

**Auburn Planning Commission  
November 12, 2020 – Regular Meeting  
MINUTES**

The Planning Commission of the City of Auburn, Alabama, met in regular session on Thursday, November 12, 2020, at 5:00 PM by means of the Zoom video conferencing web application.

**PRESENT** Wendy Birmingham, Phil Chanser, Jana Jager, Mack LaZenby, Marcus Marshall, Warren McCord, Nonet Reese, Bob Ritenbaugh

**ABSENT** Robyn Bridges

**STAFF PRESENT** Forrrest Cotten, Katie Robison, Logan Kipp, Jay Howell, Stephanie Canady, Amber English, Dan Crowdus, Matt Dunn, Scott Cummings, Megan McGowen Crouch

**CITIZENS COMMUNICATION**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Cotten asked if any items should be removed from the consent agenda for discussion. The consent agenda included the following items:

- **Weber Farms South Extension Annexation – PL-2020-00586:** Recommendation to City Council for annexation of approximately 1.9 acres
- **Koullas-Young Subdivision, Redivision of Lot 1 – PL-2020-00595:** Final plat approval for a performance residential development (22 townhouse lots, one open space lot, and one lot for a mixed-use development)
- **Yarbrough Farms Subdivision, Sawgrass – PL-2020-00576:** Waiver to Article III 4d.(6), Final Plat, of the *City of Auburn Subdivision Regulations*, regarding the time in which a development must be completed in order to extend the bonding period
- **Woodward Oaks, Phase 1 – PL-2020-00615:** Waiver to Article III 4d.(6), Final Plat, of the *City of Auburn Subdivision Regulations*, regarding the time in which a development must be completed in order to extend the bonding period

**Mr. LaZenby made a motion to approve the consent agenda, which included the minutes from the October 5, 2020 packet meeting and the October 8, 2020 regular meeting, with staff comments.**

**Ms. Jager seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 8-0.**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Bedell-Weber Farms Annexation**

**PL-2020-00592**

Mr. Howell stated the request was for a recommendation to City Council for annexation of approximately 93.96 acres located north of 1100 Ensminger Road. The subject property was located outside of the City's Optimal Boundary, and staff recommended denial.

Brett Basquin with Foresite Group, Inc. represented the applicant, who was proposing three to 10 acre lots. He did not feel the annexation represented sprawl, as the property would be developed with large lots. While the growth model considered overall density and demands, it did not take into account the availability of land and its suitability for development.

Mr. Chansler said the driver of the CompPlan was the optimal boundary, and he had a hard time going against that.

Mr. McCord was inclined to follow policy, which was based on sound data and research. He felt it would not be staying true to planning principles if the property was annexed.

**Mr. LaZenby made a motion to deny Case PL-2020-00592, Bedell-Weber Farms Annexation, a request for a recommendation to City Council for annexation of approximately 93.96 acres, based on the property's location outside of the City of Auburn's Optimal Boundary.**

**Mr. Ritenbaugh seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 8-0.**

### **Weber Farms South Extension Rezoning**

**PL-2020-00587**

Mr. Kipp stated the request was for a recommendation to City Council for rezoning of approximately 1.9 acres from Rural (R) (pending annexation, Case PL-2020-00586) to Development District Housing (DDH). The subject property was located at the eastern terminus of Sutherland Lane. The proposed rezoning was in line with the future land use designation of Low Density Residential. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Chansler opened the public hearing.

Public comment was provided by the following individuals:

- BJ England, 1741 Philmore Court, was opposed to the request.
- Cathi Elmore, 1735 Philmore Court, was opposed to the request.

After no further comments were received, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Chansler asked if there were plans for the property to the east of the subject property.

Mr. Cotten was not aware of any future plans.

Brett Basquin with Foresite Group, Inc. represented the applicant. He said the property to the east was in the county and there was currently no plan for it. He said there was no plan for the proposed subdivision to be part of the Camden Ridge homeowners' association.

**Mr. LaZenby made a motion to approve Case PL-2020-00587, Weber Farms South Extension Rezoning, a request for a recommendation to City Council for rezoning of approximately 1.9 acres from Rural (R) to Development District Housing (DDH), with staff comments.**

**Mr. Marshall seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 8-0.**

**Weber Farms South Extension 2 Preliminary Plat**

**PL-2020-00594**

Mr. Kipp stated the request was for preliminary plat approval for a conventional subdivision (11 lot single family residential subdivision). The subject property was located at the eastern terminus of Sutherland Lane in the Development District Housing (DDH) zoning district (pending rezoning, Case PL-2020-00587). The plat met requirements of the subdivision regulations for preliminary plat approval, and staff recommended approval.

Mr. Chansler opened the public hearing.

Public comment was provided by the following individuals:

- BJ England, 1741 Philmore Court, expressed concern about increased traffic.
- Josh Clanton, 1671 Sutherland Lane, expressed concern about increased traffic.
- Jennifer Shelton, 1687 Sutherland Lane, expressed concern about increased traffic.
- Stacy Couch, 1688 Sutherland Lane, expressed concern about increased traffic. She anticipated dead children in the street.
- Mark Armstrong, 1661 Sutherland Lane, was opposed to the request based on traffic concerns.
- Forrest Parker, 1716 Philmore Court, was opposed to the request based on traffic concerns.
- Cathi Elmore, 1735 Philmore Court, was opposed to the request and asked about the staff comment that recommended a temporary turnaround on Sutherland Lane.
- Robyn Wilborn, 1729 Philmore Court, was opposed to the request.
- Kathryn Beezley, Sutherland Lane, was opposed to the request based on traffic concerns.

After no further comments were received, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Reese said the Commission had to discern whether the plat met requirements of the subdivision regulations for approval.

Mr. Kipp explained the temporary turnaround was a common requirement for stub-outs to allow public safety and/or utility vehicle access.

Mr. Chansler asked if it was possible to access the subject property from the east.

Ms. Frazier was not aware of an access from the east.

**Mr. Marshall made a motion to approve Case PL-2020-00594, Weber Farms South Extension 2 Preliminary Plat, a request for preliminary plat approval for a conventional subdivision (11 lot single family residential subdivision), with staff comments.**

**Mr. LaZenby seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 8-0.**

**Tuscany Hills, Phase 7**

**PL-2020-00593**

Mr. Howell stated the request was for preliminary plat approval for a performance residential development (43 single family residential lots and one open space lot). The subject property was located north of the Cantera Court terminus in the Development District Housing (DDH) zoning district. The plat met requirements of the subdivision regulations for preliminary plat approval, and staff recommended approval.

Blake Rice with Barrett-Simpson, Inc. represented the applicant. He noted the staff comment that Cantera Court should be extended to the west property line and stubbed-out for future connectivity. He asked why that connection was necessary. While it was possible, it seemed unnecessary based on existing connections.

Mr. Chansler opened the public hearing.

Public comment was provided by the following individuals:

- Colby Watford, 205 Flagstone Place, opposed connecting to the new development through Stonewood Farm.
- Matthew Dabbs, 2640 Cantera Court, said the proposed subdivision was not compatible with Stonewood Farm. He was concerned about property values and traffic.
- Kristy Cerro, 2631 Cantera Court, was concerned about property values and traffic.
- Brandon Henderson, 307 Flagstone Place, said the proposed subdivision was not compatible with Stonewood Farm. He was concerned about property values.
- Seth Snider, 294 Quarry Place, said the proposed subdivision was not compatible with Stonewood Farm. He was concerned about property values.
- David Darby, 2654 Cantera Court, asked for details regarding the project's stormwater plan. He asked if there would be covenants and if a traffic study was available.
- Elizabeth Snider, 294 Quarry Place, was opposed to connecting the new development through Stonewood Farm.
- Deepa Devarakonda, 2604 Capri Way, was concerned about property values and increased traffic.
- John James, 240 Flagstone Place, opposed connecting to the new development through Stonewood Farm.
- Kathryn Hollenbeck, 2641 Cantera Court, opposed connecting to the new development through Stonewood Farm.
- Michelle Sanford, 299 Flagstone Place, opposed connecting to the new development through Stonewood Farm.

After no further comments were received, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Chansler thought the connectivity issues were significant.

Mr. Rice said the developer did not own property that would facilitate a connection to the west. He said Tuscany Hills Drive could not extend without serious ecological ramifications. Cantera Court was the only option for an initial connection.

Ms. Frazier said it was important to note that, without connectivity, the City would continue to experience and hear about traffic issues.

Ms. Jager asked if it was possible to traverse the wetland area with a bridge in order to use the Tuscany Hills Drive connection.

Ms. Frazier thought it could be possible.

Mr. McCord said that some stub-out to the west was necessary. He suggested tabling the application to discuss further options.

Mr. Rice thought it was in his client's best interest to provide a stub-out to the west to offer a possible future connection.

Mr. LaZenby asked if Quarry Place was adequate to handle the anticipated traffic.

Ms. Frazier said yes.

**Mr. LaZenby made a motion to approve Case PL-2020-00593, Tuscany Hills, Phase 7, a request for preliminary plat approval for a performance residential development (43 single family residential lots and one open space lot), with staff comments.**

**Mr. McCord seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 8-0.**

Mr. McCord left the meeting.

## **620 East Glenn Condos**

**PL-2020-00569**

Ms. Robison stated the request was for a recommendation to City Council for conditional use approval for a performance residential development (multiple family development). The subject property was located at 620 East Glenn Avenue in the Corridor Redevelopment District – East (CRD-E) zoning district. The applicant proposed to construct an eight bedroom, 3-unit development on 0.36 acres. The project proposed a town house style product with parking located behind the structure. The site plan appeared to be consistent with the intent language of both the zoning district and the future land use designation. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Chansler opened the public hearing.

Public comment was provided by the following individuals:

- Michael Gross, 677 Kings Way, was concerned about ISR, drainage, and erosion problems.

After no further comments were received, the public hearing was closed.

David Walker, the applicant, discussed the project's timing.

Ms. Frazier said the project would be reviewed by the Development Review Team.

**Ms. Jager made a motion to approve Case PL-2020-00569, 620 East Glenn Condos, a request for a recommendation to City Council for conditional use approval for a performance residential development (multiple family development), with staff comments.**

**Ms. Reese seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 7-0.**

#### **The Preserve, Phase 4C**

**PL-2020-00589**

Mr. Crowdus stated the request was for an appeal of denial of an Engineering Design & Construction Manual waiver request related to the requirements in Section 5.3.6 (Right Turn Lane Warrants) and Section 5.3.7 (Deceleration Lanes and Tapers). The applicant submitted a waiver request for relief from installing the northbound left turn lane on Farmville Road at the intersection of Bud Black Road (which is also the intersection of the Phase 4C development entrance). The waiver request also sought to postpone construction of the southbound left turn lane at the same intersection, to a future date. Since Phase 4C would create a direct connection to Farmville Road, and the turn lanes were part of a signed development agreement, the waiver request was denied.

David Slocum with Pinnacle Design Group, Inc. represented the applicant. He explained the waivers were requested to delay construction of the southbound deceleration lane until it was warranted. This would allow construction of Phase 4C to commence in accordance with recommendations outlined in the traffic study. The study said the turn lanes would not be required until at least 2025.

Mr. LaZenby questioned if it was wise to wait for the turn lanes to be warranted. He thought it was important to support staff.

Mr. Chansler asked if this could be part of the bonding process.

Ms. Frazier said the improvements could be made part of the bonding process if required with the final plat.

Ms. Jager said, at a minimum, the right and left turns into The Preserve should be built now.

**Ms. Reese made a motion to deny Case PL-2020-00589, The Preserve, Phase 4C, a request for an appeal of denial of an Engineering Design & Construction Manual waiver request related to the requirements in Section 5.3.6 (Right Turn Lane Warrants) and Section 5.3.7 (Deceleration Lanes and Tapers).**

**Mr. LaZenby seconded the motion.**

**A vote was taken, and the motion passed with a vote of 7-0.**

**CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATION**

Mr. Chansler acknowledged that Mr. Cotten would be departing the city for employment in Florida. He said Mr. Cotten was leaving quite the legacy of great municipal planning. Without a doubt, Auburn was a better place because of him.

**STAFF COMMUNICATION**

**ADJOURNMENT-** With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

---

Mack LaZenby, Secretary

---

Phil Chansler, Chair