2026 & MOD-003884-2026

Location: 53 Foreman Road & 6784 & 6788 Dickens Ferry Road
Subdivision Name: Gracepointe Mobile Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Byrd Surveying, Inc.
Council District: District 7

Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 5.14± acres; Major Modification of a previously approved Planning Approval allowing the expansion of an existing church in an R-1, Single-Family Residential Suburban District, to modify lot lines in coordination with an associated subdivision; 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 an associated subdivision and to allow shared access and parking between two (2) building sites.

The Applicant/Agent, Jerry Byrd, 2609 Halls Mill Road, Mobile, Alabama, discussed the following issues:

- Waiving the twenty-five (25) foot radius at the intersection of Old Shell and Foreman Road (#2)
- Waiving the twenty-foot (25) foot radius curve at intersection of Foreman Road and Dickens Ferry Road (#3) in the subdivision request, but in the Modifications (both PA & PUD) only #2 as they are listed in the same number.

Chairman Stubbs deferred to Staff. Staff deferred to George Davis with the City Engineering Department. Mr. Davis stated the Engineering Department was acceptable with waiving the radius of twenty-five (25) foot for Old Shell Road and Foreman Road, however, for Old Shell Road and Dickens Ferry Road the Engineering Department would like to get the radius down on the southwest corner.

There was no one else present regarding the application.

Subdivision: A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

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

1. Retention of the right-of-way widths of all streets on the Final Plat;
2. Dedication to provide a 15-foot radius curve at the intersection of Foreman Road and Dickens Ferry Road;
3. Retention of the 25-foot minimum building setback line along all street frontages on the Final Plat;
4. Retention of the lot size labels in both square feet and acres on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required dedication, or the furnishing of a table on the Final Plat providing the same information;
5. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating the 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.

Major Planning Approval Modification: A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

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. Retention of the lot size labels in both square feet and acres, adjusted for any required dedication, or the furnishing of a table on the site plan providing the same information;
2. Revision of the site plan to illustrate a 15-foot radius curve at the intersection of Foreman Road and Dickens Ferry Road, as required for the subdivision;
3. Revision of the site plan to remove the 2002 case numbers and replace them with the current 2026 case numbers;
4. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that any future development or redevelopment of either of the lots, or any change in the uses of the lots, may require additional modification of the Planning Approval to be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council;
5. Placement of a note on the site plan stating the Traffic Engineering comments;
6. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of revised site plan prior to forwarding to the City Council; and,
7. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

Major PUD Modification: A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Kenny Nichols. The Motion passed unanimously.

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 labels in both square feet and acres, adjusted for any required dedication, or the furnishing of a table on the site plan providing the same information;
- 2. Revision of the site plan to illustrate a 15-foot radius curve at the intersection of Foreman Road and Dickens Ferry Road, as required for the subdivision;
- 3. Revision of the site plan to remove the 2002 case numbers and replace them with the current 2026 case numbers;
- 4. Placement of a note on the site plan stating that any future development or redevelopment of either of the lots, or any change in the uses of the lots, may require additional modification of the Planned Unit Development to be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council;
- 5. Placement of a note on the site plan stating the Traffic Engineering comments;
- 6. Submittal to and approval by Planning and Zoning of revised site plan prior to forwarding to the City Council; and,
- 7. Full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

10. SUB-003838-2026, MOD-003841-2026 & MOD-003842-2026

Location: 50 & 60 South Ann Street
Subdivision Name: Third Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Gregory Saad, Saad Development Corp.
Council District: District 2
Proposal: Subdivision of 1 lot, 3.58± acres; Major Modification of a previously approved Planning Approval allowing expansion of an existing church in an R-1, Single-Family Residential District, to modify lot lines in coordination with an associated subdivision; 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 an associated subdivision.

The Applicant/Agent, Jake Mosley, 5588 Jackson Road, Mobile, Alabama, requested a holdover on this agenda application and agenda application number four (4) to the October 15th Planning Commission meeting. There was no one else present regarding the application.

Subdivision: Motion TO HOLDOVER was made by Jay Stubbs. Second by Matt Anderson. The Motion TO HOLDOVER until the October 15, 2026, meeting passed unanimously. There was no one else present regarding the applications.

After discussion and at the applicant's request, the application was heldover to the October 15th meeting.

Major Planning Approval Modification: Motion TO HOLDOVER by Jay Stubbs. Second by Matt Anderson. Heldover until the October 15, 2026, meeting.

After discussion and at the applicant's request, the application was heldover to the October 15th meeting.

Major PUD Modification: Motion TO HOLDOVER by Jay Stubbs. Second by Matt Anderson. Heldover until the October 15, 2026, meeting.

After discussion and at the applicant's request, the application was heldover to the October 15th meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS:

SUB-003811-2026

Location: 5654 U.S. Highway 90 West
Subdivision Name: Tread Subdivision
Applicant / Agent: Byrd Surveying, Inc.
Council District: District 4
Proposal: Subdivision of 2 lots, 2.02± acres

The Applicant/Agent, Jerry Byrd, 2609 Halls Mill Road, Mobile, Alabama, requested to remove Condition #2 from the Letter of Decision from the August 20th Planning Commission meeting. The original condition read:

“Revision of the Final Plat to depict dedication of a 25-foot corner radius at the intersection of U.S. Highway 90 West and I-10 Industrial Parkway unless a waiver of 6.C.6. is recommended by the City Engineer and Traffic Engineer.”

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Matt Anderson. Second by Larry Dorsey. The Motion passed unanimously.

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

1. Retention of the 180-foot-wide right-of-way along U.S. Highway 90 West and the 60-foot-wide right-of-way along I-10 Industrial Parkway on the Final Plat;
2. Retention of the lot sizes in square feet and acres on the Final Plat, adjusted for any required dedication;
3. Retention of the 25-foot setback along U.S. Highway 90 West and I-10 Industrial Parkway in compliance with Section 64-2-14. E. of the Unified Development Code and Section 6.C.8 of the Subdivision Regulations adjusted for any required dedication;
4. Compliance with all Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
5. Placement of a note on the Final Plat stating all Traffic Engineering comments noted in the staff report;
6. Compliance with all Urban Forestry comments noted in the staff report;
7. Compliance with all Fire Department comments noted in the staff report; and
8. Full compliance with all other codes and ordinances.

Review of Minutes from the following Planning Commission meetings:

- July 16, 2026
- August 20, 2026

A Motion TO APPROVE was made by Jennifer Denson. Second by Matt Anderson. The Motion passed unanimously.

Approved Date: October 15, 2026

Chairman John W. "Jay" Stubbs: 