

MOBILE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MEETING OF DECEMBER 1, 2005 - 2:00 P.M.
AUDITORIUM, MOBILE GOVERNMENT PLAZA

Members Present

Terry Plauche, Chairman
Mead Miller
Nicholas H. Holmes, III
James F. Watkins
Victoria L. Rivizzigno
Ann Deakle
John Vallas

Members Absent

Clinton Johnson
James Laier

Urban Development Staff Present

Richard L. Olsen, Deputy Director of
Planning
David Daughenbaugh, Coordinator of
Urban Forestry
Madeleine Masters, Planner I

Bert Hoffman, Planner I
Trista S. Cole, Secretary I

Others Present

John Lawler, Assistant City Attorney

Jennifer White, Traffic Engineering

Pat Stewart, County Engineering
Beverly Terry, City Engineering

Mr. Plauche stated the number of members present constituted a quorum and called the meeting to order.

The notation *motion carried unanimously* indicates a consensus, with the exception of the Chairman who does not participate in voting unless otherwise noted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

HOLDOVERS:

Case #ZON2005-01923 (Rezoning)

White-Spunner & Associates (Nancy Stone, Agent)

South side of Kreitner Street at its West terminus.

The request for a change in zoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential, and B-2, Neighborhood Business, to B-3, Community Business, to eliminate split zoning in a proposed commercial subdivision.

The plan illustrates the existing structures and parking.

December 1, 2005

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

After discussion a motion was made by Mrs. Deakle and seconded by Mr. Miller to recommend the change in zoning to the City Council subject to the following conditions:

- 1) **ensuring that the legal description reflects rezoning of the entire site, and not just the R-1 portion;**
- 2) **full compliance with the frontage tree requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, to be coordinated with Urban Forestry;**
- 3) **submission and approval of an Administrative Planned Unit Development application for shared parking and access;**
- 4) **that the site be limited to a single curb cut for each lot, with no continuous curb cuts;**
- 5) **replacement of paving with curbs, gutters, and landscaping where parking or curb cuts are removed; and**
- 6) **full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.**

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00209 (Subdivision)

Shannon Heights Subdivision, First Addition, Resubdivision of a Portion of Lots 18, 19, 20, and 21

2648, 2650, and 2652 Government Boulevard

(Northwest corner of Government Boulevard and Merwina Avenue, extending to the South side of Kreitner Street at its West terminus).

4 Lots / 1.6± Acres

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

After discussion a motion was made by Mrs. Deakle and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the above referenced subdivision subject to the following conditions:

- 1) **the depiction of the 25-foot building setbacks on the final plat;**
- 2) **the illustration of 50-foot building setbacks, measured from the centerline of the planned major street (Crosstown Loop 4 New Connection);**
- 3) **the completion of the rezoning process;**
- 4) **the removal of excess and continuous curb cuts; and**
- 5) **the placement of a note on the final plat stating that each lot is limited to a single curb cut, with no continuous curb cuts.**

The motion carried unanimously.

December 1, 2005

Case #SUB2005-00231 (Subdivision)

Timberlane Woods Subdivision, Unit One

West terminus of Timberline Ridge.

4 Lots / 9.0± Acres

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Dr. Rivizzigno to hold this application over until December 15th meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

GROUP APPLICATIONS

Case #ZON2005-02108 (Planning Approval)

Buccaneer Yacht Club (William T. Partridge, Jr., Agent)

4381 Park Road

(East side of Park Road, ¼ mile± South of Terrell Road, extending to the South terminus of Bay Front Road [unopened public right-of-way], and to Mobile Bay).

A request for Planning Approval to allow the expansion of an existing yacht club in an R-1, Single-Family Residential district.

The plan illustrates the existing structures, harbor area, and parking, along with the proposed structure.

(Also see Case #ZON2005-02109 – Buccaneer Yacht Club (William T. Partridge, Jr. Agent) – Planned Unit Development – below)

William T. Partridge, Jr., agent for the applicant, was present in this matter and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

- 1) depiction of a stormwater detention basin, if required;**
- 2) location of any dumpster storage area on the site;**
- 3) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site is limited to its existing curb-cut onto Park Road, and;**
- 4) if necessary, approval of all applicable federal, state and local agencies prior to the issuance of any permits.**

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2005-02109 (Planned Unit Development)

Buccaneer Yacht Club (William T. Partridge, Jr., Agent)

4381 Park Road

December 1, 2005

(East side of Park Road, ¼ mile± South of Terrell Road, extending to the South terminus of Bay Front Road [unopened public right-of-way], and to Mobile Bay).

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

The plan illustrates the existing structures, harbor area, and parking, along with the proposed structure.

(For discussion see Case #ZON2005-02108 – Buccaneer Yacht Club (William T. Partridge, Jr., Agent) – Planning Approval – above).

William T. Partridge, Jr., agent for the applicant, was present in this matter and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

- 1) depiction of a stormwater detention basin, if required;**
- 2) location of any dumpster storage area on the site;**
- 3) placement of a note on the site plan stating that the site is limited to its existing curb-cut onto Park Road, and;**
- 4) if necessary, approval of all applicable federal, state and local agencies prior to the issuance of any permits.**

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2005-02211 (Planned Unit Development)

McCrary Automotive Subdivision

1445 East I-65 Service Road South

(East side of East I-65 Service Road South, 600'± South of Pleasant Valley Road).

A request for Planned Unit Development Approval to allow shared access and parking between multiple building sites.

The plan illustrates the proposed development.

(Also see Case #ZON2005-02212 – McCrary Management, L.L.C. – Sidewalk Waiver)

Robert McBryde was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mrs. Deakle to approve this plan subject to following conditions:

December 1, 2005

- 1) the completion of the subdivision process prior to the issuance of any permits;
- 2) full compliance with landscaping and tree requirements of the Zoning Ordinance to be coordinated with Urban Forestry; and
- 3) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2005-02212 (Sidewalk Waiver Request)

McCrary Management, L.L.C.

1445 East I-65 Service Road South

(East side of East I-65 Service Road South, 600'± South of Pleasant Valley Road).

Request to waive construction of a sidewalk along East I-65 Service Road South.

(For discussion see Case #ZON2005-02211 – McCrary Automotive Subdivision – Planned Unit Development – above).

Robert McBryde was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mrs. Deakle to approve this request.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2005-02206 (Rezoning)

Nasser Parvinrouh

3000 and 3006 Old Shell Road

(Area bounded by Old Shell Road, Sage Avenue, Columbia Street, and the Illinois Central Gulf Railroad right-of-way).

The request for a change in zoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential, B-2, Neighborhood Business, and B-3, Community Business, to B-2, Neighborhood Business, for an aquatic fitness center and gymnasium, retail sales, and offices.

The plan illustrates the proposed development.

(Also see Case #ZON2005-02207 – Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision – Planned Unit Development – below) and (Case #SUB2005-00238 – Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision – Subdivision – below).

Mr. Olsen noted that there was an error in the staff report where it initially stated that the applicant was requesting B-3. The application was actually for B-2, which was recommended by the staff.

December 1, 2005

Frank Dagley was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Vallas and seconded by Mr. Holmes to recommend the approval of this change in zoning to the City Council subject to the following conditions:

- 1) the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 25 feet from the centerline of Columbia Street;**
- 2) the retention of the mature trees lining the Columbia Street and railroad frontages, to the extent possible, to be coordinated with Urban Forestry;**
- 3) the provision and maintenance of a vegetative buffer where the site faces residentially zoned property;**
- 4) the denial of direct access to Columbia Street, and limitation of the site to one curb cut each to Sage Avenue and Old Shell Road;**
- 5) compliance with Traffic Engineering comments (*Driveway number, sizes, location and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and conform to AASHTO standards. Sign and mark the one-way drive to MUTCD standards*); and**
- 6) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.**

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #ZON2005-02207 (Planned Unit Development)

Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision

3000 and 3006 Old Shell Road

(Area bounded by Old Shell Road, Sage Avenue, Columbia Street, and the Illinois Central Gulf Railroad right-of-way).

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

The plan illustrates adequate circulation, and parking in excess of the minimum requirements.

(Also see Case #SUB2005-00238 – Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision – Subdivision – see below) & Case #ZON2005-02206 – Nasser Parvinrouh – Rezoning - above).

Frank Dagley was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

December 1, 2005

- 1) the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 25 feet from the centerline of Columbia Street;
- 2) the retention of the mature trees lining the Columbia Street and railroad frontages, to the extent possible, to be coordinated with Urban Forestry;
- 3) the provision and maintenance of a vegetative buffer where the site faces residentially zoned property;
- 4) the denial of direct access to Columbia Street, and limitation of the site to one curb cut each to Sage Avenue and Old Shell Road; and
- 5) compliance with Traffic Engineering comments (*Driveway number, sizes, location and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and conform to AASHTO standards. Sign and mark the one-way drive to MUTCD standards*); and
- 6) full compliance with all municipal codes and ordinances.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00238 (Subdivision)
Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision

3000 and 3006 Old Shell Road

(Area bounded by Old Shell Road, Sage Avenue, Columbia Street, and the Illinois Central Gulf Railroad right-of-way).

1 Lot / 2.6± Acres

(For discussion Case #ZON2005-02207 – Nasser Old Shell & Sage Subdivision – [PUD] above) & (Case #ZON2005-02206 – Nasser Parvinrouh – Rezoning - above).

Frank Dagley was present on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the staff recommendations

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

- 1) the completion of the rezoning process prior to the issuance of any permits;
- 2) the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to provide 25 feet from the centerline of Columbia Street;
- 3) the depiction of the 25-foot building setback, measured from property lines after dedication;
- 4) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the site is denied direct access to Columbia Street, and is limited to one curb cut each to Sage Avenue and Old Shell Road; and
- 5) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that, where the site faces residentially developed property, a buffer must be provided, per Section V.A.7 of the Subdivision Regulations.

The motion carried unanimously.

December 1, 2005

Case #ZON2005-02155 (Planned Unit Development)

St. Emanuel Street Subdivision

350 St. Emanuel Street

(Southwest corner of St. Emanuel Street and Canal Street).

A request for Planned Unit Development Approval to allow shared access and parking between multiple building sites.

The plan illustrates the existing structures, along with the proposed structure and parking.

(Also see Case #SUB2005-00234 – St. Emanuel Street Subdivision – below).

Don Williams, Williams Engineering, was present representing this application. Mr. Williams pointed out the subject property, which was very near the metro jail. He said the applicant, an existing law firm with an office in midtown, was partially involved in criminal practice, and it would benefit them to have a satellite office at this location for one or two lawyers. The lot would only accommodate a 900 square foot building. Mr. Williams said that prior to World War II this area of town was developed residentially, although it was very much downtown, and now there was commercial development in the area as well as the jail. When the current Zoning Ordinance went into effect in the 1960s, this site was used as an industrial type site, and therefore all of these smaller lots, most of which were less than 10,000 square feet, which was less than the minimum required for light industry, were placed in the light industrial category, and with it came the minimum 10,000 square foot lot size. Mr. Williams said they felt this proposal was compatible with the size of many of the structures in the area, and met city requirements in regard to setbacks, site coverage, landscaping percentages, tree planting, Traffic Engineering curb cuts, right-of-way approval, off-street parking, stormwater retention, flood plain elevations, sidewalks, handicap accessibility, and building codes. They do not meet the minimum I-1, light industry, lots size requirement. The lot is 7000 square feet, and divided in two they would have a 3000 square foot lot and a 4000 square foot lot. They were, however, able to comply with 12 out of 13 specific City regulations. Mr. Williams also pointed out that they were not building light industry, but professional office space, a B-1 use. They were allowing off-street parking, which they would be sharing with an existing building that is on that site. The staff has recommend the application be held over so that they could explore a PUD. Mr. Williams said they had already applied for a PUD because of the shared parking between the two buildings. The staff presumably wanted them to look at the fact of having two buildings on the lot and going for less than 10,000 square feet on the lot size. He said that would be difficult. The other building that would remain on the lot was now used for a bail bonding company. The law firm that wants to purchase the second of the two lots would like to divide off themselves from the existing building with the bail bondsmen because the Bar Association frowns upon the fact of a law firm owning a bail bonding company, or having the land on which the business was operating. For that reason they would like to split the property in half so they could run a law office on one lot; the bail bonding company could remain on the other lot. To do that, Mr. Williams said they would need a property line between the two. If they had to have common ownership, they would not be able to do this project. He

December 1, 2005

said they needed to have a separate piece of property. They could share the parking lot but could not share the ownership. Currently there were two buildings on the site, both of which were probably 50 years old. They would like to tear down the building that is in the middle and have a parking lot there to be used by tenants of both buildings. If this application were denied, then they would not be able to build on this site and it would remain as it is with a vacant building. Parking would still remain on the street, and there would be no compliance with the tree ordinance. Mr. Williams said he felt this was a great opportunity for the City to encourage a small business to move downtown, and that the man on the street was not going to know, or care, that there was an unseen property line between the two buildings. It would continue to function as two buildings on one lot in an area of close-in residential scale size buildings. They feel this would be an improvement to the neighborhood. Mr. Williams asked if they were any questions.

Mr. Plauche asked if any of the members had any questions of Mr. Williams.

Mr. Holmes commented that if developed as proposed, and the property sold, they would have a structure without any parking. He asked if the parking was the real issue here?

Mr. Olsen stated that there were actually a couple of issues. One was that the PUD would require the shared parking, so there would still be some affiliation between the law office and the bail bonding company. The other issue that really hadn't been addressed, was that they were asking the Commission to waive the minimum lot size for each lot, yet they had not heard Mr. Williams present any evidence of unusual difficulties or hardships related to this property that would justify the Commission waiving that requirement of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Lawler said that was correct, but asked if the title to this lot were held by an LLC, would that remove the ownership problem that the lawyers would have owning in common with someone else?

Mr. Williams deferred the question to their attorneys.

Will Phillips and his law partner David Green, of Green and Phillips Attorneys, applicants, were present in this matter. Mr. Phillips showed the Commission a picture of their office on Florida Street which they built among dilapidated houses. It proved to be an improvement to the area, and that was their intention with this site on St. Emanuel Street. He showed pictures of the existing building on the site and the roof of the adjacent building. They proposed to have their parking where the dilapidated building now sits. Mr. Phillips presented additional photos which showed the general dilapidated nature of the area.

Mr. Plauche said he thought the essence of Mr. Lawler's question was whether their contract was to purchase the entire site, including the operating bail bonds business, or did the bail bonds ownership want to retain ownership in their building.

December 1, 2005

Mr. Phillips said the bail bonds business wanted to retain ownership of their building and did not want to be a tenant to them, and they (the applicants) did not want to be tenants to the bail bonds business.

Mr. Vallas said the question was whether the applicant could prove a hardship.

Mr. Phillips pointed out that the area was zoned industrial and no one was building any industry down there. They wanted to build an upscale office with wrought iron, a New Orleans style building, which would be a catalyst in the area. There was no parking for the existing building on the property, so they would be providing some parking there. As far as a hardship, Mr. Phillips did not know what they were looking for.

Ms. Deakle asked if the applicant had considered taking this lot and making it more equal to the two parcels and then sharing a driveway.

Mr. Holmes commented that the basic issue was that there was no parking.

Mr. Williams stated that at this time, the entire site had no parking. Clients of the bail bonds business were parking along the street. In their desire to develop this property, Mr. Williams said they needed to prove that they could get as much compliance as they could with many other City ordinances that allowed them to create the parking off-site for the benefit of both parties. He felt the hardship aspect here would be that the buildings that would be available were either too large or too dilapidated to justify the financial cost of going in. Mr. Williams said he understood the financial aspect needed to not be the primary motivation here, but the fact that the jail had pretty much changed the character of this industrial area in their opinion. For this reason, the kinds of people that needed to locate there were not able to find reasonable size and reasonably priced property with parking. Mr. Williams felt that with this proposal they could produce something that was a little more compatible with what was going on in the area.

Dr. Rivizzigno commented that by taking the existing lot and dividing it in half and tearing down the existing building, part of that could be used for parking for one building and part could be used for the other building.

Mr. Vallas noted that the entire lot right now was only 7000 square feet. Divided by two, neither one of those lots would meet the minimum lot size requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Williams said that was correct. He started off at 7000 square feet in a 10,000 square foot district. Any slicing below that was getting worse as far as compliance with the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Olsen pointed out that 10,000 square feet was the requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. The 7200 square foot requirement was in the Subdivision Regulations.

December 1, 2005

Mr. Williams said he hoped they could overcome the square footage objection by presenting other things such as landscaping, off-site parking, trees, and things they would not get otherwise with this type of project.

Mr. Olsen said several of the members questioned the possibility of shifting the line between lots 1 and 2 to the north to more equally divide the lots, such that it was even more apparent based on the subdivision plat, that the parking was provided on each lot and shared.

Mr. Williams said they would have no objection to that.

Mr. Watkins said he would be a lot more comfortable with this if it showed on the plat that there was adequate, or at least dedicated, parking to that lot.

Mr. Williams said they would have no problem splitting between the two lots so that the driveway was 12 feet on one side and 12 feet on the other side.

Mr. Miller commented that he was in complete sympathy with the applicant in terms of this neighborhood. He felt this would be an enclave for bail bonds businesses, and he felt some of the other Commission members were sympathetic, but they could not just throw out a regulation. He suggested a holdover might be the best solution so that the plan could be redesigned.

Mr. Holmes suggested approving the application with the property line down the center.

Ms. Deakle asked if the Commission could approve a change in the property line without seeing it redrawn.

Mr. Plauche said they could discuss this further in deliberations.

Ms. Deakle stated that they had never gotten the question answered about the parcel being the name of an LLC to circumvent their legal problems with being associated with a bail bonding company.

Mr. Phillips said that would be unethical. The Bar would not allow them to share office space with a bail bonding company.

Mr. Olsen said that was not pertinent or relevant to what the Planning Commission was considering.

In deliberations Ms. Deakle again asked if the Commission could approve a change in a lot line which was not correct on the plat, or would the applicant have to get the plat redrawn and resubmitted.

December 1, 2005

Mr. Lawler said it would probably be better for the Commission to have something before them to approve as opposed to a concept. He suggested that the applicant revise the plat and present it at the next meeting.

Mr. Olsen felt it was a simple enough change that the applicant should be able to have the drawing back for consideration at the December 15th meeting.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Vallas to hold this application over to the December 15th meeting, so that the applicant can revise the plat to reflect a change in property line between the proposed lots.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00234 (Subdivision)

St. Emanuel Street Subdivision

350 St. Emanuel Street

(Southwest corner of St. Emanuel Street and Canal Street).

2 Lots / 7,260± Sq. Ft.

(For discussion, see Case #ZON2005-02155 – PUD – above.)

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Vallas to hold this application over to the December 15th meeting, so the applicant can revise the plat to reflect a change in the property line between the proposed lots.

The motion carried unanimously.

NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

Case #SUB2005-00239

Green Harvest Subdivision

Northwest corner of Demetropolis Road and Halls Mill Road, extending to the East side of Government Boulevard at the East termini of Landsdowne Drive and Drexel Drive.

14 Lots / 32.1+ Acres

Michael Daniels was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

- 1) Lots 3 through 14 not be recorded until the rezoning requirement for a service road along Government Boulevard has been addressed;**
- 2) the placement of a note on the final plat stating that the site be allowed a maximum of three curb cuts to Government Boulevard, with the location, size, and design to be approved by ALDOT and Traffic Engineering;**

December 1, 2005

- 3) **full compliance with Urban Forestry comments (*Preservation status granted for all 50" and larger trees. All work under the canopies is to be permitted and coordinated with Urban Forestry, removal to be permitted by Urban Forestry only in the case of disease or impending danger. Exact curb cut locations and location of the proposed street and internal circulation drive should also be coordinated with Urban Forestry to ensure that no trees 50" and larger are effected.*); and**
- 4) **full compliance with City Engineering comments (*Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Any work performed in the right-of-way will require a right-of-way permit. Drainage easements and/or Hold Harmless agreements must be provided from any affected property owner for increased and/or concentrated stormwater discharge*).**

The motion carried. Mr. Vallas recused from voting in this matter.

Case #SUB2005-00216

Hartsfield Station Subdivision

West side of McFarland Road, 900'± North of Scott Dairy Loop Road South.

40 Lots / 11.9± Acres

Matt Orrell, representative for the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

- 1) **construction and dedication of new roads to meet Mobile County standards;**
- 2) **the placement of a note on the final plat stating that Lots 1, 28, 29, 34, 35 and 40 (which are corner lots) are limited to one curb cut each, with the size, location and design to be approved by County Engineering;**
- 3) **the placement of a note on the final plat stating that maintenance of the common area is the responsibility of the property owners; and**
- 4) **the placement of a note on the final plat stating that any lots which are developed commercially and adjoin residentially developed property must provide a buffer, in compliance with Section V.A.7. of the Subdivision Regulations.**

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00236

Park Place Estates, Resubdivision of Lots 14, 15, 40, & 41

North and South sides of the West termini of Park Place Drive North and Park Place Drive South.

4 Lots / 0.6± Acre

December 1, 2005

L.K. Cochran, representative of the applicant was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

After discussion a motion was made by Dr. Rivizzigno and seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the above referenced subdivision.

The motion carried unanimously.

Case #SUB2005-00233

Terry Subdivision, Second Sector

Northwest corner of Staples Road and Terry Lane.

2 Lots / 0.7± Acre

Joseph Coggin, was present and concurred with the staff recommendations.

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

- 1) **the approval of all applicable federal, state and local agencies prior to the issuance of any permits; and**
- 2) **full compliance with City Engineering comments (*Any water body/ditch that handles public water must be dedicated as drainage easement. Stormwater detention is required any time one lot is divided to 3 or more. Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Any work performed in the right-of-way will require a right-of-way permit.*)**

The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Special Election – Secretary

Mr. Plauche stated that with the recent passing of Vic McSwain, the position of secretary on the Commission was open. Mr. Plauche opened the floor for nominations for secretary.

Ms. Deakle nominated Dr. Victoria Rivizzigno for the position of secretary.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller.

Mr. Plauche called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

December 1, 2005

Announcement

Mr. Plauche introduced Mr. Bill Demouy, who was appointed to take Mr. McSwain's place as the City Administration representative on the Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: January 5, 2006

Victoria Rivizzigno, Secretary

Terry Plauche, Chairman

tc/ms