

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
NORTHPORT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2025**

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in a regular session at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 2025, in the City Council Chambers at Northport City Hall.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kevin Turner. Upon roll call the following members were found to be present: Mr. Brian Chandler, Mr. David Kemp, Mr. Roland Lewis, Mr. Clay Randolph, Mr. Kevin Turner and Mr. Karl Wiggins. Absent and failed to vote: Mrs. Tracey Kelly, Mr. Timothy Martin, and Mr. Jason Ward. Staff present were Mrs. Julie Ramm, Planning Director, Mr. Ron Davis, City Attorney, Mrs. Kimberly King, Assistant City Attorney, Mr. Shaun Patten, Zoning Administrator, Mr. Brad Matthews, Assistant City Engineer, Ms. Meredith Mullins, Planner, Mrs. Katelyn Lesley, Administrative Assistant.

Chairman Kevin Turner introduced the board members and staff members to the public.

Information on Back of Agenda – Chairman Kevin Turner explained the meeting procedures on the back of the agenda.

Approval of the Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) –

Motion by Mr. Wiggins to approve the minutes of the regular meeting minutes for March 11, 2025. **Seconded by Mr. Lewis.** Voice vote was given. **Motion Carried.**

Verification of No Conflict of Interest – None

Verification of Proper Notification – Mrs. Ramm confirmed proper notification was given.

Disclosure of Ex Parte Communication – None

Old Business

- A. **S-25-5 Harper Road Condominiums**– Sentell Engineering is requesting preliminary plat approval for approximately 3.51 acres for the property located at 5610 Oak Park Circle.

Mrs. Ramm stated that Sentell Engineering is requesting preliminary plat approval for approximately 3.51 acres located at 5610 Oak Park Circle. The current site consists of an undeveloped lot that is zoned Residential Multifamily (RM). The applicant is proposing a 35-lot townhome development. The applicant is requesting Right-of-way dedication. The required waiver not shown is Stub Street requirements. The property is surrounded by retail developments zoning Commercial Highway (C-6) to the south and east, a single-family detached neighborhood zoned Residential Single-Family (RS-1) and an undeveloped parcel that is not in the City limits but is in the planning jurisdiction to the north, and by a single family detached residence on a parcel not in the City limits but in the planning jurisdiction to the west. The future land use plan within Northport Compass shows this area as “Limited Mixed-Use”. The property is currently zoned as Residential Multifamily, which permits this use by right.

Mr. Matthews stated that he was incorrect when he stated that 60' is the standard for collector, it is 80'. They are proposing to dedicate additional Right-of-Way, the current R.O.W. is 40' and they would be dedicating to a total of 60'. That does accommodate the sidewalks that are proposed. The stub street is a waiver they are requesting because townhomes have to be built from private streets. Mr. Matthews also stated that minimum driveway spacing is 300', which includes the adjacent driveway to the south. They are proposing 250' between their entrances. Mr. Matthews also stated that public sanitary sewers are required, they are not on the plat, but they would have to meet standards.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Matthews if the existing R.O.W. is 40' proposed is 50', they are dedicating 5' on either side. Mr. Matthews clarified that they are requesting 60' total so they would dedicate 10' on their side.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews what his opinions were on getting the full width of R.O.W. as far as future projects. Mr. Matthews stated that the only reason would be if there is a street widening project was ever performed, there is nothing in the comprehensive plan that would reflect that, however, there is a lot of development proposed in this area.

Chris Sentell, Sentell Engineering, spoke at the podium. He stated that they will be glad to do public sewer and will do the sewer impact study, we would require. As far as the double entrance goes, they are willing to do a traffic study. They are proposing 35 townhome lots, for sale not rent. They will be glad to dedicate the R.O.W.

Mr. Turner asked on the driveway spacing, if we had to come up with some solution to meet fire code, as far as being evaluated. Mr. Sentell stated that we could make it contingent on the traffic study. Mr. Turner stated that there is a lot of clean-up that needs to be done and questions that need to be answered.

Mr. Wiggins asked Mr. Sentell if there was an open space at the top of the plat. Mr. Sentell confirmed to the north was an open space and where they are doing the storm water detention. Mr. Wiggins asked if there was an issue with the distance between the entrances, could there be an entrance from the north? Mr. Sentell confirmed they could do that, they would just have to redesign the storm detention.

Mr. Sentell requested a continuance to the May meeting.

Chairman Turner opened the floor for a public hearing.

With no one to appear before the commission, Chairman Turner closed the floor for a public hearing.

Mrs. Ramm stated this will serve as public notice for the May meeting.

Motion by Mr. Turner to continue the preliminary plat for 3.51 acres for the property located at 5610 Oak Park Circle. **Seconded by Mr. Lewis.** Voice vote was given. **Motion Carried.**

- B. **A-25-1 The Cove at Northcreek** – Longleaf Engineering requests annexation of approximately 1.28 acres located on the south side of Old Union Chapel Road. **APPLICANT REQUESTED TO CONTINUE UNTIL MAY. NO ACTION NEEDED.**
- C. **R-25-2 The Cove at Northcreek** – Longleaf Engineering requests rezoning of approximately 26.3 acres from Residential Single-Family (RS-1) to Special District (SD) for the property located on the south side

of Old Union Chapel Road. **APPLICANT REQUESTED TO CONTINUE UNTIL MAY. NO ACTION NEEDED.**

New Business

- A. **A-25-3 Magnolia Hills West** – Longleaf Engineering is requesting annexation with original zoning designation of Residential Single-Family (RS-1) for approximately 30.1 acres located south of Northwood Estates subdivision and west of the Magnolia Hills subdivision.

Tom Sims, Longleaf Engineering, spoke at the podium. He stated that he would like to continue this case to May due to a mix up with the city staff and to give them enough time to properly review everything.

Chairman Turner opened the floor for a public hearing.

With no one to appear before the commission, Chairman Turner closed the floor for a public hearing.

Mrs. Ramm stated that this notification will serve as proper notification for any adjoining property owners. **Motion by Mr. Turner** to continue the annexation case 30.1 acres for the property located south of Northwood Estates subdivision and west of the Magnolia Hills subdivision. **Seconded by Mr. Randolph.** Voice vote was given. **Motion Carried.**

- B. **R-25-4 Magnolia Hills West** – Longleaf Engineering is requesting rezoning and Special District Plan approval for approximately 29.17 acres located south of the Northwood Estates subdivision and west of the Magnolia Hills subdivision.

Tom Sims, Longleaf Engineering, spoke at the podium. He stated that he would like to continue this case to May due to a mix up with the city staff and to give them enough time to properly review everything.

Chairman Turner opened the floor for a public hearing.

With no one to appear before the commission, Chairman Turner closed the floor for a public hearing.

Mrs. Ramm stated that this notification will serve as proper notification for any adjoining property owners.

Motion by Mr. Turner to continue the rezoning case 29.17 acres for the property located south of Northwood Estates subdivision and west of the Magnolia Hills subdivision. **Seconded by Mr. Wiggins.** Voice vote was given. **Motion Carried.**

- C. **R-25-3 University Beach** – University Beach, LLC is requesting rezoning and Special District Plan approval for approximately 76.2 acres located north of McFarland Boulevard and east of Harper Road.

Mrs. Ramm stated that University Beach, LLC is requesting rezoning with Special District Plan approval for approximately 76.2 acres located north of McFarland Boulevard and east of Harper Road. The property is currently zoned Highway Commercial (C-6). The proposed development features a mixed-use development centered around a 10-acre lagoon and features a water park, hotel, retail, restaurants, and residential. The proposed layout is shown in the included Special District Plan and detailed in the included narrative. The Special District Plan proposes changes from the regular requirements of the subdivision regulations and zoning ordinance.

Category	Required / Permitted	Proposed
R.O.W. Width	60'	50'
Street Width	31'	28'
Stub Streets	2 along eastern boundary	None
Sidewalks	4' sidewalks along both sides of all public R.O.W.	See sheet SD5.1
Landscaping	20' perimeter, interior parking lot, 7' foundation plantings, 10' vehicular area screening	10'-20' perimeter, interior parking lot, 10' vehicular area screening, street trees -see sheet SD9.1
Lot sizes – Single Family Detached	50' width; 4,000sf minimum area	30' width; 2,100sf minimum area
Setbacks – Single Family Detached	20' Front, 7' Side, 25' Rear	5' Front, 0' to 10' Side with 8' minimum between buildings, 3' Rear
Signage	1 freestanding sign up to 150sf and 20' tall per lot, or 2 freestanding signs up to 350sf total and 35' tall per development	10 freestanding signs throughout development, including one 50' tall digital sign up to 650sf – see attached signage plan beginning on sheet XS101
Fencing	Chain-link, privacy, and fences over 4' tall not permitted in a front yard	Since a detention pond is proposed in the front yard near Hwy 82, a 6' fence will be required
Parking	9'x20 spaces	9'x18' spaces
Building Materials - Nonresidential	Min. 40% masonry on front façade, min 30% masonry elsewhere	A mixture of brick, stone, split-face block, architectural metal panels, architectural wood cladding, and other cementitious materials.
Uses	Agricultural, Residential, Commercial, Entertainment & Recreation, Institutional & Utilities, Industrial	Water parks, lagoons, plus all shown in green in the table at end of report
Building Heights	In C-6, up to 50' generally, up to 75' for hotels, 40' for multifamily	Up to 85' generally, up to 65' for multifamily, up to 3 stories for single-family

The zoning ordinance requires that special districts contain 20% usable open space for active and passive recreation. The development as proposed contains roughly 30% open space. Proposed amenities include a lagoon, water park, boardwalk, walking trails, and private beaches as shown on the site layout. Sheets SD3.1 and SD3.2 show two alternate site layouts for potential residential development in the southwest corner of the site. Sheet SD3.1 shows the proposed layout with multifamily, while sheet SD3.2 shows the site layout with additional single-family detached units. The applicant has expressed the intent of deciding which option to

pursue at a later date. If this plan is approved the applicant will have the ability to develop either of the options shown. The narrative included with this submission proposes a maximum of 470 residential units, with a minimum 50 being single-family detached houses. This would allow the applicant to build up to 420 multifamily residential units. For reference, the development closest in size and scale to this would be the 300+ unit development in Tuscaloosa known as The Lofts. The exact number of required parking spaces cannot be determined at this time, as it depends on the final building sizes and occupant loads, which have not yet been specified. The narrative specifies that a minimum of 1,500 parking spaces would be provided for the entertainment subdistrict once fully built. The future land use plan contained within Northport Compass depicts this property as "General Mixed-Use", which supports a broad variety of commercial, entertainment, and high-density residential uses. The proposed development and requested zoning do not conflict with the comprehensive plan. The site currently consists of vacant property zoned Highway Commercial (C-6). The site is surrounded by undeveloped unincorporated land to the north (no zoning), undeveloped unincorporated land to the east (no zoning), a mixture of restaurant and retail uses zoned Highway Commercial (C-6) to the south across Highway 82, a mixture of restaurant and retail uses zoned Highway Commercial (C-6) to the southwest, and by single-family residential neighborhoods zoned Residential Single-Family (RS-1 and RS-4) to the west across Harper Road.

Mr. Matthews stated that in regard to the sidewalks generally what they are proposing is on the public roadway (perimeter of the development) they would be providing sidewalks on the inside with no development on the outside, the comprehensive proposal shows a pretty extensive network of public sidewalks on the private property. He stated that in regard to the street widths it is important to point out that the roadways will not have on street parking as there is quite a bit of parking proposed within the development and our normal requirements are written around a cross section that includes on street parking so what they are proposing 24' of asphalt so that is 2 12' lanes, anything bigger than that he would have concerns about what kind of speeds are being generated. He stated that the R.O.W. Width being 50' does go hand in hand with the narrower streets and their ability to accommodate utilities throughout the development. He also stated that in regard to the Stub Street Requirements, they do have one proposed to the north but not to the east.

Mr. Wiggins asked Mr. Matthews if the R.O.W. included Harper Road as well or if it was just interior. Mr. Matthews stated it would be the same standard as what was just discussed, and the requirement would be 40' R.O.W on their side, the applicant would need to confirm what they are proposing. He stated that they have proposed sidewalks on Harper Road.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews on our standard type street what is the size of the sidewalk, 4'? Mr. Matthews stated that was correct, that is what subdivision regulations require. Mr. Turner asked what size the sidewalks are that the city was doing on some of their projects. Mr. Matthews stated that MLK Jr. Blvd will have two 6' sidewalks on either side on some other projects we have one 6' sidewalk proposed.

Mr. Wiggins asked if the large sign would be on Highway 82. Mrs. Ramm confirmed that is where she believes it was proposed.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews if there has been a traffic study on this development. Mr. Matthews stated that they have performed a traffic study in coordination with their permitting with ALDOT on their main entrance of Highway 82. Mr. Turner asked if there were any other improvements on city streets that need to be made. Mr. Matthews stated that there are no recommended turn lanes to city streets, there is a considerable amount of work that needs to be done on Highway 82 with the turn lanes and traffic signals.

Kent Donahue, 2121 Midway Road, spoke at the podium. He stated that they are wanting to modify the current zoning from C-6 to special district, the reason for the request is to modify the design standards in order for them to implement the mixed-use resort and development. He put together a 3D design of beach club and lagoon to show the commission, he explained what will be on the boardwalk. He showed the restaurant and bar, the concert venue, the surf club, the sky loft, cabana offerings, plunge pool, and surf training facility. He stated that the boardwalk is one point of access, everything shown before is about 12' off the ground, the bottom is a ticketed event, called adventure cove, this will have a wipeout course, a swim up bar, island with seating ledges on them, DJ area, and volleyball. He stated that the waterpark will be just west of the lagoon, the lagoon is what creates a regional destination, they are bringing people from 200 miles away, which brings a tremendous amount of tax revenue. He stated that is what was agreed to for phase 1 but as they got into realized they cannot build this destination driver and not have hospitality at the same time. He stated that they started the design process about 60 days ago for a 150-key hotel, adjacent to the beach club. They also looked at what Tuscaloosa has done on what is needed for conference space in the region, they had a study that came out that recommended 30,000 square feet to go along with the hotel, also will be a part of the wedding market. He stated that the beach club will be something unique to the entire country.

Mr. Donahue stated that with the investment the city has made with the ball fields, ball fields are very competitive so the city needs another hook to get teams here for tournaments and this will be a true regional destination. He stated that after meeting with the tourism board, there are over 400 state conferences every year that Tuscaloosa hasn't been able to be a part of because they do not have the space, the only downside to the event space is that they really need more hotel keys. Mr. Donahue showed renderings of the hotel and conference center. He stated that the rates will be about \$250/night with premiums some times.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Donahue to talk outside of the beach club and the lagoon. Mr. Donahue stated that on the west side they will have beach homes, really for second homes, you have 2 or 3 primaries', it could be individually owned, or they will keep them and rent them out. No maintenance, turf front yard. He stated that there are 19 beach front homes, the residents will have access to the fitness facility and pool at the hotel, fully maintained by the HOA, alley served. He stated that the homes will be in front of the park or the beach, the park will have an open space, fire pits, etc. and the homes will be 2,500-3,200 sf, the beach front lots will probably go for 1.5 million.

Mr. Turner asked if the residential portion would have garages. Mr. Donahue stated that they will be alley served garages.

Mr. Lewis asked if it was alley way. Mr. Donahue confirmed that was correct, they will also provide some additional parking, so that people do not park in the alleys.

Mr. Donahue reviewed the water park; and stated the following: the lazy river will be 1400 linear feet. There will be an infant pool, elementary school age pool, and a waterslide tower with five slides. There will be an opportunity for paddle boards, kayaks, and then a wipe out course. They are really hoping to tie in the University and have discount days.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Donahue if he could touch on what is intended on McFarland. Mr. Donahue stated that it was more conventional small shop retail at the entry, two pads to the left, then just behind those pads that would be a great spot for a limited service if the hotel offering is successful. He stated that the other part of the southside of the lagoon, they have 20 units that would be in phase 2, the multi-family would be in phase 2, then about 22,000 square feet of boardwalk retail. Phase 2 is in the wetlands now, they have reworked the design plan, but at the end of the day ended up with a concept that's even better than what they had done. He stated

that the comprehensive plan did request for a variety of housing types so multi-family is plugged in there. This is expensive multi-family because it is all garage parked.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Donahue if he had met with some of the community and neighbors since some of the design was based on their feedback. Mr. Donahue stated that he wanted to but after a lawsuit, council stated that it was not a good idea to meet with the community.

Mr. Kemp asked Mr. Donahue if the HOA was going to be in charge of the west side of the lagoon. Mr. Donahue stated that was correct. The Master Association will maintain all of it, then there will be a sub-association for the residential area. Mr. Kemp also asked Mr. Donahue what the timeline was for phase 1 and phase 2. Mr. Donahue stated that phase 1 is actually the majority of the project, phase 2 is 20 beach homes, the multifamily and the boardwalk retail. Mr. Kemp asked if phase 1 and phase 2 would be done at the same time. Mr. Donahue stated there would be a gap because of the Corps of Engineers. He stated that the numbers they have received for direct taxes to the city over the life of the development agreement (30 years) is \$240 million. He stated that University Beach participates in 62% of that. Mr. Kemp asked how many livable units were in phase 1 and phase 2. Mr. Donahue stated that there were 50 livable units in phase 1 and 20 livable units (beach homes) and 400 multifamily in phase 2, if he cannot get the rents to justify the multifamily, he will build more beach homes.

Mr. Turner asked regarding the development impacts based upon assumed project phasing that the City of Northport public service providers will be able to provide sufficient services to the special district while maintaining sufficient levels of service to existing development. Mr. Donahue stated that they have checked the capacities, and he thinks they have updated some of the stations. Mr. Turner asked what all that included, water, sewer, police, and fire. Mr. Donahue stated he did not think it included police and fire.

Mr. Kemp stated that it is a lot and by going this route that they are after and all of the allowable items on the chart, this turns loose a lot of potential things, if it is done, we then have no more control about what goes in here because of what is allowed. Mrs. Ramm stated that Mr. Kemp was correct, if they are listed in green, that would be what would be permitted in this specific special district plan. However, if the commission has any specific concerns about any of the items, the commission has the authority to make suggested changes in the recommendation to council. Mr. Kemp stated that his only issue with that is the time frame of going through the list and sitting in this meeting, because there are a few he is not crazy about. Mr. Kemp stated that self-storage climate control is one that sticks out to him that we would lose control over if the special district was allowed, is this a good place for that or not? Mr. Donahue stated that he did not have one planned for here, a lot of people use them especially for second homes, it would not be a big 6-7 acres facility, it would be a high rise. They would be fine with taking self-storage off, and they are open to suggestions. Mr. Kemp stated that the reason he asked about the phases is because they are basically asking the commission to cover the phasing of construction the entire 76+ acres.

Mr. Randolph stated where there is an option for 470 residential units, if they don't do this then it was mentioned that the alternative would be more beach homes, what is the trade off? Mr. Donahue stated that we are all better off if we can keep the multifamily, as far as we have seen in Dallas, they need people to support these restaurants, if you have walkability and more density. The rent will be higher than most mortgages in the area, but if he can't get those rents, he will not build the multifamily. Mr. Randolph stated that he is trying to get an idea for comparison, instead of the 470, there would be 36 beach homes in phase 2. Mr. Donahue stated that was correct and that is one he wants to keep flexibility on, because it benefits the mixed use components. Mr. Turner stated that as pointed out in the Staff Report the largest multi-family complex in Tuscaloosa is the Lofts, and it's just over 300 units and its right there near the University and one thing that we know from the backgrounds of it is they are high crime areas. He stated that then by allowing one that is 400 units, that's why

the question regarding police and fire came up. Mr. Donahue stated that there will be 24-hour security and an EMT. Mr. Turner states this goes back to Mr. Kemp's point, approving something with the what if in it and without knowing, that's tough on the Commission's decision. He stated that the Commission is just recommending this, ultimately it is the City Council's decision, but we at least want to vet the part of what could be allowed.

Mr. Lewis stated that during the discussion he took the time to read the green highlighted, there are 48 of them, but there are only 11 that are conditional and not already allowed. Which means there are 11 things that they can have a discussion on to say yes or no to the condition so that we do not have to draw this out. Mr. Donahue asked if there would be a special use permit to get that use under the C6 zoning. Mr. Lewis stated that what they are requesting to change the uses of the special use area, out of the ones that are already permitted in what you have there are only 11 that you are asking to add. He stated that we can discuss the 11 and move on, if those 11 are an issue we do not have to vote on those. Mr. Lewis went through the 11 Conditional Uses:

1. Multi-Family Dwelling
2. Townhouses
3. Upper story dwelling
4. Alternative financing: They can get rid of this.
5. Brewery
6. Mini warehouse
7. Motel: They can get rid of this.
8. Nursery, Wholesale: They can get rid of this.
9. Retail – unenclosed including flea market: Mr. Donahue stated that sometimes people like to do festivals but he doesn't want to have a farmers' market out there and maybe they can come back at a later date and get a special condition to do that if they want to have a festival.
10. Self-Storage – Climate Controlled: They can get rid of this.
11. Outdoor/indoor drive in theatre

Mr. Wiggins asked Mrs. Ramm if they were going to modify the permitted uses would they include that in the motion. Mrs. Ramm confirmed they will need to include it in the motion.

Chairman Turner opened the floor for a public hearing.

Bart Harper, 4035 Harper Road, spoke at the podium. He stated it is not a good fit for the City of Northport and that we are not a destination town.

Tuffy Holland, 3314 Mayberry Landing Drive, spoke at the podium. He stated that he feels we need to table the item, and the developer is being disingenuous with the wetlands.

Danny Higdon, 5519 Chestertown Trace, spoke at the podium. He stated that he is concerned about traffic on Highway 82, emergency responders going down the alleyways, parking, and there are no walking spaces.

Jason Sellers, 5314 Lakehurst Drive, spoke at the podium. He asked how it affects the city's investment if phase 2 is not built.

Tim Beasley, 5605 Clearbrook Drive, spoke at the podium. He stated that he is concerned about the noise and wetlands.

Lee Boozer, 4105 Flatwoods Road, spoke at the podium. He stated that some of his property is already in the flood plain and asked if it would have an effect on Mill Creek. He is also concerned about traffic and that a project has never been completed by this company.

Tom Morrison, 15050 Murray Lane, spoke at the podium. He stated that he is concerned about the traffic study and the level of service off of Harper Road.

Bobby Johnson, 5615 Bridle Lane, spoke at the podium. He stated that there are many other destinations in Alabama and to table the item.

Stan Allen, 3715 Horsebend Lane, spoke at the podium. He stated that he is concerned about the noise.

Dale Phillips, 5518 Chestertown Trace, spoke at the podium. He stated that no one has supported this. He also asked if this fits a comprehensive long-range plan.

Holly Brof, 2517 14th Street, spoke at the podium. She asked if the special district provides changes to governance and would like a reiteration of what can be done tonight.

Chairman Turner closed the floor for a public hearing.

Mr. Turner asked Mrs. Ramm what we are voting on and what the options are then what the next steps would be. Mrs. Ramm stated that the commission is voting on a rezoning request and as with any other rezoning request that is a recommendation to city council. She stated that the options tonight would be to make a favorable recommendation to city council, a favorable recommendation with proposed changes, or you can make an unfavorable recommendation to city council. Also, with the applicants' consent the commission could table the item. She stated that as far as the next steps, when he gets ready to subdivide, that subdivision plat would have to come back to the commission.

Mr. Turner stated that for the item heard earlier in the meeting, Harper Road Condominiums, that property is already zoned multifamily, they were wanting to come in and divide the property up so we were hearing a different type of case.

Mr. Kemp stated that if you see on the board do not get caught up in the red and green, there are 6 columns, there are things that are permissible and there are things that are under conditional use. He stated that as the property is zoned right now (C6), the ones we went back and looked at, there were only 11 items in that group that were conditional.

Mr. Wiggins asked Mrs. Ramm to explain a little bit about what the special district is to clear up any questions. Mrs. Ramm stated that when the Planning Commission and the City Council approved the zoning ordinance that was adopted in December, there was a new district called a special district, essentially a planning and development district. In the special district language in the Zoning Ordinance, essentially what an applicant would do is propose a new zoning district that is only applicable to that specific property. Mr. Wiggins asked Mrs. Ramm if the intention of the trade off for having variations for what we have as our standard. Mrs. Ramm stated that we had a lot of requests for RS-4, when the ordinance was approved that RS-4 was completely taken off because the commission and staff that worked on the draft all felt that if someone were to come in and propose smaller lots or higher density that the city or residents deserve some sort of trade off, so we have those outlined in the special district, they have to meet certain criteria in order for us to satisfy the council.

Mr. Turner stated that as far as the prior agreements that have nothing to do with the Commission, we are looking at property and the uses proposed. There were numerous questions about traffic. Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews if he wanted to answer the questions about traffic as far as what has been submitted to staff, the only improvement proposed as far as this project is the signal at the entrance on McFarland Boulevard. Mr. Matthews stated there's signal entrance, left turn lane, and right turn lane, all within ALDOT Right of Way. There are roadway improvements but not roadway capacity improvements. Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews in regard to the fire access on the alleyways, has fire already reviewed that. Mr. Matthews stated they had reviewed it and he is not here to speak for the fire department, but he believes that the developer has been in touch with the fire department. He stated that in regard to the street width, the required street width in the fire code is 20'. Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews if he could talk in regard to the wetlands what can be done from a city permitting standpoint. Mr. Matthews stated that the Corps of Engineers is in charge of the wetlands and we do not have any separate regulations.

Andy McCarthy, 3200 Rice Mine Road, spoke at the podium. He stated that he was going to let Daniel Conner go over the traffic study information.

Daniel Conner, Two Perimeter Park South, spoke at the podium. He stated that they are still in coordination with ALDOT, and the study is not finalized yet. They are recommending a turn signal on Highway 82, turn lanes and multiple lanes exiting the site. Mr. Turner asked Mr. Conner if there were any improvements needed at Harper Road and McFarland Boulevard. Mr. Conner stated the only improvements needed would be signal timing updates. Mr. Turner also asked Mr. Conner if the study went from Harper Road to Flatwoods Road and from Flatwoods Road to Highway 43. Mr. Conner stated the study did go that far, the only recommendations were at Harper Road and Flatwoods and that recommendation was unrelated to the development.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews if a drainage study had been completed. Mr. Matthews stated that there is an conceptual drainage plan that shows what the layout will be like but he has not seen a formal drainage study. Mr. Turner asked Mr. Matthews to speak on what is required pre-development vs. post-development. Mr. Matthews stated the ordinance requires post-development discharge to not exceed the pre-development discharge.

Mr. Randolph had concerns about the parking spaces vs. how many people the concert venue could hold. Mr. Donahue stated between uses and shared parking, there is enough capacity to handle something like that, if parking does become an issue, ability to do a structure in some of those lots. Mr. Wiggins asked Mr. Donahue if he knew based on the 2000 person seating, how many cars that would bring. Mr. Donahue said that he could get us the information on that.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Donahue if he could address the questions regarding the noise that would generate from the facility. Mr. Donahue stated that there is a hotel next door, so they do not plan on going past midnight on concert nights. He stated that they changed the plan to where the staging is pointing southeast, they also think that the multifamily and the homes will create a buffer. Mr. Turner stated that he thinks there are noise ordinances in the city.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Donahue if there was another place in Texas that he built. Mr. Donahue stated that he has been in business 30 years so he has had a lot of projects. He stated that he built a bridge crossing interstate 30 and a marina.

Mr. Kemp asked Mr. Donahue if he would consider splitting phase 1 and phase 2 from this proposal based on the special district he is proposing. Mr. Donahue stated that he will not consider it. Mr. Kemp asked Mr.

Donahue if he would consider tabling this so they would have more time to review. Mr. Donahue stated he would not consider tabling the item, he is happy to answer any other questions the commission has and be willing to accept compromises.

Mr. Turner has concerns about the multifamily, the pedestrian side of things, and the sidewalks.

Mr. Turner asked staff if what is proposed in the motion are approved by the council once it comes back for the subdivision the right of way elements are locked in. Mrs. Ramm stated that was correct and referenced section 13.01 in the subdivision regulations. Mr. Turner stated they are requesting stub street, street width, R.O.W. width, and sidewalks as far as subdivisions are concerned. Mrs. Ramm stated that if the commission has any concerns about any of that, they have the ability to make changes to the request and put in the recommendation to the council. Mr. Turner asked Mrs. Ramm if it does go to the council with the changes the commission suggest, can the council change those? Mrs. Ramm stated they do have that option.

Mr. Chandler asked Mr. Donahue, assuming this is not rezoned is there a development plan you could use as its currently zoned. Mr. Donahue stated that they could but not as planned, the residential component would be cut out.

Motion by Mr. Turner to make a favorable recommendation to City Council for the rezoning approval for approximately 76.2 acres located north of McFarland Boulevard and east of Harper Road from C-6 to Special District and for Special District Plan approval for University Beach with the following conditions that the uses of alternative financial services, mini warehouse, nursery – wholesale, motel, self-storage climate control will not be an allowed use and that the sidewalk should be 6' in width within the public right of way. **Seconded by Mr. Kemp.** Roll call was as follows: Mr. Turner – No; Mr. Kemp – No; Mr. Chandler – No; Mr. Lewis – Yes; Mr. Randolph – Yes; Mr. Wiggins – Yes. **Motion Failed.**

D. AMD-25-01 – City of Northport proposes amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Ramm stated that The City of Northport is requesting an amendment to the zoning ordinance. This amendment follows a planned three-month review of the zoning ordinance rewrite adopted on December 16, 2024. The updates serve to correct errors, clean up and clarify minor issues that were discovered.

Motion by Mr. Turner to make a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. **Seconded by Mr. Kemp.** Roll call was as follows: Mr. Turner – Yes; Mr. Kemp – Yes; Mr. Chandler – Yes; Mr. Lewis – Yes; Mr. Randolph – Yes; Mr. Wiggins – Yes. **Motion Carried.**

COMMITTEE REPORTS

OTHER AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

A. City of Northport Subdivision Regulations – Public Hearing

Jason Fondren with KPS, presented proposed changes to the subdivision regulations.

ADJOURNMENT – Motion by Mr. Lewis. Seconded by Mr. Turner

Meeting was adjourned at 9:12pm.



Kevin Turner, Chairman

ATTEST:



Julie Ramm, Secretary