

Public Comments received for Planning Commission – August 20, 2026

UPDATED 08/19/2026 AFTER 2:00 P.M.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Members of the Mobile City Planning Commission, Mayor Cheriogotis, and Members of the Mobile City Council:

On behalf of The Peninsula of Mobile and the many residents and community members who have consistently advocated for responsible development throughout the Peninsula, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed expansion of Sea Pines Mobile Home Park at 1451 Cedar Crescent Drive from the currently authorized maximum of 133 mobile homes to as many as 447. Specifically, we respectfully ask the Mobile City Planning Commission to recommend denial of the request to remove the existing 133-unit limitation, and we ask the City Council and Board of Zoning Adjustment, as applicable, to deny the related approvals necessary to authorize this expansion.

This is not a minor expansion. The applicant is requesting authorization for 314 additional mobile homes, increasing Sea Pines to more than 3.3 times its currently authorized size. The City's own Planning staff describes the proposal as a "substantial increase in the intensity of the existing use."

The practical impact of that increase extends well beyond the Sea Pines property. Using an estimate of two vehicles per household, 447 occupied homes could represent approximately 894 vehicles. At three to four residents per household, the development could accommodate approximately 1,341 to 1,788 people. The expansion alone could therefore add approximately 628 vehicles and 942 to 1,256 residents to this part of the Peninsula.

These are estimates rather than City projections, but they put the magnitude of this request into perspective. The question is not whether the Sea Pines property itself can physically accommodate 447 mobile homes. The question is whether the surrounding residential community, its road network, and this location on Mobile Bay are appropriate for an additional 314 homes and potentially more than 1,000 additional residents.

Given the scale of the proposed increase, The Peninsula of Mobile believes the potential impacts on the surrounding transportation network and public infrastructure deserve careful consideration. The staff report reflects no specific comments from Engineering or Traffic Engineering at this stage.

We respectfully ask the Planning Commission to consider whether additional evaluation of traffic, roadway capacity, drainage, emergency access and evacuation impacts is appropriate before recommending authorization of this level of increased density. An expansion of 314 homes could reasonably result in hundreds of additional vehicles using the surrounding road network, and those impacts extend well beyond the boundaries of the Sea Pines property.

Our concern is not whether the internal streets and utilities at Sea Pines were historically designed for 447 spaces. The applicant may very well be able to demonstrate that they were. Our concern is what potentially 600 additional vehicles and more than 1,000 additional residents mean for the surrounding residential community and the limited transportation network of the Peninsula.

Location is equally important. The City's own Future Land Use Map designates the Sea Pines property as Low Density Residential, and Planning staff states that the surrounding area is developed predominantly with single-family residential uses. The City is being asked to authorize 447 mobile homes within an established residential area on Mobile's coastal Peninsula.

The current 133-unit limitation is also not some obsolete restriction inherited from the 1970s. The City Council established a maximum of 133 mobile home dwellings in March 2022. Only four years later, the property owner is asking the City to increase that number to 447.

That raises a straightforward question: if an applicant came before the City today proposing a new 314-unit mobile home park at this location, surrounded by established residential neighborhoods on the Peninsula, would the City approve it?

The Peninsula community has answered that question before. In 2022, residents strongly opposed a proposed new manufactured-home development on Brill Road, and the Planning Commission denied the Planned Unit Development request. The concerns expressed then remain relevant today: compatibility with the surrounding community, development intensity, infrastructure, public safety, coastal vulnerability, and the long-term direction of the Peninsula.

The Peninsula of Mobile advocated or collaborated for: the implementation of the Peninsula Overlay (to ensure better land-use policy), improved sidewalks and pedestrian connectivity, stormwater improvements, environmental restoration, living shorelines, parks, cleanups, beautification, and responsible investment throughout the Peninsula. There has been a tremendous amount of public, nonprofit and private effort devoted to improving the Peninsula and reversing decades of blight and incompatible development. The Peninsula of Mobile believes City land-use decisions should reinforce that progress rather than return this community to development patterns residents have spent decades working to overcome.

We are not advocating for the displacement of the people currently living at Sea Pines, nor is this an argument against affordable housing. Existing residents are members of our community. This is about whether adding the equivalent of an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park is appropriate at this particular location.

The Peninsula is Mobile's coastal community. It is a narrow land mass bordered by Mobile Bay and Dog River, with environmentally sensitive watersheds and limited transportation routes. Those geographic realities are precisely why The Peninsula of Mobile has advocated so strongly for the Peninsula Overlay, improved stormwater management, coastal resilience, and thoughtful redevelopment.

Adding potentially more than 1,000 residents and approximately 600 additional vehicles at this location is not simply a decision about the boundaries of one parcel. It is a decision affecting the surrounding neighborhoods and the future direction of the Peninsula.

The City's own record establishes that increasing Sea Pines from 133 to 447 homes would substantially increase development intensity. City staff further states that the applicant's historical 447-space capacity does not, by itself, establish the unnecessary hardship required for the variance and that the submitted materials do not demonstrate compliance with all applicable current development standards.

For these reasons, The Peninsula of Mobile respectfully asks the Mobile City Planning Commission to recommend denial of the request to remove the existing 133-unit limitation. We further ask the Board of Zoning Adjustment and City Council, as applicable, to deny the related approvals necessary to expand Sea Pines from 133 to 447 mobile homes.

The most important question is not whether 447 homes can physically fit within Sea Pines. It is whether an additional 314 mobile homes-and the traffic, population and development intensity they represent-are appropriate within an established residential community on Mobile Bay.

We believe they are not. Attached are photos that members of the community have sent to us in regards to the current upkeep of the property, as you will be able to discern, Sea Pines is in disrepair far beyond fences. Our hope is that bringing light to this issue during the property owners request for expansion will force action into Sea Pines becoming accountable for their dereliction in property maintenance.

The Peninsula of Mobile has spent years working with the City, our residents and community partners to improve this area and establish a better direction for its future. We respectfully ask the Planning Commission to recommend denial and ask the City to protect that progress as this matter moves through the approval process.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Planning commission and Commissioner Small,
We have lived here since 2005 and have been active in getting our area into a homey community. Please deny the expansion of the Sea Pines Trailer Park. There is not enough tax dollars that can justify this type of growth. Our little community can not, nor do we want to, accommodate this type of quick growth. We have a unique area and would like to keep it geared to quiet family atmosphere.
Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

I had lived on Riverside Drive at off VIP for 25 years and I love this place dearly but if you increase with that sea pines and all those people in trailers, I will sell my house. It will be awful for this community to have that many trails in this area. Please don't let that pass. DIP is too pretty of a place to live without being crowded and jammed up by trailer parks, please vote no against it. Thank you.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

I am currently a resident in 36605 and close proximity to the sea Pines Mobile home park. I want to convey my concerns and specifically my opposition to the Sea Pines Mobile Home Park expansion request.

The section off Dauphin Island Parkway is currently an area in the midst of low to economically struggling households.

The additional traffic, noise, watershed, native wildlife as well as other Environmental impacts would be negative in an already fragile area.

As a 26 year resident of 36605 in this quadrant off Dauphin Island Parkway, I have seen modest improvements, albeit these improvements have impacted quality of life positively.

I do not believe this is a project that would add value to our homes and the surrounding areas nor to the quality of life.

I feel this will negatively impact home values. This is incompatible with the direction we are choosing to move our unique and environmentally diverse neighborhood.

The new airport impacts could be potentially a positive impact to the community. That said, the anxiety arises from the fact we could be dealing with low quality business development as well.

We have an opportunity to show our best face forward.

Provide a safe, beautiful enviable area our community and the City Of Mobile could be and should be proud to have as a first impression for people traveling through, to, shopping and staying in close proximity to the new airport.

Eco tourism, more green space, more walkable, better landscaped inviting areas is much more compatible to bring in the value, businesses, outdoor markets, outdoor music venues, fishing, boating and cycling opportunities that will help our area grow.

"DIP" is barely getting away from the negative name recognition. Our vision is to draw people in not just from our ZIP Code, but from all areas of Mobile and surrounding cities and communities.

I am opposed to this mobile home park expansion. I am further requesting blighted homes and unkept areas on south DIP be addressed.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

We are against the rezoning-condition change for the Sea Pines project. Here's why:

- **Massive increase in density:** The request would increase Sea Pines from the City-approved maximum of 133 to 447 mobile homes—314 additional units and more than 3.3 times the currently authorized development. City Planning staff describe this as a “substantial increase in the intensity of the existing use.” Potentially 1,000+ additional residents: At an estimated 3–4 people per home, the expansion alone could add approximately 942–1,256 residents to this part of the Peninsula. Potentially 600+ additional vehicles: At an estimated two vehicles per home, the additional 314 units could introduce approximately 628 additional vehicles into the surrounding residential community.
- **Wrong location for this intensity:** The property is designated Low Density Residential on the City's Future Land Use Map and is surrounded predominantly by residential development.
- **Inconsistent with the Peninsula Overlay:** The City adopted the Peninsula Overlay specifically to guide development on Mobile's unique and environmentally sensitive coastal Peninsula. Increasing this property from 133 to 447 mobile homes—potentially adding more than 1,000 residents and 600 vehicles—is inconsistent with the Overlay's intent to promote responsible development, protect the Peninsula's sensitive coastal environment, and address stormwater and development impacts.
- **The impacts extend well beyond Sea Pines:** The issue is not whether 447 units can physically fit on the property. It is whether the surrounding neighborhoods, roads, drainage, emergency services and

limited transportation network of the Peninsula can reasonably absorb this level of additional population and traffic.

- Coastal location and vulnerability: This is a geographically constrained residential community on Mobile Bay, where evacuation, stormwater, coastal resilience and emergency access deserve particular consideration before adding hundreds of additional mobile households.
- The City recently established the limit: The City recently established the limit—and required the property to come into compliance: The 133-unit maximum was imposed by the City Council in 2022, not decades ago. That same approval recognized outstanding issues on the property and required compliance with specific fencing, buffering and other applicable City requirements. The City's current staff report states that the site does not appear to have been brought into compliance with those 2022 conditions beyond fencing and vegetation that already existed. Yet only four years later, the applicant is asking the City to remove the 133-unit limitation and authorize 447 homes.
- Contrary to the direction of the community: The Peninsula of Mobile has spent years advocating for better land-use planning, removal of blight, the Peninsula Overlay, environmental restoration, infrastructure improvements and responsible investment. RevitalizeDIP and other community organizations are also actively working to improve the Dauphin Island Parkway corridor. Approving this level of increased density moves the Peninsula in the opposite direction.
- Perspective: The proposed 314-unit expansion is effectively the equivalent of building an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park inside an established residential community. If this were vacant property and an applicant proposed 314 new mobile homes here today, the City would have to consider whether that intensity is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods, the Peninsula Overlay, the limited roadway and evacuation network, stormwater and drainage impacts, coastal vulnerability, emergency services, and the City's long-term plans for the Peninsula. In fact, when a new manufactured-home development was proposed on Brill Road in 2022, the community rallied behind PoM and opposed it. Ultimately, The Planning Commission denied the PUD request. Calling these 314 units an “expansion” does not change the impact they will have on the surrounding community."

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Members of the Planning Commission,

Ref: Rezoning-condition change, ZON-UDC-003780-2026 (Sea Pines Mobile Homes)

I am a resident of the Peninsula of Mobile, and I am writing to oppose the requested condition change that would allow the Sea Pines Mobile Home Park to expand from 133 to 447 units. I respectfully ask the Commission to deny the request.

The scale of the increase is the central problem. The request would add 314 units to a property the City capped at 133, more than tripling the authorized development. Your own Planning staff describe this as a substantial increase in the intensity of the existing use. At three to four people per home, the expansion alone could add roughly 942 to 1,256 residents, and at two vehicles per home, roughly 628 additional vehicles into an established residential community.

This is the wrong location for that intensity. The property is designated as a Low Density Residential on the City's Future Land Use Map and is surrounded predominantly by residential development. The

request is also inconsistent with the Peninsula Overlay, which the City adopted specifically to guide development on Mobile's environmentally sensitive coastal Peninsula and to address stormwater and development impacts. Tripling density on this site runs directly against that purpose.

The impacts do not stop at the property line. The question is not whether 447 units can physically fit on the parcel. It is whether the surrounding neighborhoods, roads, drainage, emergency services, and the Peninsula's limited transportation network can reasonably absorb this level of additional population and traffic. We are a geographically constrained community on Mobile Bay, where evacuation routes, stormwater capacity, coastal resilience, and emergency access all deserve hard scrutiny before hundreds of additional households are added.

The City set this limit recently, and the conditions attached to it have not been met. The 133-unit maximum was imposed by the City Council in 2022, not decades ago. That same approval recognized outstanding issues on the property and required compliance with specific fencing, buffering, and other City requirements. The City's current staff report indicates the site does not appear to have been brought into compliance beyond fencing and vegetation that already existed. Four years later, the applicant is asking the City to lift the limit entirely and authorize 447 homes. Granting additional density before the existing conditions are satisfied would send the wrong message about whether City conditions carry weight.

Consider what is actually being proposed. A 314-unit expansion is the functional equivalent of building an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park inside an established neighborhood. If this were vacant land and an applicant brought that proposal forward today, the Commission would have to weigh it against the surrounding low-density residential character, the Peninsula Overlay, the limited roadway and evacuation network, drainage and stormwater impacts, coastal vulnerability, emergency services, and the City's long-term plans for the Peninsula. When a new manufactured-home development was proposed on Brill Road in 2022, this Commission denied the PUD request. Labeling these 314 units an expansion rather than a new development does not change the impact on the surrounding community.

This moves the Peninsula backward. Our Dauphin Island Parkway community has spent years working to improve this area. Residents, the Peninsula of Mobile, Revitalize DIP, and other neighborhood organizations have pushed for better land-use planning, removal of blight, adoption of the Peninsula Overlay, environmental restoration, infrastructure improvements, and responsible private investment along the DIP corridor. That work is finally gaining traction. Approving this level of density undercuts it directly and works against everything we have been trying to build, which is a Peninsula that is a great place to live, work, and build a future. We are asking the City to invest in that direction, not to reverse it.

I respectfully urge the Commission to deny the requested condition change and to uphold the 133-unit limit, and to require the applicant to come into full compliance with the conditions of the 2022 approval.

Thank you for your time and for your consideration of these comments.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

My household on Park Road 36605 opposes the Sea Pines Mobile Home expansion. Please deny the proposed re- zoning of the property. If it was not right in 2022, it is no different now.

Statistically, 36605 zip code has the lowest per capita income and the worse health in the state of Alabama, this is inviting more of the same. I would much rather see a modest to an upscale home development there. We know that will not happen; however, we do not need the expansion.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Councilman Small and the Mobile Planning Commission,

I am reaching out to respectfully urge you to vote against the rezoning condition change — ZON-UDC-003780-2026 — concerning the mobile home park. It's vital to preserve and protect Mobile's Coastal Community. If this change is approved, it could lead to over 300 new mobile homes being added behind BC Rain and along Bay Front Road. This development would contradict the efforts made by the Peninsula of Mobile, Revitalize DIP, and other local organizations dedicated to restoring and preserving our community. Furthermore, it would go against the limits that the City Council established only a few years ago.

I appreciate your consideration on this important matter.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

To:

Councilman CJ Small
Planning Commission

Respectfully:

As a DIP property owner since 2006. What can I say?

We still have many houses that are uninhabitable on Staples Rd from Katrina!! As well as others... These need to be mitigated now!!

We have properties that are doing significant improvements and not PAYING taxes without permits!

We have abandoned properties including vacant businesses, buildings waiting for years and years for WHAT? All up and down the DIP, you only need drive and look, they are not hidden from sight, although many others are.

It doesn't make sense to me to finally remove one delapidated "Mobile Home Park" on DIP, make a concerted effort to "CLEAN" up the visible DIP only to approve an additional 300 units or any number of additional units to another. The increased police effort due to the elements that eventually congregate in these very poorly conceived and managed locals is simply not worth the eventual blight and is a detractor from the COMMUNITY as a whole!! This is NOT a viable solution to lower income housing...

WE THE PEOPLE OF THE DIP DESERVE AND CAN DO WAY BETTER THAN THIS!!

I am not for this usage of that property, if you own a plot of land, rural in nature and you want to place a mobile home there, that is an acceptable use.

What else can we do to improve the DIP, again let's say grace over what is already in need of repair and or replacement before we add to the problems of the COMMUNITY, continue to eliminate abandoned and blighted properties both residential and commercial for a better DIP!!

Thank you!

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

We are against the rezoning-condition change for the Sea Pines project. Here's why:

- **Massive increase in density:** The request would increase Sea Pines from the City-approved maximum of 133 to 447 mobile homes—314 additional units and more than 3.3 times the currently authorized development. City Planning staff describe this as a “substantial increase in the intensity of the existing use.” Potentially 1,000+ additional residents: At an estimated 3–4 people per home, the expansion alone could add approximately 942–1,256 residents to this part of the Peninsula. Potentially 600+ additional vehicles: At an estimated two vehicles per home, the additional 314 units could introduce approximately 628 additional vehicles into the surrounding residential community.
- **Wrong location for this intensity:** The property is designated Low Density Residential on the City's Future Land Use Map and is surrounded predominantly by residential development.
- **Inconsistent with the Peninsula Overlay:** The City adopted the Peninsula Overlay specifically to guide development on Mobile's unique and environmentally sensitive coastal Peninsula. Increasing this property from 133 to 447 mobile homes—potentially adding more than 1,000 residents and 600 vehicles—is inconsistent with the Overlay's intent to promote responsible development, protect the Peninsula's sensitive coastal environment, and address stormwater and development impacts.
- **The impacts extend well beyond Sea Pines:** The issue is not whether 447 units can physically fit on the property. It is whether the surrounding neighborhoods, roads, drainage, emergency services and limited transportation network of the Peninsula can reasonably absorb this level of additional population and traffic.
- **Coastal location and vulnerability:** This is a geographically constrained residential community on Mobile Bay, where evacuation, stormwater, coastal resilience and emergency access deserve particular consideration before adding hundreds of additional mobile households.
- **The City recently established the limit:** The City recently established the limit—and required the property to come into compliance: The 133-unit maximum was imposed by the City Council in 2022, not decades ago. That same approval recognized outstanding issues on the property and required compliance with specific fencing, buffering and other applicable City requirements. The City's current staff report states that the site does not appear to have been brought into compliance with those 2022 conditions beyond fencing and vegetation that already existed. Yet only four years later, the applicant is asking the City to remove the 133-unit limitation and authorize 447 homes.
- **Contrary to the direction of the community:** The Peninsula of Mobile has spent years advocating for better land-use planning, removal of blight, the Peninsula Overlay, environmental restoration, infrastructure improvements and responsible investment. RevitalizeDIP and other community organizations are also actively working to improve the Dauphin Island Parkway corridor. Approving this level of increased density moves the Peninsula in the opposite direction.

- Perspective: The proposed 314-unit expansion is effectively the equivalent of building an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park inside an established residential community. If this were vacant property and an applicant proposed 314 new mobile homes here today, the City would have to consider whether that intensity is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods, the Peninsula Overlay, the limited roadway and evacuation network, stormwater and drainage impacts, coastal vulnerability, emergency services, and the City's long-term plans for the Peninsula. In fact, when a new manufactured-home development was proposed on Brill Road in 2022, the community rallied behind PoM and opposed it. Ultimately, The Planning Commission denied the PUD request. Calling these 314 units an "expansion" does not change the impact they will have on the surrounding community."

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Councilman Small:

I am writing to oppose the above-referenced rezoning request to significantly expand the Sea Pines Mobile Home Park off Dauphin Island Parkway.

Although the expansion may benefit the developer, its broader effects would be borne by existing residents and the city. Adding this many housing units would increase demands on already-limited infrastructure and public services while bringing substantially more traffic to the surrounding streets.

The city and local residents have worked hard to improve this corridor through new parks, bike lanes, sidewalks, and efforts to attract businesses and private investment. Approving a high-density development of this scale risks undermining that progress. The additional vehicle traffic would also create new safety concerns for the pedestrians and cyclists these improvements were designed to encourage.

The development's location in a storm-prone coastal area raises further concerns about housing vulnerability, emergency response, debris removal, and post-storm cleanup costs. The commission should also carefully consider whether the proposed density is compatible with the surrounding community and how it could affect nearby property values and the city's long-term tax base.

This proposal appears to place the developer's interests ahead of responsible growth and the welfare of current residents. I respectfully ask you to deny the rezoning request and support the community's ongoing efforts to make this area safer, stronger, and more attractive for residents and businesses.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Planning Commission,

We are writing to oppose the rezoning and expansion of Sea Pines Mobile Homes from 133 to 447 units. This massive increase creates severe density, environmental, and traffic problems for our community.

Key Concerns

- **Massive Density Spike:** Units jump from 133 to 447, adding 314 new homes. City staff call this a substantial intensity increase.
- **Over 1,000 New Residents:** The expansion adds about 942 to 1,256 people based on 3 to 4 residents per home.
- **Over 600 New Cars:** The project adds roughly 628 vehicles, straining local roads.
- **Wrong Land Use:** The site is zoned Low Density Residential and sits near quiet neighborhoods.
- **Peninsula Overlay Violation:** Growth conflicts with rules protecting our sensitive coastal environment and stormwater systems.
- **Wider Community Impact:** Problems affect nearby roads, drainage, and emergency services, not just the park borders.
- **Perspective:** The proposed 314-unit expansion is effectively the equivalent of building an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park inside an established residential community. If this were vacant property and an applicant proposed 314 new mobile homes here today, the City would have to consider whether that intensity is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods, the Peninsula Overlay, the limited roadway and evacuation network, stormwater and drainage impacts, coastal vulnerability, emergency services, and the City's long-term plans for the Peninsula. In fact, when a new manufactured-home development was proposed on Brill Road in 2022, the community rallied behind PoM and opposed it. Ultimately, The Planning Commission denied the PUD request. Calling these 314 units an "expansion" does not change the impact they will have on the surrounding community."

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

In reference to the Rezoning Condition Change ZON-UDC-03780-2026

My family lives off the Parkway and we are opposed to this rezoning change to develop this area.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Dear Mobile Planning Commission,

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the request to expand Sea Pines Mobile Homes. I am sure you are aware of efforts to improve conditions around Dauphin Island Parkway. Expansion of Sea Pines will be detrimental to the area. Adding more mobile homes will not only affect the value of surrounding single home properties, it will increase traffic, create drainage and road issues. The City of Mobile and Councilman Small have been working in conjunction with the Peninsula of Mobile to improve the area environmentally by updating and planning additional parks, in conjunction of establishing development guidelines. Sea Pines Mobile Homes is not esthetically pleasing, an expansion will only make it more worse and population dense. Due to the Mobile Home Park's close vicinity to the new Mobile International Airport and to Mobile Bay, this is not the correct project for this area. I am concerned that if this project is approved, it will set the wrong precedent for the Peninsula of Mobile. Please protect us from this intrusion by voting "no" to this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

Please allow this letter to serve as my strong objection to proposed expansion of 300 trailers at sea pines mobile home park.

Numerous groups have been trying to save our waterfront community . I have been living on the water in the dip community for almost 50 years. It has gone downhill due to these type of areas.

Please do not approve this expansion.

Agenda #01 ZON-UDC-003780-2026

John S. Ray, Tenacious 4, LLC

I am a resident in the area and oppose this change. Please consider these reasons for **opposition** to the referenced request for an expansion of the Sea Pines Mobile Homes:

- **Massive increase in density:** The request would increase Sea Pines from the City-approved maximum of **133 to 447 mobile homes**—314 additional units and more than 3.3 times the currently authorized development. City Planning staff describe this as a “substantial increase in the intensity of the existing use.” **Potentially 1,000+ additional residents:** At an estimated 3–4 people per home, the expansion alone could add approximately **942–1,256 residents** to this part of the Peninsula. **Potentially 600+ additional vehicles:** At an estimated two vehicles per home, the additional 314 units could introduce approximately **628 additional vehicles** into the surrounding residential community.
- **Wrong location for this intensity:** The property is designated **Low Density Residential** on the City's Future Land Use Map and is surrounded predominantly by residential development.
- **Inconsistent with the Peninsula Overlay:** The City adopted the Peninsula Overlay specifically to guide development on Mobile's unique and environmentally sensitive coastal Peninsula. Increasing this property from 133 to 447 mobile homes—potentially adding more than 1,000 residents and 600 vehicles—is inconsistent with the Overlay's intent to promote responsible development, protect the Peninsula's sensitive coastal environment, and address stormwater and development impacts.
- **The impacts extend well beyond Sea Pines:** The issue is not whether 447 units can physically fit on the property. It is whether the surrounding neighborhoods, roads, drainage, emergency services and limited transportation network of the Peninsula can reasonably absorb this level of additional population and traffic.
- **Coastal location and vulnerability:** This is a geographically constrained residential community on Mobile Bay, where evacuation, stormwater, coastal resilience and emergency access deserve particular consideration before adding hundreds of additional mobile households.
- **The City recently established the limit: The City recently established the limit—and required the property to come into compliance:** The **133-unit maximum was imposed by the City Council in 2022**, not decades ago. That same approval recognized outstanding issues on the property and required compliance with specific fencing, buffering and other applicable City requirements. The City's current staff report states that the site does not appear to have been brought into compliance with those 2022 conditions beyond fencing and vegetation that already existed. Yet only four years later, the applicant is asking the City to remove the 133-unit limitation and authorize 447 homes.

- **Contrary to the direction of the community:** The Peninsula of Mobile has spent years advocating for better land-use planning, removal of blight, the Peninsula Overlay, environmental restoration, infrastructure improvements and responsible investment. RevitalizeDIP and other community organizations are also actively working to improve the Dauphin Island Parkway corridor. Approving this level of increased density moves the Peninsula in the opposite direction.
- **Perspective:** The proposed 314-unit expansion is effectively the equivalent of building an entirely new 314-unit mobile home park inside an established residential community. If this were vacant property and an applicant proposed 314 new mobile homes here today, the City would have to consider whether that intensity is compatible with the surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods, the Peninsula Overlay, the limited roadway and evacuation network, stormwater and drainage impacts, coastal vulnerability, emergency services, and the City's long-term plans for the Peninsula. In fact, when a new manufactured-home development was proposed on Brill Road in 2022, the community rallied behind PoM and opposed it. Ultimately, The Planning Commission denied the PUD request. **Calling these 314 units an “expansion” does not change the impact they will have on the surrounding community.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

Dear Members of the Mobile City Planning Commission

Re: 801 South University Boulevard

MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park

District 5

Major modification of a previously approved Planned Unit Development allowing shared access and parking between multiple building sites to allow construction of a 1,110 square-foot building addition and ten (10) additional parking spaces.

We appreciate Building B's desire to improve its property and do not oppose reasonable improvements. However, we have significant concerns about the potential impact of the proposed building addition and expanded parking on storm-water drainage throughout the office park.

Our office is located on sloping terrain, with Buildings A and B fronting University Boulevard at the higher elevation and Buildings C and D situated downhill. During the recent heavy rainfall, substantial standing water accumulated around Buildings B, C, and D. Buildings C and D also experienced flooding on three sides of the buildings. We have photographs documenting these conditions.

The proposed project will increase the amount of impervious surface through additional roof area and parking. Unless it includes an adequate storm-water management system designed by a licensed Alabama civil engineer, there is a legitimate concern that runoff will worsen the existing drainage problems affecting the lower portions of the property.

As owners and members of University Professional Park, LLC, we have a fiduciary interest in ensuring that improvements to one building do not create additional maintenance costs, drainage issues, or potential liability affecting the common property or the other owners.

Because the LLC owns the common property, and our governing agreement requires majority approval for improvements affecting the common areas, we respectfully request the following before approving new construction:

- A storm-water drainage plan addressing the increased runoff, prepared by a licensed Alabama civil engineer.
- Written certification that the proposed construction will not increase storm-water runoff or adversely affect Buildings C or D or the common property.
- Confirmation that all applicable City of Mobile permits and drainage requirements have been obtained.
- A written acknowledgment that the owner of Building B will be solely responsible, at its own expense, for correcting any drainage problems or property damage resulting from the project.
- A construction plan that maintains safe and convenient access for patients, visitors, and staff throughout the project. Construction vehicles, equipment, and material deliveries should be staged and scheduled so they do not obstruct access to any office, parking areas, or driveways during normal business hours.

These requests are not intended to prevent reasonable improvements but to protect the LLC and all owners from foreseeable drainage issues, unnecessary disruption, and future disputes. Requiring appropriate engineering documentation and reasonable construction safeguards before work begins is a prudent measure that benefits every owner in the office park.

We have attached photos of the flooding and the operating agreement for University Professional Park.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

Planning & Zoning
City of Mobile
P.O. Box 1827
Mobile, AL 36633-1827

Re: 801 South University Blvd. - Proposed Building B Addition and Parking Expansion

Dear Planning & Zoning,

I have carefully reviewed the request submitted by the occupants of Building B regarding their proposed property improvements, including the expansion of the parking area and related site modifications. I have also reviewed the concerns that have been raised regarding the existing water drainage issues currently affecting several of the buildings within the University Professional Park, LLC.

As the owner of Building D, we share these concerns. Given that our building is situated at a lower elevation within the complex, we are particularly concerned that the addition of impervious surfaces, including expanded parking areas, could exacerbate existing drainage problems and increase the potential for flooding at our property.

After considering the information presented and participating in several discussions regarding this matter, I believe that a comprehensive drainage assessment should be completed before any construction, renovations, or parking lot expansion is approved or undertaken. Such an assessment should evaluate the current drainage conditions throughout the development and include specific engineering recommendations to address existing deficiencies and mitigate any additional flooding risks that could result from the proposed improvements.

While we are not opposed to Building B making reasonable improvements to its property, we believe it is prudent to first ensure that any proposed modifications will not adversely affect neighboring property owners. A thorough evaluation and an appropriate mitigation plan would provide assurance that the interests of all members of the University Professional Park are being protected.

Please keep us informed regarding the status of Building B's request, as well as any engineering assessments, drainage studies, or recommended mitigation plans that are developed as part of this process. We appreciate the opportunity to remain informed and to participate in discussions regarding matters that may affect the entire professional park.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We appreciate your consideration and look forward to receiving updates as they become available.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

To the Members of the Planning Commission:

I am an owner within University Professional Park, LLC, and I respectfully object to the proposed PUD modification and building addition currently before the Planning Commission.

I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to Dr. Thomas, or any other member of University Professional Park, LLC, adding reasonable square footage to an existing building. My concern is that the project comply with the LLC's governing documents, be properly authorized, adequately address drainage and stormwater impacts, and remain compatible with the existing professional park.

Authorization and LLC Requirements. The proposed project appears to affect common area owned by University Professional Park, LLC. To my knowledge, the LLC has not authorized the proposed modification or alteration of that common area. Further, Section 3.02 of the Operating Agreement requires prior written approval from more than one-half of the members for construction of this nature. To my knowledge, that approval has not been obtained or provided. The applicant should therefore be required to demonstrate the necessary ownership authority and provide evidence of the required member approval before approval.

Drainage and Stormwater. Drainage and stormwater concerns also remain unresolved. On July 31, we met with Ben Cummings, the project architect, who advised that Don Whittington was responsible for the drainage plans, but no drainage drawings were available for review. We subsequently met with both on August 7, when they stated that, in their opinion, the addition would not create additional drainage problems. While we appreciate their input, a project of this size should not be approved based solely on

verbal assurances. Complete drainage and stormwater plans should be available for review to determine whether the project could affect neighboring buildings, parking, common areas, or other property.

Architectural Compatibility. During the August 7 meeting, we learned that the proposed addition would be a two-story structure. The design shown to us does not appear architecturally harmonious with the existing park and differs materially in scale and appearance from the addition previously constructed on the pediatric side of Building B. We were previously assured by Dr. Thomas that the addition would look like the existing rear portion of Building B. The current exterior drawing does not appear consistent with that representation. Additions within a shared professional development should preserve its architectural character and protect the interests of all owners.

Request. Without the complete application, architectural and site plans, drainage and stormwater plans, documentation regarding common property, and evidence of required LLC authorization, affected owners have not had an adequate opportunity to evaluate the proposal.

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the PUD modification in its present form or defer consideration until:

1. Complete application, architectural, site, drainage, and stormwater plans are available for review;
2. The applicant provides documentation of compliance with Section 3.02, including the required prior written approval of a majority of the members;
3. The project's potential effects on drainage, stormwater, common areas, neighboring buildings, parking, and other owners have been adequately evaluated; and
4. The proposed two-story addition has been reviewed for architectural compatibility with University Professional Park.

I am not asking the Commission to prohibit a reasonable expansion. I am asking that this project proceed only after the applicable ownership and authorization requirements have been satisfied and its impacts on the development and other owners have been fully considered.

Until then, I respectfully request that the Commission not approve the proposed PUD modification.

Please include this objection in the official record for the application.

Thank you for your consideration.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

To the Members of the Planning Commission: I am an owner within University Professional Park LLC and I respectfully object to the proposed PUD modification and building addition currently before the Planning Commission. I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to Dr. Thomas or any other member of University Professional Park LLC adding reasonable square footage to an existing building. My concern is that the project comply with the LLC's governing documents be properly authorized adequately address drainage and stormwater impacts and remain compatible with the existing professional park. Authorization and LLC Requirements. The proposed project appears to affect common area owned by

University Professional Park LLC. To my knowledge the LLC has not authorized the proposed modification or alteration of that common area. Further Section 3.02 of the Operating Agreement requires prior written approval from more than one-half of the members for construction of this nature. To my knowledge that approval has not been obtained or provided. The applicant should therefore be required to demonstrate the necessary ownership authority and provide evidence of the required member approval before approval. Drainage and Stormwater. Drainage and stormwater concerns also remain unresolved. On July 31 we met with Ben Cummings the project architect who advised that Don Whittington was responsible for the drainage plans but no drainage drawings were available for review. We subsequently met with both on August 7 when they stated that in their opinion the addition would not create additional drainage problems. While we appreciate their input a project of this size should not be approved based solely on verbal assurances. Complete drainage and stormwater plans should be available for review to determine whether the project could affect neighboring buildings parking common areas or other property. Architectural Compatibility. During the August 7 meeting we learned that the proposed addition would be a two-story structure. The design shown to us does not appear architecturally harmonious with the existing park and differs materially in scale and appearance from the addition previously constructed on the pediatric side of Building B. We were previously assured by Dr. Thomas that the addition would look like the existing rear portion of Building B. The current exterior drawing does not appear consistent with that representation. Additions within a shared professional development should preserve its architectural character and protect the interests of all owners. Request. Without the complete application architectural and site plans drainage and stormwater plans documentation regarding common property and evidence of required LLC authorization affected owners have not had an adequate opportunity to evaluate the proposal. I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the PUD modification in its present form or defer consideration until: 1.Complete application architectural site drainage and stormwater plans are available for review; 2.The applicant provides documentation of compliance with Section 3.02 including the required prior written approval of a majority of the members; 3.The project's potential effects on drainage stormwater common areas neighboring buildings parking and other owners have been adequately evaluated; and 4.The proposed two-story addition has been reviewed for architectural compatibility with University Professional Park. I am not asking the Commission to prohibit a reasonable expansion. I am asking that this project proceed only after the applicable ownership and authorization requirements have been satisfied and its impacts on the development and other owners have been fully considered. Until then I respectfully request that the Commission not approve the proposed PUD modification. Please include this objection in the official record for the application. Thank you for your consideration.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

Members of the Board,

One reason you are receiving numerous emails from University Professional Park, LLC, is because we have an operating agreement that we have sent to you.

The document is not a private agreement between a few people.

It is a legal document that was required by the Mobile City Planning Commission according to their ruling (Case #SUB2004-00156) Professional Associates Subdivision in your Letter Of Decision dated July 16, 2004 after the meeting on July 14, 2004, in order for the Planning Commission to approve the initial PUD that exists today.

The document governs all four building owners and their successor owners in order to maintain the office complex and the common areas. The document is designed to protect all building owners as well as the overall maintenance of the office complex (PUD).

It states that any improvements to any building requires a majority vote of the existing members, and that has not happened.

None of the members were informed about any of the plans except that Building B planned to add on to the rear his building (the initial site plan shows a one story addition) and also remove the common area sidewalk in front of his building. We have learned over the last few weeks that the plan is definitely a major modification that adds approximately 3800 square feet which will probably impact the traffic flow into the complex and around the complex on the private road. It will also impact the parking problem that we recently discussed. There are multiple concerns that could have been addressed if the applicant had shared his plans with all the members/owners of the existing partners of University Professional Park, LLC, as required in Section 3.02 and 3.03, and we could have all come to an agreement re: his addition.

For this reason, along with concerns shared in earlier emails, we respectfully request that your approval be postponed.

Agenda #13 MOD-003825-2026

University Professional Park (Cummings Architecture Corp., Agent)

Maitre and Crabtree Dental Group are withdrawing our approval for planned addition of Harvey and Thomas now until design can be altered.

Agenda #14 MOD-003829-2026

City of Mobile (James Roberts, III, Agent)

To the Mobile City Planning Commission I am writing regarding Case MOD-003829-2026 the proposed Major Modification to the Planned Unit Development at 1891 & 1901 Hurtel Street which would remove two lots from the previously approved PUD. As an adjacent property owner I have a few questions I'd like addressed before or during the August 20 2026 hearing: 1. What is the intended future use of the two lots being removed from the PUD? Will they be sold rezoned or developed separately and if so for what purpose? 2. How will removing these lots affect the shared access arrangement between building sites that was part of the original approval? Will there be any changes to driveways traffic patterns or access points along Hurtel Street? 3. The notice states this application will not modify my property. I would appreciate written confirmation that this modification does not involve any acquisition easement or boundary change affecting adjacent parcels. Thank you for your time and please add this comment to the case file for the Commission's review.

Agenda #15 SUB-003836-2026 & ZON-UDC-003834-2026

SDC-B1 Subdivision (Goodwyn Mills Cawood, Agent)

I live one block away from the proposed development and I have 3 other houses also one block away from the site. Today you will hear lots of opposition to the development with complaints about proximity to the deadliest intersection in the city flooding on Airport Blvd and the now shuttered CVS development that previously destroyed houses to up-zone. But I offer something different. I propose a path forward for the development if they agree to a few concessions. First instead of the minimum

required 6-foot privacy fence between B-1 and R-1 I request they build an 8-foot-tall fence. Second I request a larger 30-foot vegetative buffer of both preserved vegetation and new trees added. Third I propose no street monument/pylon sign for the business. Fourth I suggest a larger retention pond on the north side of the property to manage 125% of the projected rainfall on the property. Fifth I ask that they not have a loud dumpster on to site but instead use trash cans picked up along the road. Sixth I ask that they not have a drive thru or anything that would have a loudspeaker outside. Although it will be impossible for a two-story business to blend in with a residential neighborhood I feel these simple requests will help make the change more palatable for the neighbors who never expected to live next to a bustling business. Voluntary restrictions put on the site will show the business wants to be a good neighbor after all.

Agenda #15 SUB-003836-2026 & ZON-UDC-003834-2026 SDC-B1 Subdivision (Goodwyn Mills Cawood, Agent)

I strongly oppose this proposal. There is already a failed business (CVS) across Dogwood Dr leaving a vacant building. Access from westbound Airport Blvd is nearly impossible due to the proximity to the Airport/University intersection and the possible additional traffic will make this already miserable traffic congestion worse and increase the potential for accidents.

Agenda #15 SUB-003836-2026 & ZON-UDC-003834-2026 SDC-B1 Subdivision (Goodwyn Mills Cawood, Agent)

My husband, son, and I moved here in 1999. But first let me define from Merriam-Webster: Neighborhood is a localized community inside a large town, city, or rural area people live close to each other. It includes both the physical place - such as houses, streets, and parks and the social community of people who share daily life and local interactions there. Business District is a specific part of a town or city where many commercial companies, offices, shops, banks, and restaurants cluster together, etc. We love our neighborhood because of the quiet atmosphere, great quality of life it offers families of all ages. We have been fighting for years to maintain and keep this neighborhood at its natural state of tranquility. We will continue to fight to keep it this way.

Agenda #15 SUB-003836-2026 & ZON-UDC-003834-2026 SDC-B1 Subdivision (Goodwyn Mills Cawood, Agent)

This is the third time that re-zoning of this property has been proposed. I believe it should be DENIED again: to wit: The proposed re-zoning is not a part of an Area Wide concept and contradicts the theme as defined by the FLUM plan. Rather it behaves much like the concept of Spot Zoning since it does not seek to connect along Airport Boulevard to Summit Drive and in the future to Hillcrest Drive to the East which would then make it more like an Area Plan. One can reasonably be concerned at the result of 135 new parking spaces and cars being funneled onto an already congested part of Airport Boulevard with no additional outlet for relief. Also the method of storm water detention has yet to be illustrated. One can reasonably project that the addition of a Detention Basin to the proposal would likely put the two green space areas to the Southeast and Southwest at risk if reduction or even elimination altogether. Furthermore any new storm water will be directed into an already inadequate Storm Sewer on Airport Boulevard which periodically causes 2 1/2 East bound lanes to flood causing a risk to the Safety of

numerous motorists as well as bus passengers seeking to load and unload at the same location. In summary for all of the foregoing we believe the Re-zoning proposal should be DENIED.

Agenda #16 ZON-UDC-003831-2026 & ZON-CUP-003832-2026
Owen Gates, Kinetic Capital IV, LLC (Lieb Engineering Company, LLC, Agent)

Planning and Zoning,

I am an adjacent property owner to the property located at 2654 Halls Mill Road and strongly oppose the proposed rezoning from R-1 to R-3 to allow the expansion of the existing manufactured housing development.

While I recognize that a mobile home community already exists on a portion of this property, the current proposal would significantly expand that use by adding approximately 26 additional manufactured homes and further transforming the area into a larger rental-based housing park. The fact that a mobile home community already exists does not justify expanding it in a manner that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and contrary to the character of the area or wants of the community.

I am also concerned about the current visual impact and long-term maintenance associated with this type of development. While manufactured homes may be attractive when first installed, experience shows that as the homes age and frequent ownership changes, maintenance standards can vary significantly. The addition of more manufactured homes increases the likelihood of older, worn, and deteriorating units over time, creating an appearance that is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhoods, luxury apartments, hotels and businesses in the area, in addition, potentially impacting nearby property values. There is currently a trash and litter problem in that community.

Public safety is another major concern. Residents in nearby neighborhoods have already experienced theft and property-related crimes, and many homeowners are concerned about further increasing housing density in an area that already faces challenges. Additional rental units and increased population density will generate more traffic, place additional demands on law enforcement and emergency services, and increase the potential for crime and nuisance-related issues that affect neighboring communities. These concerns are particularly important given the proximity of this development to established neighborhoods with families and children.

The issue before the Commission is not whether a small, existing mobile home community should remain, but whether it should be expanded by an additional 26 units and intensified into a larger rental park at the expense of the surrounding neighborhoods and businesses. The Planning Commission has a responsibility to consider not only the interests of the developer, but also the long-term effects on current residents and the community.

I do not believe this proposal represents the highest and best use of the property, nor do I believe it serves the long-term interests of the surrounding community character and aesthetics.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the rezoning request and maintain the current R-1 zoning designation. Doing so will help preserve neighborhood character,

protect property values, promote public safety, and support responsible development that is compatible with the surrounding area.

Agenda #16 ZON-UDC-003831-2026 & ZON-CUP-003832-2026
Owen Gates, Kinetic Capital IV, LLC (Lieb Engineering Company, LLC, Agent)

To the Planning and Zoning Commission:

My primary concern is the impact this proposed expansion will have on my property's value, marketability, and quality of life. While no one can guarantee that property values will decline as a result of the proposal, my nearly 20 years of living on Moot Avenue and in this neighborhood as a homeowner give me reason for concern. During that time, I have witnessed a shift from a predominantly owner-occupied community to one with a growing concentration of rental properties. As a result, I have seen increased tenant turnover, reduced owner occupancy, and inconsistent property maintenance, which I believe have contributed to a decline in neighborhood stability and have negatively affected the appearance and character of the community.

My home is located at the end of a dead-end street that currently provides a buffer between my property and the existing mobile home park. The proposed expansion would eliminate that buffer and convert our street into an access point for additional homes, bringing increased traffic, noise, and activity to our street.

Notably, two mobile home communities like Magnolia Pointe Mobile Home Park and The Palms Mobile Home Court. I've noticed utilize access points on major roadways such as Schillinger Road and Highway 90. The proposed expansion differs in that it would introduce additional traffic through an existing residential street. In my view, traffic associated with higher-density developments is more appropriately directed to roads designed to accommodate greater traffic volumes rather than through an established residential neighborhood.

My objection is not about the individuals who may live in the community. Rather, it is about the physical impacts of a significant expansion on an established residential neighborhood. The increased residential density, and additional traffic would alter the living environment that homeowners have relied upon and invested in for many years. Increased density would also place greater demands on local roads and infrastructure, potentially resulting in more congestion, higher activity levels, and increased noise. These changes may reduce the appeal of the area for current and prospective homeowners and could negatively affect property values and marketability.

Additional concerns include the capacity of existing infrastructure and public services to support the proposed development, potential stormwater and drainage impacts, and construction-related disruptions. Increased residential density may also bring more continuous vehicle traffic, including deliveries, moving trucks, contractors, and maintenance vehicles, resulting in greater activity, noise, and traffic near existing homes throughout the day.

Also, I specifically asked Theresa Smith, Regional Manager for Kaliber Management, whether the homes in the proposed development would be owner-occupied only or available for rent as that was one of my concerns already within my neighborhood and specifically Moot Ave. She confirmed they would only be for sale as the company's goal was to provide an affordable housing option to first time home buyers.

While driving through the mobile home community, I observed signs advertising homes **which stated: "For Sale or Rent," "Kaliber Homes For Sale or Rent, 251-280-7180, 3 Bed / 2 Bath, \$1,000 per Month Kaliber-Homes.com."**

Based on this information, it is reasonable to expect that at least some of the homes within the development may be offered as rental properties.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Commission carefully consider the long-term impacts this proposal may have on existing homeowners, property values, and the established character of the neighborhood before approving the rezoning request.

Thank you for your time and consideration.