```
1
                 COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN:
                                                So moved,
       Mr. Chairman.
    2
                 CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: There's a motion on the
    3
    4
        table to recommend this. Is there a second?
    5
                 COMMISSION MEMBER BRANDON BIAS: Second.
    6
                 CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Can I have a rollcall
    7
       vote?
    8
                 MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Oken?
   19 Maria Commission member arthur oken:
                                                Yes.
10
      1. · · · · 76 1 ?
                MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Monroe?
              COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: Yes.
   11
   12 - 12
               MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Nance?
      West Commission Member Daniel Nance: Yes.
14
      MR. VINCE JACKSON: And Mr. Bias?
       COMMISSION MEMBER BRANDON BIAS: Yes.
15
 16
       MR. VINCE JACKSON: Motion carries. And we
   17
       will take that recommendation to the County Commission.
                 CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Thank you, Vince.
   18
   19
   20
                     8C - CASE Z-18044, DCF, LLC PROPERTY
                 MR. VINCE JACKSON: Okay. Our next case is --
   21
   22
       This one is also in Planning District 26 -- Z-18044, DCF,
       LLC Property. This is a re-zoning from RSF-1 to RSF-2.
   23
   24
            The subject property is located on the west side of
       Scenic Highway 98 south of Battles Road in Planning
   25
   26
       District 26. This property is, as I stated, currently
   27
       RSF-1, and it consists of two-point-three (2.3) acres.
   28
            The reason for this request is to re-zone to the
```

RSF-2, combine this parcel with an adjacent RSF-2 parcel to the north, and then create -- It's called a family subdivision, but I think the way we would view it is more of a family compound where they would keep the ownership of the property in the family and provide dwelling units for the family members.

It's something with the configuration and location of the property and with the configuration that they're looking for that it's a creative thing to do. It's, I think, an admirable goal to keep family property together.

It doesn't fit neatly into our conventional regulations. So we talked about -- and we talked about it for a while -- how do we get there? What are some options?

And basically what they're attempting to do, as I stated, is re-zone this to RSF-2, combine it with an adjacent RSF-2 parcel that they own, then they would seek approval to do a planned residential development. But there's a variance that would have to go along with that.

There is a variance application pending. It was originally scheduled for October 8th, but it's been postponed in order to let the re-zoning application run its course.

So it probably will not go before the Board of Adjustment until December. So if they get the re-zoning and then if they get the variance, they will proceed with their PRD site plan.

We're not considering a variance or a PRD site plan tonight. I'm just bringing that up to kind of let you all know where they're trying to go. So that's the reason that they requested this re-zoning.

There is adjacent property zoned RSF-2. They are smaller lots, but it is adjacent. There is also adjacent property zoned B-2.

And then if you look to the south, there -- south of Battles Drive -- Battles Wharf Drive, rather, there are some RSF-2 down there. There's some more RSF-2 where Meeks Lane runs into Scenic 98.

And then just to the south of the Battles Wharf

Drive development, there is an RMS-6 area. That is a condominium development that's been there for a number of years.

This is an issue that the staff really doesn't have a problem with. It's a change in designation, but it would not be a change in use. It's a way of accomplishing what has been communicated to us as a kind of creative situation. And, like I said, creativity doesn't always fit within conventional zoning regulations.

The only other option we came up with that might have made this work was for them to request re-zoning to RMS-6, multi-family, and we did not feel that that was appropriate here. So they're attempting to get the RSF-2.

And I will be happy to answer any questions that you

```
might have.
              CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions for Vince?
2
              COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE:
 3
                                                Yeah.
    you say they're looking at another piece of property to
 4
    be part of this compound; correct?
5
              MR. VINCE JACKSON:
 6
              COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: Which parcel
7
    is that on the map?
    MR. VINCE JACKSON: If you look at the map,
   there's a parcelato the north that has frontage on the
10
    bay that's already zoned RSF-2. It's adjacent to this
11
12
    parcel.
            COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: The smaller
13
14
    parcel?
      MR. VINCE JACKSON: Yeah. This family already
15
    owns that. So they would combine it, keep all of the
16
    property in the family, but they would have additional
17
18
    dwellings to accommodate the different family members.
    And there's a representative of the applicant here who
19
20
    can better address what their plans are.
              COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE:
                                                I see that.
21
              CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: No one is signed up to
22
    speak in favor of this.
23
              MR. CRAIG DYESS: If no one has signed up, I'm
24
    Craig Dyess, and I'll be glad to speak, if you'll allow
25
26
    it.
              CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: All right. Let's finish
27
    up with Vince. Anymore questions for Vince?
28
```

1 (No response.) 2 CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Thank you, Vince. 3 We'll open the public hearing at this point. Come 4 on up, Craig. 5 MR. CRAIG DYESS: Thank you very much. Vince did a pretty good job leading off. This piece 6 7 of property has been in my client's family for 8 seventy-five years, plus or minus. And they've got a pretty large family; eight at this point plus quite a few children and grandchildren. And it's a very sentimental 10 11 piece of real estate. When I sat down with Vince's staff, the objective 12 13 was to do just as he described, to try to create a family compound really adjacent -- They own property 14 adjacent to the north, which has been in their family for 15 the same amount of time. 16 And then the property adjacent to the south is 17 18 smaller than anything that would ultimately come out of 19 this. And as you can see from the map, there's an RSF-2 20 in quite a bit of places as well as RMFS-6, you know, 21 that it was called years ago. If I can answer any questions, I'll be glad to. 22 23 it's pretty straightforward. CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions for Craig? 24 25 COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: The only two 26 parcels you're looking at though are the one that's in blue right now and the parcel to the north; the smaller

jang kan

27

28

parcel?

```
MR. CRAIG DYESS: Well, they own the smaller
       1
       2
          parcel already, and it's already zoned RSF-2. The only
       3
          parcel being requested to change the zoning on, which is
       4
          RSF-1 is the subject property.
       5
                    COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: Correct.
                                                                But
       6
          you would be combining those two properties?
      7
                    MR. CRAIG DYESS:
                                      That is correct.
                    CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any other questions?
      8
(Maria 1997 (1941 )
                                    (No response.)
           Thank you.
   10.
                                                           There's
          four people signed up in opposition. I had asked at the
   11
     12
         beginning of the meeting in a case like this to try to
         pick one or two in order to present the case. So have
     13
          y'all done that?
     14
     15
                    MR. RICHARD JOHNSON: No, sir.
                                                   But I'll go
          first.
     16
     17
                    CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: We appreciate y'all doing
          that, too.
     18
     19
                    MR. RICHARD JOHNSON: I'm Richard Johnson.
     20
          represent Ellen Dyess. She owns the property immediately
     21
          south to this proposed change. And we're gonna piggyback
     22
          a lot from the prior application.
     23
               We're looking at the big picture here. And I think
     24
          one thing that wasn't asked is how many lots and how many
     25
          houses they're planning for this family subdivision,
     26
          they're calling it.
     27
               It's my understanding they can put, once they
     28
          combine, up to six to eight different lots on that piece
```

of property. And that's just simply another dangerous precedent to start here.

I don't think there's any other estate lots like this up and down Battles Wharf or Point Clear where there's six to eight family homes.

You get into the same issue. It doesn't comply with the development pattern plan for this area. It creates a high-density environment. We don't have an ingress or egress, if this gets approved at some point.

Right now, there's only one access to the north on here, and it's about ten (10) foot wide, which won't meet the minimum of, I believe, thirty (30) once this -- if this is ever approved.

This is supposed to be a low-density area. If you do this, it will be high density. It's gonna also create traffic issues. I'm sure other people may speak about it here today, and the sewage issues as well.

Just like the last one, if you do this, I think it is gonna set a dangerous precedent. What's to stop somebody else further down the bay in Point Clear from saying, well, the Dyesses did it, why can't we put in six to eight houses on our property? We've got it.

I think if you look at the numbers right now, that's a hundred and three thousand (103,000) square foot they've got just right now before they merge it with the other piece of property. That's six lots right there.

And based upon what we've heard, they're planning six to eight on this property. And it's just simply too

```
much and sets a dangerous precedent for this area.
     2
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions for this
     3
         gentleman?
                                   (No response.)
     4
     5
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Thank you.
     6
             Did he properly represent, or are there any other
     7
        concerns that he didn't cover?
     8
                  COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN:
                                                  There's a
        variance on this? Is there a pending variance on this
 9
    10
        case?
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Excuse me?
 11
         COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: Was there a
12
    13
        variance pending on this case?
       and the feathman, SAM DAVIS: Subject to the re-zoning.
    14
   .15
                  MR. RICHARD JOHNSON: Yes. It's postponed.
             MR. RONALD SNIDER: I'm Ron Snider. My wife
    16
    17
        and I and Paul and Amy Hamilton have owned a summer house
        on the bay for approximately thirty years immediately
    18
    19
        adjacent to this property.
    20
             In addition to what he said, I guess our main
    21
        concern is changing the entire character of this property
    22
        and make this a subdivision.
             What we've understood, the two houses they own on
    23
        the bay, they're going to have a third house on the bay.
    24
        They were going to add five to six more houses behind the
    25
    26
        property.
    27
             We have a one-lane driveway with three houses using
    28
        it now. We could have as many as nine houses using it.
```

```
1
      But I think, primarily, it's just a terrible precedent
  2
      for the Battles Wharf/Point Clear area. And we would
  3
      respectfully ask that y'all not start setting precedents.
  4
                CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions for
      Mr. Snider?
  5
  6
                                (No response.)
  7
                CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Thank you, sir.
                MR. RONALD SNIDER: Thank you.
  8
  9.
            CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Anyone else got anything
 10-
     that's signed up in protest that hasn't already been
 11
     covered? Now is your chance.
 12 | . . )
                                (No response.)
 13
     CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: All right. Craig, do you
     want to answer the concerns?
 14
 15
                MR. CRAIG DYESS: I'll be glad to. Thank you.
16
           It's pretty black and white, you know, the reality
 17
      of this precedent. You know, the last one, Allan was up
 18
     here. And the previous case you guys heard was about a
 19
      family subdivision.
 20
           I think Vince described it as Posey Lane Property.
      That isn't as Point Clear as it gets. It's down just
 21
 22
      south of Zundel's. So the other thing is just -- You
      know, they're all over from here up. The Ridingbarks
 23
 24
      [sic] have divided property. That's really kind of a
 25
      moot point from our perspective.
 26
           The adjacent property, which Mr. Snider spoke of,
      which he's owned for sometime, he and his partner, you
 27
 28
      know, it's smaller than any property we would potentially
```

100

, . <sub>1</sub>, . <sub>2</sub>

put on those three acres that we own combined with the lot next door.

So at the end of the day, we're not asking for you to approve a subdivision or approve a site plan. We're asking for you to consider re-zoning this to the same zoning as they're asking for, which are, I believe, nonconforming as well even for what they've been zoned RSF-2.

So at the end of the day, we're just asking for one thing, just to re-zone our property RSF-2 and let us take -- move it forward and see if we can get to where we need to get.

We do have a large family. There's seven children and my mother, who is ninety-three. And this obviously came through her family. So there's a lot of heartstrings tied to this piece of property.

And it almost galls me that newcomers would give us grief about the fact that we wanted to stay there on the bay where everyone grew up.

Lastly, Ellen Dyess' piece of property without the driveway that goes from the back of Snider's property to the highway would be RSF-2 as well. The only reason is the square footage of that lot is greater than -- It's probably closer to the thirty thousand (30,000) required for RSF-1.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions -- Before you leave, Craig, any questions for Craig?

```
1
                                  (No response.)
     2
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: All right. Thank you.
     3
                  MR. CRAIG DYESS:
                                    Thank you.
     4
                  MS. TRICIA NIEMEYER: Has the family
         considered --
     5
     6
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Excuse me, ma'am. Are you
     7
        signed up to speak?
     8
                  MS. TRICIA NIEMEYER: I did something to my
    9 | foot on the way out. But never mind.
               MR. CRAIG DYESS: She did sign up to speak.
   -10
    11
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: She did?
           MR. CRAIG DYESS: She said her foot is hurt.
   12
       CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
    13
14 | didn't understand you had a foot problem. So go ahead.
          MS. TRICIA NIEMEYER: Right. I do apologize.
   15
       I do honor the family's desire to have their
   16
        seventy-five years of history stay where it is on the
    17
        bay. I wonder if you could consult with an architect and
   18
        design such a dwelling that wasn't six separate ones.
    19
   20
             There's some creative family homes to do exactly
        what you're trying to do that don't require as much
   21
        drive, as much parking, as much -- I'm just throwing it
   22
   23
        out there.
   24
                  MR. CRAIG DYESS: Do you want me to reply?
   25
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS:
                                       If you'd like.
   26
                  MR. CRAIG DYESS: I'll just say yes, we have.
   27
        We actually are dealing with a couple of architects on
   28
        this -- a couple of architects and land planners.
```

BALDWIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING 10/04/2018 The name of the game is to make this small cottages, coastal and as environmentally sensitive as possible. And I know I've had these conversations with the Planning Department many times about other properties on doing environmental subdivisions in site-planned

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

 $\cdot 13$ 

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 12

residential communities.

And they are available. It's available to us. yeah. Just like I said, we just want to get through the R-1 to RSF-2 and then let us push forward with a site plan. And you'll get another bite at it.

MR. RICHARD JOHNSON: I'd like to raise up another question, if I may. What's to prevent them from selling the lots to somebody else later on down the line? MR. CRAIG DYESS: There is nothing to prevent that.

CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Nothing to prevent that now or then.

All right. We'll close the public hearing. Staff got anything else?

MR. VINCE JACKSON: I was just gonna mention we didn't get into a lot of the details of what they're proposing with their PRD, because we don't have an active PRD application yet. We didn't want to confuse the issue and start discussing an application that is not currently on the table.

Like I said, this is an unconventional kind of thing that we spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to possibly make this work. And there were two options.

```
And the other option of re-zoning to RMS-6, we did
 1
 2
     not feel was appropriate at all. We felt like this with
 3
     the re-zoning, a variance PRD, that was an easier way to
 4
     try to go.
         And we stated upfront there were no guarantees,
 5
     because it is unconventional. But we applaud the effort
 6
     to keep family land together and, you know, have a
     dwelling for their mother and the various siblings.
 8
 9
               CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Any questions for Vince?
10
           COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: I've got a
     clarification just to make sure. If we approve or deny
11
    this, then it goes to County Commission for their
13
     approval?
      MR. VINCE JACKSON: Yes. As a recommendation.
14
15
          COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: As a
     recommendation or not, does it also go to Fairhope?
16
17
              MR. VINCE JACKSON: The re-zoning does not.
18
         Now, when we get to the -- You know, assuming we get
19
     to the point where they submit a PRD site plan, if the
20
     PRD site plan is ultimately approved, then there will be
     some subdivision issues that the City of Fairhope will
21
22
    have to look at. But it'll be after all that.
23
               COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: So there's at
24
     least two more or three more steps before they can do
     anything?
25
26
              MR. VINCE JACKSON: At least two, probably
27
    more.
28
              COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE:
```

```
CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Anymore questions for
     1
     2
        Vince?
     3
                                  (No response.)
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Vince.
     4
             Any discussion?
     5
     6
                                  (No response.)
    7
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: All right. Anyone care to
        make a motion?
    - 9
            GOMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: Motion,
    10
        Mr. Chairman.
         CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Motion to recommend
   11
   12
        approval?
         COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: Move for this
   13
       Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend to the County
  14
        Commission approval of this application subject to the
15
        approval of the pending variance.
12 16
                  CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: No. This is a re-zoning.
   17
   18
        So your motion would be to re-zone.
   19
                  COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: Subject to the
   20
        variance.
                  MR. VINCE JACKSON: Let me clarify. The
   21
   22
        variance doesn't have anything to do with the re-zoning.
   23
        It only has to do with the PRD.
   24
                  COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: I see.
                  MR. VINCE JACKSON: So they'll have to get the
   25
   26
        variance before they can move forward with the PRD
   27
        application.
   28
                  COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN: So I'll restate
```

```
the motion. Then it's a motion to recommend to the
            County Commission to approve this application.
        2
        3
                     CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS:
                                         Is there a second?
        4
                     COMMISSION MEMBER BRANDON BIAS: Second.
        5
                     CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Okay. Let's have a
            rollcall vote.
        6
                     MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Oken?
        7
                     COMMISSION MEMBER ARTHUR OKEN:
        9
                   MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Monroe?
   . - - - 10
                  COMMISSION MEMBER SPENCE MONROE: No.
       11
           MR. VINCE JACKSON: Mr. Nance?
           Commission Member Daniel Nance: Yes.
     12
            MR. VINCE JACKSON: And Mr. Bias?
  13
1.4
          COMMISSION MEMBER BRANDON BIAS: Yes.
    . 15
          MR. VINCE JACKSON: So that motion carries on a
       16
           vote of three-to-one. And we will take that
       17
            recommendation to the County Commission.
       18
                     CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: All right. Thank you.
       19
       20
                   8D - CASE Z-18046 THE RESERVE AT DAPHNE PROPERTY
                     CHAIRMAN SAM DAVIS: Our final case is Z-18046
       21
            the Research at Daphne. Could we have a staff report?
       22
       23
                     MR. VINCE JACKSON: Yes, sir. This is a
            request for PRD site plan approval. The applicant is
       24
       25
            requesting site plan approval of a proposed development
            to be known as the Reserve at Daphne consisting of six
       26
            hundred nine (609) lots on approximately four hundred and
       27
       28
            sixty-nine (469) acres.
```

The subject property is located north of the Reserve at Daphne Phase I, south of Plantation Hills and east of County Road 54 in Planning District 7, 15 and 28.

Planning Districts 15 and 28 are zoned. Planning District 7 is un-zoned.

If this seems familiar to you, you have seen this before. This is the third time that you've looked at the Reserve at Daphne -- most of you.

When this first came before the Planning Commission, May of 2018, the PRD at that time consisted of six hundred and twelve (612) lots. Subsequent to Planning Commission action, the plans for the PRD were revised to include an additional six (6) lots. And as a result, it was felt that further review by the Planning Commission was necessary, so it came back to the Planning Commission. And that revised site plan was again recommended for approval this time on July 12, 2018.

Having said that, the application was withdrawn prior to any action by the County Commission because there was some issues that came up relative to the property. And also, at the time, it was expressed that they might add some additional lots.

What we've ended up now is a new application that actually has fewer lots than the original approval.

We're down to six hundred nine (609) lots now.

I would mention -- And I'm just gonna go through the maps. This is the locator map, area photography, this is a survey, and then this is the proposed site plan.