

Public Comments received for Planning Commission – April 16, 2026

UPDATED 04/15/2026 AFTER 2:00 P.M.

Agenda #04 SUB-003674-2026 Shreves Estates Subdivision

Mobile City Planning Commission,

We live [on] Dawson Drive. We are not sure if Mr. Shreves is planning to sub-divide parcel R0023307370004040 or keep it as one parcel, but we do have some concerns regarding this application.

1. While I understand this lot is within code for building, it is not large enough to build a house of a size that would match the neighborhood. We also don't want to see a stand-alone garage, carport or lean to on this property. The property is also not large enough for a building and a driveway or parking. There is no room for street parking. We feel this would bring our property value down substantially and would also be an eyesore as the front of our house is directly across from it.
2. It is our understanding from Councilman Ben Reynolds that Dawson Drive is slated to be paved and widen this year. With that being the case, we know that some of the easements will have to be taken to widen our street. Thus, the lot would be even smaller.
3. This lot is known to flood in a major rainstorm or a tropical depression. The water has previously come up from the canal over the lot and onto our lot. The drainage for our side of the road flows across the street to that side. We are concerned that any building on the lot might upset the drainage system and allow water to stand on our property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Agenda #04 SUB-003674-2026 Shreves Estates Subdivision

Dear Planning Commission,

It is hard to believe that this application has gone this far. The applicant has already built a non-permitted boathouse and timber bulkhead. He even hired an unlicensed builder to do the construction work.

The bulkhead is located so as to simply take possession of submerged state land, again without any sort of permitting.

Now, he wants the blessing of the City of Mobile for his total lack of concern for the environment.

In the survey submitted, one can clearly see that significantly more than half the proposed subdivision is currently underwater and/or wetlands. Please do not endorse the destruction of wetlands simply so that someone can build on part of a lot that is simply too small to build upon.

Please deny this request.

Agenda #04 SUB-003674-2026 Shreves Estates Subdivision

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to submit a formal comment regarding the proposed subdivision at 4047 Dawson Drive (SUB-003674-2026), specifically concerning the bulkhead construction along the canal.

As a neighboring property owner, I have serious concerns about how the installation and placement of this bulkhead is impacting the canal and surrounding properties. Bulkheads, if not properly designed, permitted, and constructed, can alter natural water flow, increase wave reflection, and accelerate erosion on adjacent properties.

In our experience, the current conditions have already created issues. While attempting to put our boat into the canal, we scratched the bottom of our boat due to the altered shoreline conditions and/or obstructions associated with the bulkhead. This has resulted in property damage and raises concerns regarding both safety and navigability within what is intended to be a shared waterway.

Additionally, the placement of a bulkhead in a canal environment raises important regulatory considerations. Work along navigable waters and canal shorelines may require proper permitting and compliance with agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM). It is critical that this project complies with all applicable shoreline protection, erosion control, and environmental impact regulations.

I am also concerned that the bulkhead may constitute an encroachment or create a condition that interferes with the reasonable use and access rights of adjacent property owners. Any structure that restricts safe navigation or alters the character of the waterway should be carefully reviewed for compliance with local ordinances, setback requirements, and riparian rights.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Verify that all required permits and approvals have been obtained prior to construction
- Evaluate whether the bulkhead complies with applicable setback, shoreline, and encroachment regulations
- Assess the impact on water flow, erosion patterns, and neighboring properties
- Consider the effect on safe access, navigation, and use of the canal by adjacent property owners

I urge the Commission to ensure that this bulkhead does not negatively impact surrounding property owners, violate regulatory requirements, or compromise the environmental integrity and usability of the canal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Agenda #04 SUB-003674-2026 Shreves Estates Subdivision

These comments are in response to the following application before the Commission:
4047 Dawson Drive
SUB-003674-2026
Shreves Estates Subdivision

I am opposed to the landowner's application to create a buildable Lot by bulkheading in a significant area of wetland and public navigable canal and backfilling it to double the size of the dry land that he currently owns. I urge the Commission to deny this application based on the severe and irreversible impacts that it will have to the wetlands, the increased flooding risk to neighboring properties, the destruction of valuable wildlife habitat and the fact that he is taking a portion of the public canal/waterway to increase the size of his property.

I think it is important for the Commission to understand that the landowner began constructing a bulkhead in the canal without getting a permit or authorization from the Corps of Engineers/ADEM/City. The Corps came out to investigate, and the landowner was ordered to stop work on the bulkhead. The landowner then applied to the Corps to construct a bulkhead in that location. The application called for a 186-foot bulkhead and filling in over 6000 square feet of wetlands and canal areas, totaling approximately 670 cubic yards of fill. A copy of the letter that I submitted to the Corps of Engineers in protest of the Permit Application SAM-2025-00045-JEB is attached for reference and lays out many of my objections to the current application for this subdivision/lot. I do not know the status of that application with the Corps.

In addition to points set out in the protest letter to the Corps, I want to make three additional points with respect to the subdivision application:

First: The landowner's application for the Lot indicates that the property will be 14,921 square feet if you approve the Lot and allow him to finish the bulkhead and backfill over the wetland and canal areas. Of note, the square footage in the Corps application did not include all of the wetland/canal area that is included on the subdivision survey map ... and on the survey map it looks like the cross-hatched or "wet" area is at least 50% or more of the square footage of the proposed lot. This means that approximately 42% (at 6000 sqft) to over 50% (survey map) of the proposed lot is currently water – water that is part of a navigable public canal.

It is important for the Commission to understand that the cross-hatched section on the application survey map is not just land that is "wet", it is land that is 5-6 feet underwater closest to the unpermitted partially constructed bulkhead and probably 2-3 feet underwater nearest the solid land. There is tidal flow in the river/canal, but even at low tide, the area in the cross-hatched section is under water (in most areas under several feet of water). I have attached/uploaded several pictures along with my comments to show how much water/canal area the landowner is trying to add to the dry land that he owns.

Second: The survey map shows a "timber bulkhead" as the property line along the canal. This is not a proper boundary line, as the landowner without a permit, sunk the pilings into the canal. The pilings are not in a straight line and bow out in the middle. Additionally, the unpermitted bulkhead was placed far

beyond any historical alignment, advancing into the canal in a manner inconsistent with neighboring properties and further amplifying hydrological impacts. Of the nine parcels of land along the canal on Dawson Drive, only three currently have (or had) residential structures on them. The other parcels, including this parcel, are primarily wetland, not bulkheaded and unbuildable, with the majority of them owned by the property owner across the street (whose sit on Rattlesnake Bayou) as a means to access the canal and protect the area from development. The \$15,000 purchase price (purchased in October 2024) reflects that it is a small unbuildable piece of property. The landowner in this case wants to fill in a substantial area of open public canal water and wetland to create free real estate for someone to build on.

Not knowing much about reading survey maps, I would think that the located reference corners denoted by the triangle (open top iron pin) on the survey would mark the corners of the property. If that is the case, the two corners nearest the canal are nowhere near the unauthorized "timber bulkhead". If that is the case, the unpermitted placement of the bulkhead extends way too far into the canal and should not be allowed to stay where it currently is. If this landowner is allowed to set his own boundary line and backfill a portion of the public canal, making it narrower and harder for upstream neighbors to get their boats out of the canal, what is there to stop another landowner from extending their bulkhead another five feet into the canal and so on until the canal eventually disappears from/due to development. A new bulkheaded lot on this parcel will also likely contribute to more flooding on neighboring properties. My property already has had more flooding due to the replacement of a bulkhead by a landowner across the canal that extended further into the canal. If one is approved for this parcel in its current location, it is also likely to contribute to increased flooding on mine and neighboring properties.

Third: The subject area across the canal from me has always had an irregular shoreline. I've lived here 13 years and the shoreline with inlets and coves has been like it currently is that whole time. The land has not eroded; it is just the nature of shoreline on that side of the canal; and that wetland nonlinear shoreline continues like it is down the rest of the canal. That property was never meant to be buildable. It was a small piece of land that abutted the canal when Dawson Drive was located and paved.

In conclusion, for the reasons stated above and those stated in the materials attached to these comments, I would like to again voice my opposition to this subdivision/lot application. This lot would be created by backfilling wetland and portions of a public canal to double the usable square footage of the parcel. This is not appropriate or acceptable. I respectfully request that the application be denied.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Agenda #04 SUB-003674-2026 Shreves Estates Subdivision

These comments are in response to the following application before the Commission:

4047 Dawson Drive
SUB-003674-2026
Shreves Estate Subdivision

We live across the canal from the landowner in this matter. We are opposed to his application to create a buildable lot by bulkheading in a huge area wetland and public navigable canal and backfilling it to double the size of the dry land that he currently owns. We urge the Commission to deny this application based on the severe and irreversible impacts it will have to the wetlands, the increased flooding risk to the neighboring properties, the destruction of wildlife habitats and the fact that he is taking a portion of the public canal/waterway to increase his own property.

The Commission should be aware that the landowner began constructing a bulkhead in the canal without getting a permit or authorization from the Corps of Engineers//ADEM/City. After the Corps investigated and ordered the landowner to stop work on the bulkhead the landowner then submitted an application/proposal calling for a 186 foot bulkhead and filling in over 6000 square feet of wetlands and canal areas, totaling approximately 670 cubic yards of fill. 670 cubic yards is about 60 to 70 dump trucks of sand. That is not "fill"; that is building land on wetlands and a public waterway. It should not be allowed.

Our property has already experienced increased flooding due to another bulkhead across the canal. If this one is approved in its current location, a portion of our property will likely experience significant flooding and may become unusable.

The waterways of Mobile are one of its greatest assets. They provide a beautiful natural habitat for birds, fowl, and people. They should be protected.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Agenda #06 SUB-003675-2026 Resubdivision of the Resubdivision of Revised Bucci Subdivision

To Whom it may Concern:

We are in receipt of the certified letter from the Mobile City Planning Commission concerning the above referenced resubdivision. We will not be able to attend the scheduled hearing on April 16, 2026 as we will be on vacation out of the Country.

For the record, we are NOT opposed to the proposed resubdivision. In fact, we very much welcome this project as an exciting new addition to the area. It is our hope that the Planning Commission will approve the proposed resubdivision.