

MOBILE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MEETING OF MAY 18, 2006 - 2:00 P.M.
AUDITORIUM, MOBILE GOVERNMENT PLAZA

Members Present

Terry Plauche, Chairman
Victoria L. Rivizzigno, Secretary
Bill DeMouy
Nicholas Holmes
Mead Miller
John Vallas

Members Absent

Clinton Johnson
Ann Deakle
Roosevelt Turner
James Watkins III

Urban Development Staff Present

Richard L. Olsen
Deputy Director of Planning
Bert Hoffman, Planner II
David Daughenbaugh, Urban Forestry
Val Manuel, Secretary II

Others Present

Jennifer White, Traffic Engineering
Pat Stewart, County Engineering
Beverly Terry, City Engineering

Mr. Plauche 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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2006 and April 20, 2006 meetings as submitted.

The motion carried unanimously.

HOLDOVERS:

Case #SUB2006-00060 (Subdivision)

L. Gordon Place Subdivision

4500 and 4528 Harvest Boulevard East
(East side of Harvest Boulevard East, 610'± North of Harvest Boulevard South).
3 Lots / 6.3± Acres

May 18, 2006

Benny Johnston of 4500 Harvest Boulevard, applicant, was present and concurred with the staff recommendations. Mr. Johnston, however, questioned the requirement for the dedication of 30 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Harvest Boulevard East. He thought a 50-foot right-of-way was required for a paved style gutter system with drainage piping.

Pat Stewart replied that a 50-foot right-of-way required underground utilities. If they are overhead, 60 feet was required.

Mr. Johnston said he had no objection.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Vallas to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 30 feet from the centerline of Harvest Boulevard East;
- 2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that there will be no future resubdivision of the property;
- 3) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the site is limited to three curb cuts; and
- 4) the placement of a note on the 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 Subdivision Regulations.

The motion carried unanimously.

EXTENSIONS:

Case #ZON2005-00998 (Planned Unit Development)

Forest Cove Subdivision, Unit Three and Unit Four

South side of Tulane Drive, 125' ± East of Belle Wood Drive East, extending to the West side of Forest Dell Road, 725' ± North of its South terminus.

Don Coleman, Rester and Coleman Engineers, was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Dr. Rivizzigno to approve a one-year extension of the previously approved Planned Unit Development.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00095 (Subdivision)

Forest Cove Subdivision, Unit Three and Unit Four

South side of Tulane Drive, 125' ± East of Belle Wood Drive East, extending to the West side of Forest Dell Road, 725' ± North of its South terminus.

137 Lots / 44.4± Acres

May 18, 2006

Don Coleman, Rester and Coleman Engineers, was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Dr. Rivizzigno to approve a one-year extension of approval for this subdivision.

NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

Case #SUB2006-00079

JaLin Estates Subdivision

8600 Dawes Lake Road

(Northwest corner of Dawes Lake Road and Dawes Lake Road East).

2 Lot / 17.0± Acres

Mr. Plauche stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the site is limited to a single curb cut per lot, size, location and design to be approved by County Engineering;
- 2) the 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 Subdivision Regulations; and
- 3) the placement of the 25-foot minimum building setbacks on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2006-00081

New Country Club Estates Subdivision, Fifth Unit, Resubdivision of Lot 13

49 Jordan Lane

(South side of Jordan Lane, 260'± West of Byrnes Boulevard).

2 Lots / 1.0± Acre

Mr. Plauche stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one in opposition.

Mr. Olsen said the neighbors had requested that the Commission request a 50-foot setback to be in line with the setback for the remainder of the existing unit of New Country Club Estates. Mr. Olsen said he had spoken with the applicant's engineer prior to the meeting and he said they would have no problem providing a 50-foot setback.

May 18, 2006

A motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Holmes to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating each lot is limited to one curb cut to Jordan Lane, with the size, location and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering;
- 2) the issuance of a demolition permit for the existing residential dwelling prior to the recording of the final plat; and
- 3) depiction of a 50-foot front yard setback line on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2006-00078

Glen Acres Subdivision, 1st Addition, Block A, Resubdivision of Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9

9074, 9100, and 9145 Glen Acres Drive North

(North side of Glen Acres Drive North, 320'+ East of Hubert Pierce Road)

3 Lots / 6.2+ Acres

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Dr. Rivizzigno to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that access to Watermain Street (prescriptive right-of-way) be denied;
- 2) dedication of sufficient right-of-way of 30-feet along each side of the centerline of the traveled roadway;
- 3) the 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 Subdivision Regulations; and
- 4) the placement of the 25-foot minimum building setbacks on the final plat.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW SIDEWALK WAIVER APPLICATIONS:

Case #ZON2006-00888

Paul Pham

1395 North University Boulevard

(Southwest corner of North University Boulevard and Overlook Road).

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

A motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Vallas to approve this request.

May 18, 2006

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION:

Case #ZON2006-00908

The Courtyards at Magnolia Grove Subdivision, Revised Lot 22

6447 Clear Pointe Court

(South side of Clear Pointe Court, 360' ± West of its East terminus).

The request for Planned Unit Development Approval to amend a previously approved Planned Unit Development to allow 40% maximum site coverage was considered.

The plan illustrates the proposed building and drive.

Mr. Plauche stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

A motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Holmes to approve this plan subject to the following condition:

- 1) that the Engineer provide verification that the existing stormwater system, including designed and constructed detention, can accommodate the increased site coverage.

The motion carried unanimously.

GROUP APPLICATIONS:

Case #ZON2006-00872 (Planned Unit Development)

Heron Lakes Subdivision, Phase One, Resubdivision of Lot 15

1232 Heron Lakes Circle

(East side of Heron Lakes Circle, 240' ± North of Yellow Heron Lane).

The request for Planned Unit Development to amend a previously approved Planned Unit Development to adjust side yard setbacks, and to allow reduced front and rear yard setbacks and allow 37% maximum site coverage was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed building, drive, and setbacks.

(Also see Case #SUB2006-00077 – Heron Lakes Subdivision, Phase One, Resubdivision of Lot 15 – Below).

Mr. Plauche stated that the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

There was no one present in opposition.

May 18, 2006

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Holmes to approve this plan subject to the following condition:

- 1) full compliance with all other municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2006-00077 (Subdivision)

Heron Lakes Subdivision, Phase One, Resubdivision of Lot 15

1232 Heron Lakes Circle

(East side of Heron Lakes Circle, 240'± North of Yellow Heron Lane).

1 Lot / 0.3± Acre

(For discussion see Case #ZON2006-00872 – Heron Lakes Subdivision, Phase One, Resubdivision of Lot 15 – Above).

There was no one present in opposition.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Holmes to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following condition:

- 1) full compliance with all other municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2006-00901 (Rezoning)

Lee Olander

South side of Overlook Road, 215'± West of Moffett Road

A request for a change in zoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to allow a mini self-storage facility was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed development.

(Also see Case #ZON2006-00910 – Lee Olander [Planning Approval] – Below; and Case #ZON2006-00909 – Lee Olander [PUD] – Below).

Doug Anderson, with the law firm of Bowron, Latta and Wasden, was present representing the applicant. Mr. Anderson provided the Commission members with an information packet which included photographs and a vicinity map showing the site and the surrounding property. He pointed out that the property to the East was zoned B-2, and the adjacent property was zoned B-2 and had a Compass Bank on it. The property beyond that was a shopping center. Directly across the street on Overlook Road on the West side was a McDonald's restaurant. All the property to the East was zoned B-2 except the very tip of that corner, which was zoned R-1 and had a B-2 use, a seafood market, on it. Across the street there was also a B-2 zoned property used for a cleaners. On the South side of Overlook Road three properties down from the subject property was

May 18, 2006

an insurance company on a site that was zoned B-2. There were four properties, including the flag-shaped R-1 lot, between the subject property and the insurance company. Mr. Anderson also showed photographs of another storage facility on Moffett Road closer to I-65 that his client owned. This was the type of storage facility proposed for the subject property.

Mr. Anderson referenced the staff's recommendation for denial, with the suggestion that maybe a B-1 use would be better suited for this property, or that possibly the site could be used for an R-1 use if a cul-de-sac was put in. Mr. Anderson said they respectfully disagree. They felt that the site was too large to be used efficiently and economically for a B-1 use. He further noted a picture of a similar storage facility as proposed right across Moffett Road which was approved by the City Council and rezoned B-3. Although it opens up to Moffett Road, it sides on Gash Lane, which was a residential street. There were approximately 12 residential properties directly across the street from that use. Mr. Anderson referred to a photo showing another storage facility on Demetropolis Road, which was rezoned 8 or 10 years ago. There were about six R-1 properties immediately adjacent to that site. Mr. Anderson said he did not see any difference in the facilities referenced that had already been approved by the Planning Commission and/or the City Council and the proposed facility for this site. He noted that these types of facilities had been approved all over the City and typically were adjacent to some type of residential property with some commercial around it. Mr. Anderson felt this property fit the same type of criteria and respectfully submitted that due to the surrounding area, this property could no longer be used as residential, nor for a B-1 use, and that a B-2 use would be proper for this property. Mr. Anderson also stated that the proposed business would be very secure, and not the 24-hour type business. These types of facilities had been in Mobile for 15-18 years, and he was not aware of any of them going in and out of business.

Mr. Plauche asked if the Commission had any questions of Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Miller asked about the hours of operation of the proposed facility.

Mr. Anderson said that hours of operation would be 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Miller asked about the letter from an adjacent property owner that had been submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Anderson said the letter was from Mr. Leer, adjacent property owner to the West, which was the R-1 property. Mr. Leer was in agreement with the rezoning request.

Mr. Holmes referenced Mr. Anderson's remarks that previous requests these types of facilities had been approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council. He asked what the circumstances were on the City Council application.

Mr. Anderson said the application was required to go to the City Council for a change in zoning.

May 18, 2006

Mr. Anderson further noted a storage facility that had been approved by the City Council in a historic district. That was B-2 abutting R-1 historical property.

There being no further questions of the Commission, Mr. Plauche asked if anyone wanted to speak in opposition to the application.

John Gelineau, 4917 Meredith Court, said he lived across the street from the houses that would back up directly to the subject property. Mr. Gelineau expressed concern about drainage, noting that there was already a serious runoff problem due to all the development in West Mobile. He recalled that in the last 10 years the street directly behind Meredith, the next street over, was sort of the bowl of the neighborhood and had been 3 to 4 feet under water several times. Within the last 5 years, the culvert directly in front of his house could not handle the existing runoff, which backed up and dug out the road on Meredith Court. He said that from the plans he was aware of, he did not see any provision for handling the additional runoff. Mr. Gelineau said the residents were also concerned about security, safety, and just general nuisance of that type of property. They felt that anyone wanting to break into the facility would do so from their neighborhood. The residents were also concerned about traffic as it merged at Overlook and Moffett Roads. Mr. Gelineau said the residents already have to deal with B-2 property on the corner that consists of an auto parts store, washateria, dollar general store, etc., that seem operate around the clock. They have had to call the police a number of times with what goes on at that corner, and they don't want to see this extended further into the back of their neighborhood. Mr. Gelineau also complained about the noise from dumpsters being emptied in the B-2 area. Lighting was also a problem, and right now the lights from the shopping center and the Compass Bank shined through his window. With the development of the proposed property, he felt he would have additional lights shining into his and his children's windows.

Mr. Gelineau said they moved to this area because they loved the area and were not downplaying other areas of town. It seemed, however, that the Eight Mile area continues to encroach South and has made it almost to Moffett Road. The residents were concerned that this development would cause their property values to decrease. Mr. Gelineau said he knew that offers had been made to purchase the subject property for residential use, and that those offers were declined five or six years ago because the owners knew they could get more money for a commercial use. He said there were numerous places along Moffett Road already zoned commercial where this proposed storage facility could be built. He felt that with a little effort other locations could be sought without upsetting the nice neighborhood that they have. He respectfully submitted that this request be declined for the sake of the many neighbors who oppose it.

John Peavy, 1401-E Alicia Drive, said he was also the managing partner of Lookover LLC, which is to the west of Calceney Lane – the entire strip behind all those homes – and of Bienville Woods, which is the balance of that neighborhood. Mr. Peavy said he had lived at this address for almost 30 years and prior to that had lived down the street. He said they had built a neighborhood and it was a magnificent place to live, and it did not compare to what was across the street on Moffett Road off of Gash Lane. Mr. Peavy

May 18, 2006

said that if you made the two comparisons of what these facilities could do, you could see some dangerous points. Drainage concerns were very important to the neighborhood, but they were also concerned about future rezoning of property to the West. The Leer property was specifically mentioned. He felt the natural transition would be that the property would be expanded for B-1 and B-2 uses, which would be an intrusion into the R-1 neighborhood. Mr. Peavy noted that the photos shown conveniently did not show the homes in Bienville Woods. He said Bienville Woods was a premiere neighborhood with housing values ranging from \$200,000-\$400,000. The residents feel any kind of change in status of the subject property would have a detrimental effect on their quality of life. Mr. Peavy also stated that there had been offers made to develop the subject property residentially, and to say that this was not a viable residential area was incorrect. He noted that there were two new subdivision applications on today's agenda located on the other side of Forest Hill Drive, which were developed by the Mitchell Company. This shows that there was vitality in the area and it could and would support residential use. Mr. Peavy asked that the Commission support the denial of this application.

Gina Gregory, City Council Representative for this district in which this proposal is located, said she was present on behalf of the neighbors to uphold the staff recommendation to deny this proposal. Ms. Gregory said a similar proposal had already gone to the Board of Adjustment and was denied, and she thought that it had also been before the Planning Commission and had been denied. On behalf of the neighbors, Ms. Gregory asked that the Commission uphold the staff report and deny this proposal.

Mr. Plauche asked if the applicant would like to respond.

Mr. Anderson stated that as far as drainage, they would be required to hold all drainage on site, and those engineering plans would first be approved by the City Engineer. Regarding the 10-foot buffer, Mr. Anderson said they would be glad to increase that to 15 feet of the natural existing buffer, plus the 8-foot high privacy fence which was shown on the site plan submitted. Addressing concerns about the noise caused by dumpsters being emptied, Mr. Anderson said garbage pickup would be during the day. He also pointed out that the adjacent B-2 property already backed up to this neighborhood, so it was not like they were coming in and having a new impact on the neighborhood. The B-2 was already touching this neighborhood. Mr. Anderson felt the proposed use would have a very low, if any, impact on the surrounding property.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Demouy to recommend the denial of this change in zoning to the City Council for the following reasons:

- 1) the range of uses permitted within the B-2 zoning category are not compatible with the existing residential fabric;
- 2) the rezoning would increase the rezoning and redevelopment pressure for the single-family residences located between the site and the one-lot B-2 district to the West; and

May 18, 2006

- 3) changing conditions within the area have not been identified to justify a change in the Ordinance.

In further discussion Mr. Vallas asked if he understood correctly that a similar application had been turned down previously by the Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

Mr. Olsen said the rezoning did come before the Planning Commission several years ago. Recently it went before the Board of Zoning Adjustment for a use variance.

Mr. Holmes asked what the situation was with the previous application.

Mr. Olsen recalled that the Moffett Road site at Gash Lane, one of two sites that Mr. Anderson referred to, was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission. There were some different circumstances with regard to the surrounding area. The access to that site was strictly via a service road that was to provide access only to those commercial properties. Residential properties did not have access to the service road. Mr. Olsen said there had already been a B-2 zoning at the corner of Moffett Road and Gash Lane many years prior for a Taco Bell. This was extending it further back and they were providing additional buffering along Gash Lane with denial of access. There were also several other issues there. Mr. Olsen said he did not recall the Demetropolis Road site.

Mr. Holmes asked if the insurance office was the only B-2 along Overlook Road in that area.

Mr. Olsen said that west of this site, the next commercial site would be at University Boulevard.

Mr. Miller felt that this was a reasonable use given the change in the zoning.

Mr. Vallas said he agreed. He suggested possibly requiring a buffer of 20-30 feet rather than 10 feet. He felt the alternative could be that a developer would come in and want to put in 12-15 small patio homes on three acres. Obviously they would not be in the same price range as the adjoining properties, and the neighbors would be opposed to that use.

After discussion Mr. Plauche called for a vote on the motion.

The motion carried.

Mr. Vallas was opposed.

Case #ZON2006-00910 (Planning Approval)

Lee Olander

South side of Overlook Road, 215'± West of Moffett Road.

May 18, 2006

The request for Planning Approval to allow a mini self-storage facility in a B-2, Neighborhood Business District was considered.

The site plan illustrates the proposed development.

(For discussion see Case #ZON2006-00901 – Lee Olander [Rezoning] – Above; and Case #ZON 2006-00909 Lee Olander [PUD] – Below).

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Demouy to deny this plan for the following reason:

- 1) the rezoning of the site to B-2 would allow other uses less compatible with residential uses to the West and South of the site.

The motion carried.

Mr. Vallas was opposed

Case #ZON2006-00909 (Planned Unit Development)

Lee Olander

South side of Overlook Road, 215'± West of Moffett Road.

A request for Planned Unit Development to allow multiple buildings on a single building site.

The site plan illustrates the proposed development.

(For discussion see Case #ZON2006-00901 – Lee Olander [Rezoning] – Above; and Case #ZON 2006-00910 - Lee Olander [Planning Approval] – Above).

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Demouy to deny this plan for the following reasons:

- 1) the range of uses permitted within the B-2 zoning category are not compatible with the existing residential fabric;
- 2) the rezoning would increase the rezoning and redevelopment pressure for the single-family residences located between the site and the one lot B-2 district to the West; and
- 3) changing conditions within the area have not been identified to justify a change in the Ordinance.

The motion carried.

Mr. Vallas was opposed.

May 18, 2006

Case #ZON2006-00904 (Planning Approval)

St. Luke Baptist Church

751 Texas Street

(Southeast corner of Texas Street and South Bayou Street).

A request for Planned Approval to allow the expansion of an existing church in an R-3, Multi-Family Residential District to include new restroom facilities and a fellowship hall.

The plan illustrates the existing structure and parking along with the proposed building, addition and drive.

(Also see Case #ZON2006-00903 – St. Luke Subdivision [PUD] – Below; and Case #SUB2006-00080 St. Luke Subdivision –Below).

Mr. Plauche stated that this application was recommended for holdover, but would hear anyone who wished to speak at this time.

Joe Brown, representing the applicant, asked if the holdover was recommended by the engineer.

Mr. Olsen stated that the staff recommended holdover because some information that was needed for the Planning Commission to make a decision was not provided with the application. He said the church's engineer, Mr. Dagley, spoke with him before the meeting and agreed to the holdover.

Mr. Brown concurred.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Mr. Miller to holdover this application until the June 15, 2006, meeting of the Planning Commission to allow the applicant time to revise the site plan as follows:

- 1) depiction of the curbing or wheel stop protection for landscape, protected tree and sidewalk areas adjacent to the parking lot;
- 2) depiction of a sidewalk leading from the handicap parking spaces to the nearest handicap accessible entrance;
- 3) depiction of any lighting proposed for the parking area or new structures, and the provision of information regarding the lighting fixtures and lighting patterns;
- 4) depiction of the required protection buffer;
- 5) depiction of any required stormwater detention facilities, flood zones and finished floor elevations – consult with City Engineering as necessary;
- 6) depiction of a dumpster or waste storage facility, if proposed;
- 7) depiction on the site plan of the drainage and utility easement located on the East side of the property, as shown on the plat;
- 8) placement of a note on the site plan / plat stating that the site is limited to the existing curb-cuts;
- 9) placement of a note on the site plan / plat stating that no permanent structures may be built within the drainage and utility easements; and

May 18, 2006

- 10) placement of a note on the site plan stating that preservation status is to be given to the 45" Live Oak Tree located on the Northwest side of the existing church building; any work on or under this tree is to be permitted and coordinated with Urban Forestry; removal to be permitted only in the case of disease or impending danger.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2006-00903 (Planned Unit Development)

St. Luke Subdivision

751 Texas Street

(Southeast corner of Texas Street and South Bayou Street).

A request for Planned Unit Development to allow multiple buildings on a single building site

The plan illustrates the existing structure and parking along with the proposed building, addition and drive.

(Also see Case #ZON2006-00904 – St. Luke Baptist Church [Planning Approval] – Above; and Case #SUB2006-00080 St. Luke Subdivision –Below).

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Mr. Miller to holdover this application until the June 15, 2006, meeting of the Planning Commission to allow the applicant time to revise the site plan as follows:

- 1) depiction of the curbing or wheel stop protection for landscape, protected tree and sidewalk areas adjacent to the parking lot;
- 2) depiction of a sidewalk leading from the handicap parking spaces to the nearest handicap accessible entrance;
- 3) depiction of any lighting proposed for the parking area or new structures, and the provision of information regarding the lighting fixtures and lighting patterns;
- 4) depiction of the required protection buffer;
- 5) depiction of any required stormwater detention facilities, flood zones and finished floor elevations – consult with City Engineering as necessary;
- 6) depiction of a dumpster or waste storage facility, if proposed;
- 7) depiction on the site plan of the drainage and utility easement located on the East side of the property, as shown on the plat;
- 8) placement of a note on the site plan / plat stating that the site is limited to the existing curb-cuts;
- 9) placement of a note on the site plan / plat stating that no permanent structures may be built within the drainage and utility easements; and
- 10) placement of a note on the site plan stating that preservation status is to be given to the 45" Live Oak Tree located on the North West side of the existing church building; any work on or under this tree is to be permitted and coordinated with Urban Forestry; removal to be permitted only in the case of disease or impending danger.

May 18, 2006

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2006-00080 (Subdivision)

St. Luke Subdivision

751 Texas Street

(Southeast corner of Texas Street and South Bayou Street).

1 Lot / 1.2± Acres

The plan illustrates the existing structure and parking along with the proposed building, addition and drive.

(Also see Case #ZON2006-00904 – St. Luke Baptist Church [Planning Approval] – Above; and Case #ZON2006-00903 St. Luke Subdivision [PUD] –Above).

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Plauche and seconded by Mr. Miller to holdover this application until the June 15, 2006, meeting to allow the applicant time to revise the plat to include the following:

- 1) a note stating that the site is limited to the existing curb-cuts;
- 2) delineation of flood zones on the site, per Engineering requirements;
- 3) notation of required finished floor elevations, per Engineering requirements; and
- 4) a note stating that no permanent structures may be built within the drainage and utility easements.

The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED:

Dr. Victoria Rizzigno, Secretary

Terry Plauche, Chairman

vm