

Public Comments received for Planning Commission – May 21, 2026

UPDATED 05/20/2026 AFTER 2:00 P.M.

Agenda #04 SUB-003714-2026 Parkway Commons Subdivision

We live at Parkway Drive, which is on the north side of the planned subdivision. There has been a privacy fence built down the length of the south side of the property. Shouldn't there be a privacy fence placed on the property line of the north side of the subdivision? Also, any utility poles or boxes needed for these homes needs to be placed on the easement in front of the subdivision property. We do not want anything else to have to cut grass around and weed eat on the easement in front of our property at our age, 69 & 70 years old.

I would like this presented at the meeting and what the plans are related to my concerns to be emailed to me.

Agenda #09 ZON-UDC-003682 Steven D. Cooner

Dear Commission Members:

My wife and I live in the Smithfield neighborhood directly across Grelot Road from the property Mr. Cooner is requesting to rezone and develop.

Wilderness Road is 100 feet from Mr. Cooner's property. It is one of the two primary neighborhood entrances to Smithfield that would be immediately and adversely affected by additional traffic along Grelot Road.

We DO NOT wish to see this proposed zoning change go forward. This is a safety concern for us.

Any additional traffic in the area of Grelot Road fronting Mr. Cooner's property will detract from the safety and quality of life in the Smithfield, Brentwood, Westchester, Brockton Place, Cameron Place, and Stonehedge neighborhoods. The entrance to and egress from these six neighborhoods along this one-mile section of Grelot Road would certainly be adversely affected by additional traffic resulting from the granting of Mr. Cooner's proposal.

Grelot Road is a rarely-patrolled 5-lane "raceway" connecting Cody Road and Schillinger Road. Drivers who try to abide by the posted 40 mph speed limit are routinely overrun by drivers passing by who consider this stretch of road to be their dragstrip. Exiting these six neighborhoods nowadays requires reaching the center lane and waiting for an opportunity to merge safely into traffic. This is a challenge and concern, day or night.

Signage currently at the Grelot Road traffic circle directs vehicles from the western parts of Mobile County to use eastbound Grelot Road as their best route to Interstate 10. This alone has increased traffic on the very mile that all six of the aforementioned neighborhoods must use. We don't need to encourage more traffic, and would prefer to see less.

Please do not approve any rezoning or development that would add to the complexity of safely navigating Grelot Road, which is currently needed and used by fully a thousand households in the City of Mobile.

Thank you.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

Re 97 Center Dr: I oppose this zoning proposal for the following reasons. 1. I was not aware of the public meeting apparently held March 26. I walk past this lot four times every day and if signs were erected they were certainly not very prominent. I note that photographs of the signage used to advertise this meeting are not included in the applicant's package. 2. Since the Commission Application has contact information redacted I have not been able to contact the company concerned even though the intent of the Commission is clearly that the Company should be available to answer questions from the public (the required signage is supposed to post publicly the applicant's valid phone number and the mailed meeting notice is supposed to contain a valid phone number and valid e-mail address). 3. This rezoning will change the character of this area. The R3 complex across the road from the lot in question has caused considerable increase in vandalism obstructive parking substantial litter and noise over the previous neighborhood character. A further lot rezoned in this way will inevitably increase again the antisocial repercussions in this neighborhood. 4. The justification provided with the application is incorrect. The Commission may recall that on February 20 2025 a rezoning application to R3 for a nearby lot (162 & 186 East Drive) was denied because "The proposed amendment is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan...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. D) The proposed amendment does not promote the community's public health safety and general welfare. E) The infrastructure is not in place to accommodate the proposed amendment; and F) There are no changing conditions in a particular area that make an amendment necessary and desirable. G) 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" All of these reasons apply also to the current proposal. Therefore I respectfully and strongly urge the Commission to deny this request.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

Dear Planning Commission My wife and I live in the Pherin Woods Subdivision which is several hundred feet from the proposed rezoning. Immediately north of our property is "The Social" apartment complex which I believe was rezoned to allow building of the multifamily project. There is constant loud music at night and weekends and pool parties with loud rap music all afternoon and night during the summer. We need to frequently call the police and file a noise complaint. The property in question is contiguous to other R-1 zoned properties - single family homes with the exception of an apartment complex on the east side of East Drive. There is no reason why this parcel should be zoned R-3 when it is surrounded by R-1 zoning. Most of the multifamily properties are on Old Shell Road. The alleged increase in enrollment at the University of South Alabama and the need for student housing should not affect the Planning Commission's decision. The University of South of Alabama is a state owned institution and the City of Mobile should not be basing decisions that would favor the state. The City of Mobile should

make the best decision for the city residents who are paying property tax. Furthermore many of the students at the university are not even citizens of the United States. Some of these students would benefit from the apartment complex at the expense of the citizens. USA faculty & employees are not looking to live in apartments with university students. They are looking for single family homes. Over the years the quality of life and property values have declined with each new apartment project bringing increased traffic traffic accidents on Old Shell Road noise and litter. Drive down West or East Drive and you will see the litter from students living in the apartment complexes. The decline in property values has already decreased property tax revenue for the city. Please reference the drop in property values in our subdivision of Pherin Woods as evidence. Please note my opposition to the proposed rezoning since I will not be able to be present at the meeting due to work obligations. Thank you for your consideration.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I would like to bring the following concerns to your attention:(a) poor publicity for the community meeting supposedly held March 26 so no-one attended (b) the proposed rezoning will drastically change the character of this area currently predominantly zoned R1 (single-family homes) (c) it is opposite an R3 complex ("The Social") that has already brought markedly increased vandalism obstructive car parking litter noise and other antisocial behavior that will increase if this rezoning is approved (d) the proposed amendment is not consistent with current development trends and there are no changing conditions that make an amendment necessary.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I am opposed to the purposed rezoning of the mentioned property - the influx of R3 developments in our vicinity has caused nothing short of neglect and a negative impact on our property values in the surrounding communities. These developments do not maintain their grounds or structural properties compared to surrounding R1 housing communities. They often change hands and communication with property owners is challenging at best if not impossible regarding upkeep or concerns. I also contend that poor publicity for the community meeting supposedly held March 26 is a reason to table the discussion at the least. I am only hearing of the rezoning due to the due diligence of another concerned neighbor. I am speaking in opposition of this motion to rezone. Thank you.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I am strongly OPPOSED to this type of housing in this area. Yes there are some other multi-family developments in this area but they are mostly along Old Shell Road. There are mostly surrounding subdivisions with small & large single family homes and definitely enough multi-family dwellings. THIS GENERAL AREA SHOULD REMAIN SINGLE FAMILY DOMINATED FOREVER.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I am a resident in the Pherin Woods Court subdivision. I wholeheartedly oppose this rezoning and would like to point out that the company making the request has not been transparent. That makes me particularly uneasy about this arrangement.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I would like to voice my concern at this development. My concerns include 1)poor publicity for the community meeting supposedly held March 26 so no-one attended (2) the proposed rezoning will drastically change the character of this area currently predominantly zoned R1 (single-family homes) (3) it is opposite an R3 complex ("The Social") that has already brought markedly increased vandalism obstructive car parking litter noise and other antisocial behavior that will increase if this rezoning is approved (d) the proposed amendment is not consistent with current development trends and there are no changing conditions that make an amendment necessary. Please do not proceed.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application 97 Center Drive (Item #11) To the Mobile Planning Commission: I am writing on behalf of my wife and I to register our strong and unequivocal opposition to the proposed rezoning of 97 Center Drive from R1 (single-family residential) to R3 (multi-family dwellings) listed as Item #11 on your agenda. Approving this rezoning will be detrimental to the health safety and character of our established neighborhood. I urge the Commission to deny this application based on the following severe concerns: - Severe Sanitation and Public Health Nuisances Our neighborhood is already suffering heavily from the negative impacts of the existing R3 complex located directly adjacent to us ("The Social"). That property is a significant nuisance largely due to its overflowing and poorly maintained dumpsters. This lack of sanitation has caused a direct and noticeable increase in pest infestations specifically mice and German cockroaches encroaching near and into my home. Allowing another high-density college-age apartment complex to be built next door will only exacerbate these unacceptable public health and sanitation issues for existing Pherin Woods homeowners. - Degradation of Neighborhood Character and Property Values The area surrounding Pherin Woods is predominantly zoned R1 for single-family homes. Introducing another R3 complex fundamentally conflicts with the established character of this area. The existing high-density development has already brought markedly increased vandalism obstructive street parking litter noise and other antisocial behaviors to our doorsteps. Expanding R3 zoning will compound these issues driving down the property values of our single-family homes. Furthermore this proposed amendment is entirely inconsistent with current development trends in our immediate area and there are no changing conditions that make this zoning amendment necessary or beneficial to the community. - Procedural Failures and Lack of Transparency In addition to the material impact on our neighborhood the process surrounding this application has been highly concerning. The developer supposedly held a community

meeting on March 26th but it was so poorly publicized that no residents attended. The community was denied a fair and reasonable opportunity to engage with the developer making it inappropriate to push this rezoning forward without proper neighborhood input. - Conclusion Our neighborhood already bears the burden of existing R3 zoning through decreased sanitation increased pests and heightened nuisance behaviors. We do not want nor can our immediate infrastructure and neighborhood character support another multi-family complex. We respectfully request that the Planning Commission prioritize the well-being and property rights of the existing residents of Pherin Woods and deny the rezoning application for 97 Center Drive. Sincerely Andrew & Stephanie Patch Resident Pherin Woods.

Agenda #11 ZON-UDC-003728-2026

Silvertone Enterprise, LLC (Casey Pipes, Helmsing Leach, P.C., Agent)

I would like to comment on the applicant's statements regarding University enrollment: "The University of South Alabama...has had three consecutive years of enrollment growth including a record-setting freshmen class in 2025. They have had a 30% increase in freshman enrollment over the past three years." USA freshmen enrollment is: Fall 2013: 3131; Fall 2014: 3296; Fall 2015: 3248; Fall 2016: 3449; Fall 2017: 2902; Fall 2018: 2646; Fall 2019: 2256; Fall 2020: 2200; Fall 2021: 2368; Fall 2022: 2378; Fall 2023: 2780; Fall 2024: 2675; Fall 2025: 2700. Total USA enrollment is: Fall 2013: 15065; Fall 2014: 15805; Fall 2015: 16211; Fall 2016: 16443; Fall 2017: 15569; Fall 2018: 14834; Fall 2019: 14397; Fall 2020: 14224; Fall 2021: 13992; Fall 2022: 13463; Fall 2023: 13768; Fall 2024: 14003; Fall 2025: 14285. From this the conclusions are that USA student enrollment is cyclic but was significantly larger before 2020 than it is now. Total enrollment reduced significantly from 2016 to 2022 and freshmen enrollment greatly reduced from 2016 to 2020. Freshmen enrollment has not increased by 30% over the last three years and nor is the 2025 freshmen class enrollment record-setting as claimed. In fact the lowest freshmen enrollment over the period of the available data was in 2020 and the increase over this longer period since then is much less than 30% (and actually reduced from 2023 to 2024). Freshmen enrollment was larger than 2025 both in 2023 and also prior to 2018; freshmen enrollment ten years ago was 28% more than in 2025 and total enrollment ten years ago was 15% more than in 2025. Rezoning decisions should not be based upon a cherry-picked three-year period but rather on trends over a much longer period of at least ten years over which the basic trend has been cyclic downwards as a result of shifting demographics and reduced overseas student numbers arising from national immigration policies. The applicant has not explained why housing levels adequate in 2016 - and that have even increased since then (for example "The Social" complex built since 2016) - are not now adequate for over 2000 *fewer* students. I oppose this rezoning for the reasons I have set out in my previous comment and also because the data do not support the applicant's contentions about University enrollment. Therefore I respectfully and strongly urge the Commission to deny this request. Data source: Factbooks at <https://www.southalabama.edu/departments/institutionalresearch/factbook.html> Table 3.2 for each year.

Agenda #13 SUB-003671-2026 (HOLDOVER) & ZON-UDC-003720-2026 Perch Creek – Dockside Marina Subdivision

To Whom It May Concern,

We, the undersigned residents living within 300 feet of the property subject to case number ZON-UDC-003720-2026, are writing to formally express our concerns regarding the upcoming hearing scheduled for May 21, 2026, at 2:00 PM.

We understand that Mr. Don Coleman of Coleman Marine, LLC is requesting a rezoning action that would retain the B-3 classification while incorporating a Planned Unit Development (PUD) component. While the zoning designation itself may not appear to change, the introduction of a PUD raises significant questions and concerns for those of us who reside in close proximity to the site.

At this time, our primary concern is the lack of clarity regarding what is specifically proposed within the Planned Unit Development. A PUD designation often allows for flexibility in land use, density, and design standards, which can result in developments that differ substantially from what is typically permitted under standard B-3 zoning. Without detailed plans, renderings, or a clear description of intended uses, it is difficult for neighboring property owners to fully understand the scope and impact of the proposed development.

We are particularly concerned about the potential impact on property values in our neighborhood. Any development that is inconsistent with the existing character of the area, introduces increased traffic, noise, or environmental disruption, or otherwise diminishes the quality of life could negatively affect our investments and homes.

Additionally, the proximity of this property to Perch Creek Preserve Park is of great importance to us. This natural and recreational area is a valuable community asset, and we are concerned that a PUD—depending on its nature—could interfere with the city's long-term vision, conservation efforts, and the overall integrity of the park and its surrounding environment.

In light of these concerns, we respectfully request the following before any approval is considered:

1. A detailed description of the proposed Planned Unit Development, including intended uses, structures, density, and layout.
2. Site plans, elevations, and any available renderings to provide visual context.
3. An assessment of potential impacts on traffic, noise, drainage, and environmental conditions.
4. Clarification on how the proposed development aligns with the city's comprehensive plan, particularly regarding the preservation and enhancement of Perch Creek Preserve Park.
5. Opportunities for community input and engagement prior to any final decision.

Until such information is made available and thoroughly reviewed, we are not in a position to support the requested rezoning action. We ask that our concerns be taken into serious consideration and that transparency be prioritized throughout this process.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.