Planning Commission

Special Workshop

Town Hall

April 17, 2018- 6:30 pm

Call to Order: Chairman Chris Head called the meeting to order at 6:35pm.


Commission Members Absent: Hank Jordan.

Invocation and The Pledge of Allegiance: Councilman Andrew Stewart

Public Comments: Chairman Chris Head opened the meeting up to public comments at 6:37pm. Members of the public spoke at this time. Public comments were closed at 6:49pm by Chairman Chris Head.

Workshop: At 6:50pm the Planning Commission had a discussion on the property the town has purchased regarding a proposed boat launch and public park. Chairman Chris Head asked all planning commission members to submit any questions they have regarding the proposed boat launch before the May meeting. At 8:05pm Chairman Chris Head closed the Planning Commission discussion.

Public Comments: Chairman Chris Head opened the meeting up to public comments at 8:06pm. Members of the public spoke at this time. Chairman Chris Head closed the public comments at 8:15pm.

Adjournment: Motion to adjourn was made by Glenna Smith with a Second by Kae Hamilton. Meeting adjourned at 8:16pm.

Chris Head, Chair

ATTEST:

Linda Pavasco, Secretary
Special Planning Commission Workshop  April 17, 2018

Additions to Minutes

Public Comments:

1. Tom Bloxham said he was speaking as a private citizen, not as a Town Councilman. He read a public statement from Steve Love who also said he was speaking as a private citizen, not a Town Councilman. He statement was submitted to the Commission to be placed in the minutes of the meeting. (It is included below.)

2. Chris Chandler read a statement with many unanswered questions for the Commission about planning issues and concerns about the State Street Boat Launch and Park. He also submitted his statements for inclusion in the minutes. (It is included below.)

Discussion during the meeting:
Kae Hamilton presented a copy to all Commission Members of a Plat from 1947 indicating that a small portion of the property was already designated as a park. Bob Gross asked about the significance of the document and noted that the portion of the property that was illustrated is currently a wetland. Kae Hamilton said it was just for informational purposes.

Christie Koehle expressed concerns over the sequence of the request by the Town Council to make text changes to the Town's Ordinances. She indicated that from her experience that request should have come from the Planning Commission to the Town Council. She also said there seemed to be too many unanswered questions to vote on these changes and that more research and planning needed to be conducted.

Glenna Smith spoke about the efforts of the AdHoc Property Search Committee's work for two years to find a suitable piece of property for the community.

Chris Head asked about the future cost of maintenance, including parking lot and boat launch maintenance, as well as the need for porte-potties.

John LeGrone suggested that the Commission schedule with the Town Council to come to the next Commission Meeting on May 2nd. Lynn Thompson will check with the League of Municipalities about having the Commission come to the Town Council Workshop the following Wednesday, April 25th to have a joint meeting to discuss Park Plan Development and to answer questions from the Commission to the Council.

End of Meeting Public Comments:
Tom Bloxham spoke about the non productivity of insulting comments and dirty looks. He said he only heard about this meeting 24 hours from before the meeting from Chris Head. He indicated that he didn’t want the outside public at our community boat launch.
No written comments were submitted.

Tommy Resmondo spoke a little about his history growing up in Perdido Beach and his desire for everyone who lives inland to have free and easy access to the water.
No written comments submitted.

Dennis Barnes expressed concerns over the lack planning he has observed by the Town for the State Street Boat Launch, using the term “Ready - Fire - Aim.”
No written comments were submitted.
NOTICE

THE TOWN OF PERDIDO BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A SPECIAL WORKSHOP ON TUESDAY APRIL 17, 2018 AT 6:30 PM AT TOWN HALL.

THE PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP IS TO DISCUSS PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE TOWN OF PERDIDO BEACH LAND USE AND ZONING ORDINANCE AS THEY PERTAIN TO THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES:

PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Article VI, Section 6.1.5
   1. Change minimum lot size from 3 acres to 1 acre.

2. Article XIX, Section 9A.11.1.
   1. Amend the time requirement for rezoning from one year to 6 months.

3. Article XXIII, Sections 23.2 Permitted Uses.
   1. In the table of permitted uses under “OR”- Outdoor Recreation Park, playground, public park, public pier boat launch and other, change use from “C” conditional use to “P” permitted use.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ARE ALWAYS WELCOME
Town of Perdido Beach
Planning Commission

Case No. PBTA-18002

Proposed Amendment to the

Town of Perdido Beach Land Use and Zoning Ordinance

1. Pertaining to Article VI, Section 6.1.5
   Change minimum lot size from 3 acres to 1 acre.

2. Article XIX, Section 19A.11.1.
   Amend the time requirement for rezoning from one year to 6 months.

3. Article XXIII, Sections 23.2 Permitted Uses.
   In the table of permitted uses under “OR” - Outdoor Recreation Park, playground, 
   public park, public pier boat launch and other, change use from 
   “C” conditional use to “P” permitted use.

   April 4, 2018
   Town Hall-6:30 pm

   Public Hearing:   April 4, 2018– Pending

   Staff Report Prepared by:   Lynn Thompson, Town Clerk
   Presented by:   Steve Love-Mayor Pro Tempore

   BACKGROUND:

   In accordance with the Town of Perdido Beach Land Use and Zoning Ordinance, at the March
   15, 2018 council meeting the Town Council voted unanimously to recommend the Planning
   Commission hold a public hearing to allow for input on proposed text amendments to the Town
   of Perdido Beach Land Use and Zoning Ordinance as they pertain to the following articles:
Baldwin Co GIS viewer -
http://isv.kcspgis.com/al.baldwin.revenue/

52 deeded pieces of property are NOT on the Plat Map posted here in the town hall. Last meeting it was discussed that this map is the go-to document. That being said, is the Town Council and Planning Commission operating off of incomplete and erroneous information? There are 27 driveways in a one block stretch on State St between Tuscaloosa Dr and the water. These pour directly into the proposed boat launch traffic. Does anyone on the town council or planning commission know this? Shouldn't this alert you to real concerns regarding safety?

http://townofperdidobeach.org/mobile/government/planning-commission/

According to the Town of Perdido Beach website -
It is the function and duties of the Planning Commission to make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the Town of Perdido Beach. The general purpose of the master plan shall be to guide and accomplish a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the Town of Perdido Beach.

The one block of State St, bordering the property under discussion tonight, is according to the amount of driveways, ingress, and egress areas platted, the most congested area in town by far. Being as the 27 driveways aren't even on the Town's Plat, how is the Planning Commission accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of this PUBLIC boat launch Project.

This is a traffic nightmare in the making. Those parking spaces are not currently being used but they are deeded and will be utilized as our area develops. Their only access is onto State St right into the loading zone of the proposed PUBLIC boat ramp.

++++

These are very fundamental questions from a planning perspective. Everyone for and everyone against the project should know the answers...

(1) How has the Planning Commission confirmed that increased boat traffic will not adversely affect water quality for marine life, swimming, etc.?

(2) How has the Planning Commission confirmed that boat launchings and associated parking will not adversely affect water quality?

(3) How has the Planning Commission confirmed that boat launchings and increased boat traffic will not adversely affect navigational safety?

(4) How many boat launchings does the Planning Commission project on any given weekday during the peak season, and same question, for weekends and holidays?

(5) What are projected peak hours for launchings?
(6) How will overflow parking be handled?

(7) How will boat launchers que?

(8) Are the roads in a condition to handle increased boat trailer traffic? The main access is State St a barely maintained sketchy single-wide gravel road with deep ditches. How do two boats with trailers pass each other on this road?

(9) What is the budget for extra maintenance necessitated by increased traffic, and how will the Town fund those extra costs?

(10) How will the town support its residents in resolving conflicts when dealing with a high use PUBLIC facility involving large vehicle traffic.

++++

Even though it was glossed over and stated that it doesn't matter in the initial zoning change from R-1 to OR there is a massive difference between a PUBLIC OR lot and a private OR lot from a use, planning, and traffic standpoint. It seems irresponsible to not acknowledge this fact.

Usage -
The private OR lots in town have a usage cap to them consisting of the number of owners and their guests. For example the private OR lot directly to the north of the proposed boat launch is comprised of 52 deedded parking spots and a common area. The max usage cap at any time is 52 owners (actually less because some owners have more than one lot) and their guests. The Actual usage however is much less because not all the owners live here, or they are not interested in water activities, and the deeded parking slots are not currently developed, or various other reasons. The PUBLIC OR lots have no max cap whatsoever. Essentially the population of the world. If you can get here then you can use it. The argument has been that the Actual usage will be low and manageable. There have not been any studies to support this point of view and all casual data collection from similar projects in the area such as the Lillian boat launch, Josephine boat launch, and the now closed Wolf Bay boat launch in fact show the opposite. All neighboring projects have, or have had in the case of the closed launch, massive problems with traffic, parking, and public nuisance. This has been confirmed multiple times by the Baldwin County Sheriffs Department. The Town of Perdido Beach has shown no planning to deal with the incredible amount of people and vehicles that will be congregated at the end of State St.

++++

As to the PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS

1. Change minimum lot size from 3 acres to 1 acre.

This applies only to the "PUBLIC boat launch" lot at State St since all other OR lots in town are already grandfathered in. This change would however provide a slippery slope for commercial development in town. There is a reason that OR lots were set at 3 acres. It is to limit the quantity of them. We have already seen the casual conversion from R-1 to OR and then false implication that OR PUBLIC is the same as OR private. There is no reason for this minimum lot size change except for the fact
that the Town Council has tried to step outside of its primary role and act as a property developer unfairly competing with private enterprise while using public money and poorly chose a site for their ill-conceived project.

2. Amend the time requirement for rezoning from one year to 6 months.

Same reasons as above.

3. In the table of permitted uses under “OR”- Outdoor Recreation Park, playground, public park, public pier boat launch and other, change use from “C” conditional use to “P” permitted use.

Same reasons as above.

Thank You
Chris Chandler

9051 Tuscaloosa Dr
Perdido Beach, AL
251-327-8316
Public Hearing Planning Commission  
re Zoning R-1 to OR  

People hate to speak in Public...  

SPEAKERS  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>live in Town</th>
<th>not resident</th>
<th>Mother-in-law is</th>
<th>lives across creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 spoke for who live in town  
15 spoke AGAINST who live in town  

more than 7/1 ratio
Planning Commission Workshop

4/17/18

I am sorry I cannot be there for this very important meeting. These are my comments as Steve Love a citizen and voter in Perdido Beach. I in no way represent the sentiments of the Council here. We all have our personnel views and I would like mine heard.

First I heard remarks at the last Public hearing that the planning commission should familiarize themselves with a lawsuit against the town concerning the State Street property. I feel this is the last thing you should do! The lawyer represents the interest of his clients and not the interest of this town. You represent what is in the best interest of your town and its citizens. That is what your decision should be based on.

These are text amendments that if passed will improve our Zoning Ordinance for future OR properties to be utilized.

Next I heard repeatedly, will these text amendments increase traffic? This is in reference to the State street property as it will also be affected by these amendments. I cannot answer this but I hope someone in Town uses it or it will be a waste. As for traffic, I have lived here almost 35 years and I can tell you historically, every time a new house is built it adds at least 2 more cars to our streets. Each home that becomes a short term rental such as VRBO adds traffic. I think I can say with certainty that boat ramp or not our traffic will increase!

Planning is how you deal with it.

Bob mentioned that he did not feel comfortable with these amendments as they took control away from the Town. In all the time I sat where you are, I can never remember anyone coming to us and saying they wanted us to have more control over their property. These changes would only permit uses by definition in Outdoor Recreation. When you zone a property OR you expect these uses, the zoning process is where you have control.
Changes in the lot size and time to rezone make it easier for anyone public or private to rezone to OR which will reduce density by nature of the zone. Controlling density and providing parks and open spaces, for the citizens, are two primary task of a municipality.

Kristy mentioned that this was just a thinly veiled attempt to make it easier for the town to make the State Street property a park and boat ramp, let’s just call it what it is. Ok, as a citizen I will accept that at face value. These text amendments will do that and also help anyone else who has now or future OR zoned property provide outdoor activities. That is why you make changes to your ordinance, to improve it and make it fit the needs of the town as they relate to the comprehensive plan.

If you cut through all the oratory, this is a simple issue. Either this planning commission supports the Town Council in trying to improve the Town and move forward as stated in the Comprehensive Plan or you do not! Please make your decision on what you feel is best for this town and its citizens. The Council was elected and you were appointed to do that.

Thank you,

Steve Love
My name is Dennis Barnes and I live at 8930 Tuscaloosa Drive.

I oppose changing the land use and zoning ordinances that are being proposed.

The original ordinances as written were for the safety and welfare of our community.

So what has changed? I’ll tell you.

The town council prematurely purchased a $500,000 piece of property and proposes to put a boat launch in the middle of a residential section of our town and, it’s too small by their own standards.

Now, what they clearly want to do is make changes to the zoning ordinances because they are violating their own ordinances.

In recent presentations to this planning commission concerning our narrow roads, I had clearly stated someone may get killed. Now someone almost has been killed. Tragic.

Our roads won’t support these big boats and big trailers.

And yet, do you pause and say we need to kill this boat ramp idea? No.

What do you do? Full steam ahead and try to rezone our ordinances to meet your undersized lot.

It’s absolutely, shameful.

This change is not good for this community now or as it continues to grow.

These lots are residential lots on all of the maps of this town and that what they should be.

I Do not agree to these changes.