

# Tuscaloosa Neighborhoods Together

## notes on TUSCALOOSA PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION August 20, 2007

*(\*\*\*These are not official minutes. They are notes taken by a private citizen and are not to be used or relied on in any way as an official document.\*\*\*)*

Each item states in which Council District the subject property is located. For reference to district maps, please see:

<http://www.tuscaloosaneighborhoods.org/Resources/Maps.html>

Present:

Commissioners: Bobby Howard, Vince Dooley, Jimmy Warren, Robert Reynolds, Aaron Christian, Joe Duncan & Steven Rumsey (In Gary Phillips' absence Commissioner Reynolds chaired the meeting)

City Staff: Joe Robinson(TDOT), Jimbo Woodson (Legal), Harold Skelton, Jessica James, Cecil Lancaster, and John McConnell (Planning & Zoning)

### ZONING

Z-13-07: Earnestine Parrish petitions to rezone property located at 2829 20th Street (Lot 8 in Block 481 of the T.C.I. & L. Survey) from R-3 to R-4. (Council District 2)

*Ms. Parrish was not present in the room when this case was called - as has been the case for the last few months. She showed up about an hour late and over the protest of Commissioner Rumsey, who argued that she should wait until last since she was so late, her case was heard and approved.*

Z-18-07: Tuscaloosa Teachers Credit Union petitions to rezone property located at the northwest corner of Veterans Memorial Parkway and 13th Avenue East from RMF-1 to BN. (Council District 5)

*Approved with conditions.*

### ORIGINAL ZONINGS

The Planning Commission considered the original zonings to be placed on these properties which have been recently annexed into the City, or on which annexation is pending.

OZ-1-07: Property located at the southeast corner of Lot 6 of the Smelser Plat No. 1

Section 1 subdivision, proposed for R-1 (Residence District). (Council District 1)

*Approved.*

OZ-2-07: Lot 10 Sunset Hills subdivision located along Lake Tuscaloosa, proposed for R-1 (Residence District). (Council District 3)

*The annexation and the original zoning were both approved.*

OZ-3-07: Harkey Property subdivision located at the northwest corner of Rice Mine Road Northeast and Old Colony Road, proposed for BN (Neighborhood Commercial District). (Council District 3)

*This is the new McDonalds near the Publix shopping center. They want a 45' pole sign which is inconsistent with the area besides which there are no sight obstructions out there that would prevent people from seeing a smaller sign. It was also pointed out that the McDonald's corporation has monument signs that they use in other cities with appropriate sign regulations. The commission discussed imposing a limitation on the size of the sign which McDonalds may erect as a condition of their zoning. The owner of the property and another woman whose identity I did not catch said that the reason they need a 45' tall sign is that McDonalds is an impulse industry and seeing the sign makes people want to eat there. She argued that it is a SAFETY ISSUE!!!!!! She said that with a small sign people won't have much advance warning of the urge to eat and they will be slamming on brakes to turn into McD's whereas if they have a tall sign visible from everywhere they will be able to plan their driving pattern and braking enough in advance to ensure the safety of everyone.*

*Commissioner Warren said that this is located at an intersection and it's not likely people will be flying by. The woman said something about people not being able to see if from beyond the intersection. He replied that this is a residential area, not an interstate. He added that he lives out there and he already knows where all the restaurants are and Commissioner Reynolds agreed, saying that you don't drive to that part of town unless you live there.*

*Bob Monfore addressed the Commission stating that he is part of the development group behind this. He gave them a drawing of the two lots in question and said that the McD's is not on the corner - it's 250' to the north. He said that his attitude on agreeing to conditions and restrictions over and above the city ordinance is that he is against it. He said they will live with the sign ordinance, whatever it is, but that landscaping and so forth should be handled in the permitting stage, not the zoning stage. He continued that he thinks this is illegal, wrong, coercion and not in the province of this commission.*

*Approved with the sign condition. Vince Dooley voted against approval.*

OZ-4-07: Property located on the east side of Hargrove Road East opposite Heatherwood

Gardens subdivision (Barrett's Trace Planned Unit Development), proposed for R-1 (Residence District). (Council District 6)

*Approved with little-to-no discussion.*

OZ-5-07: Property located southwest of U.S. Highway 82 East in Section 7, Township 22 South, Range 9 West (Proposed Sheridan Summit PUD), proposed for R-1 (Residence District). (Council District 7) (Companion Case AN-2007-16)

*This is a sizeable development out US Highway 82 going toward Montgomery. It is past the Coca-Cola plant on the south side of the highway. They are seeking annexation so they can get access to city water and sewer. The map showed that they are only contiguous to the city via a razor-thin line of property that runs along a railroad track that they must have bought for the express purpose of becoming contiguous to the city. Commissioner Warren asked where the children there will go to school. There was no more discussion on this case however.*

*Approved - both the annexation and the original zoning.*

OZ-6-07: Property located between House Bend Road and Lake Tuscaloosa in Sections 11 and 12, Township 20 South, Range 10 West (Proposed Legacy Point condominiums) proposed for R-4 (Moderate Density Residence District). (Council District 3) (Companion Cases AN-2007-13 and S-54-07)

*This property is immediately west of Pine Valley Retirement Home. Members of the Planning Department ("Staff") recommend an original zoning of R4 and mentioned that similar property further east (the Dunn Nursery property that was before this commission a few months ago) has been annexed with the same conditions. Bill Snowden and someone else said that the landscaping at this project is already done and it is very nice. They recommended some restrictions on the zoning of this property not because of the current project, but to protect the surrounding property in the future if the use changes.*

*Approved.*

OZ-7-07: Property located on the north side of Rice Valley Road in the SW 3 of the SE 3 of Section 2, Township 21 South, Range 10 West. (Proposed Belle Chase subdivision), proposed for R-4 (Moderate Density Residence District). (Council District 3) (Companion Case AN-2007-17)

*Staff member Harold Skelton said this is simply a case where the property owners want their children to be able to go to city schools.*

*Approved.*

OZ-8-07: Lot No. 4 Shoreline subdivision located along Lake Tuscaloosa, proposed for R-1 (Residence District). (Council District 3) (Companion Case AN-2007-12)

*Approved. (They were going so fast I didn't hear any details on this. I don't think any were discussed.)*

OZ-9-07: Property located at the Southeast corner of U.S. Highway No. 11 North and Industrial Drive. (Proposed Mayers Subdivision) proposed for BH (Highway-Related Commercial Districts). (Council District 5) (Companion Case AN-2007-14 and S-57-07)

### PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT SUBDIVISION PLATS

P-6-07: CHERRYSTONE, REVISED MASTER PLAN & PRELIMINARY PLAT, consisting of 95 lots located south of Lincoln Park, Lincoln Park Manor, and Hollywood Park subdivisions and west of The Glen subdivision. This revision will increase the number of previously approved lots from 91 to 95. (Council District 2)

*This is a subdivision in West End consisting of 91 lots. They are here tonight to add four lots bringing the total to 95. Two of the additional 4 lots are going into areas that were originally designated as open space. This subdivision is 5 years old and staff says that no homeowners association has been established, but they wonder if it is legal to now plat new residential lots on the open space considering that some people have already bought their lots with the promise of open space in the subdivision.*

*The engineer representing the developers which are Billy Boyd, Builders Group and S. Luther Pate, explained why they are building on the open space. He said that they originally thought the "open space" was not buildable land because of the type of soil. Since then they have done more research and found more suitable soil further down. They excavated the bad ground and replaced it with acceptable material.*

*Commissioner Reynolds asked how many lots have been sold and the answer was "virtually all of them." Reynolds asked, "didn't they buy their lots based on the platted open space?" There was discussion of whether all the people who already bought lots should agree in writing to essentially relinquish the open space originally platted in their subdivision.*

*One of the developers, Brock Corder with Builders Group, then came to the podium and explained that there is a Home Owners Association but that it has not been turned over to the actual homeowners yet. The developer is still controlling it. As such, he argued, the Home Owners Association has the authority to relinquish the open space lots and that he would write a letter for the Home Owners Association to himself as the developer stating such if that was required. He sweetened the pot by promising that if the Commission approves the four additional lots, they will take the remaining open space and construct a gazebo thus making the space useable. Commissioner Warren asked for clarification of whether the open space as originally platted was just that - unimproved open space?*

Answer: yes.

*City Attorney Jimbo Woodson asked whether the owners have consented to this in writing. Corder said no, but restated that he believes it is in the Homeowners Association's power to do this.*

*Robert Reynolds pointed out the flaw in the pot sweetening deal offered: the homeowners themselves could already build a gazebo on the subdivision's open space.*

*Corder replied, "yeah, but they probably won't."*

*Councilman/Commissioner Bobby Howard asked the attorney about the legal issue. Jimbo Woodson said that he is troubled by the fact that the subdivision was approved with open space and people bought lots with that in the plat and now they are taking it away.*

*Commissioner Rumsey asked wasn't it the case that if the Homeowners Association wanted to raise money for some improvements in the subdivision that they could sell off the open space? There was no answer to this, but the point is well taken. Commissioner/Councilman Howard said that he appreciated the developers going into an area of town that no one has wanted to go into before.*

*The engineer then explained that the subdivision has been developed in two phases. The first phase of the development did not have any open space platted so none of the people who bought houses in the first phase could have done so based on the presence of open space. Commissioner Warren pointed out however that the people who bought the lots immediately adjacent to the proposed new lots did so with the expectation that they wouldn't have houses next to them. The situation with reliance of the other property owners only applies to the second phase of the project and apparently no one has actually closed on any of those properties yet.*

*At this point, City Planner Bill Snowden made the very correct observation that if those people had a problem with this they should be here at the hearing. The room was standing room only, but no one was present from that subdivision. Furthermore, every property owner in that subdivision was sent a letter informing them of this petition.*

*Approved.*

**P-7-07: JAMESTOWN VILLAS, consisting of 91 lots located at the east end of 6th Street East in the Northeast Quarter of Section 21, Township 21 South, Range 9 West. This is east of Crescent Ridge Road East. (Proposed annexation and Council District 5)**

*This has been before this Commission for the last several months. You will recall that this development is located off of Crescent Ridge Road and it is just out of the city limits. The Commission has been torn about it because the roadways leading into the subject property are very narrow and thinly paved and they go through purely residential areas that are*

*clearly going to be adversely effected, but by the same token, whether or not the Commission approves this project, the property is going to be developed and the Commissioners feel that it will be better if they approve something they can somewhat control rather than letting it go to something they have no control over.*

*They are here tonight to admit that the neighbors and Staff were correct last month; there is no right of way for the second entrance they planned out of this development. They have now designed a different entrance that goes along another small residential street (Vassie Drive?) out to Crescent Ridge Road. The engineer explained that they didn't pursue this access before because it crosses a perennial stream they were trying to avoid. Two commissioners looking at the layout said they should move the pumping station.*

*Again, a great number of the people present in the Council Chambers were from this neighborhood and were there to protest this development. They talked again about how poor the roads were and how the County had declined their requests for help. These folks feel really helpless and they are.*

*This case is a prime example of why planning authority is needed in the County, but there is apparently no political will to enact this. I can't tell you how many times I have seen folks from just outside the city limits, but within the City's planning jurisdiction come in and ask for intervention. Most people don't understand that the City's authority is very limited within that buffer area outside the city limits. They think that they don't want zoning, but when the property next door to them is being turned into a dense multi-family development they suddenly see the appeal of it, but by that time it's too late. Our leaders are failing us by not pushing the legislation we need to get a County-wide planning authority.*

*Approved.*

**P-8-05(1): LAUREL WOOD GARDENS, (REVISED), (FORMERLY SOUTHERN OAKS),** consisting of 140 lots located north of Crabtree Road in Section 10, Township 22 South, Range 10 West. This proposed revision will change the style of buildings and minimum setbacks. (Out of City)

*This PUD has previously been approved by this Commission, but the developer has decided to change the basic design of the buildings so they will have detached garages and this requires a reduction of the front yard from 20' to 15' and a reduction of the back setbacks to 0' in some cases.*

*Bill Lunceford is the developer. He said he saw this design somewhere out of town and the change is to help avoid the "rubberstamp garden home" which, he said he is getting tired of. It gives more space between the home and the garage. The houses will be between 1,500 and 1,800 sf. There is a walking trail all the way around the development. The utilities are underground. The developer agreed to provide landscaping between the PUD and the adjacent ministorage facility which he also owns. They are also planning to put some piers out into the pond on the property.*

Approved.

### PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLATS

S-48-07: RESURVEY OF LOTS 18, 21, & 22 JERUSALEM HEIGHTS, consisting of one (1) lot located at the northeast corner of 12th Avenue East and 59th Street East. (Out of City)

*Approved as part of the Consent Agenda. No discussion was held.*

~~S-49-07: RESURVEY OF PART OF LOTS 227 AND 230 OF THE CITY OF TUSCALOOSA PLAT OF McCALLA=S STREET CENTER SURVEY OF 1891, consisting of two (2) lots located on the south side of 6th Street, between 30th and 31st Avenues. (Council District 4)-(CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER MEETING)~~

S-50-07: THE CHIMES CONDOMINIUMS, consisting of two levels of parking beneath four levels of living area containing a total of 49 units located along the west side of Hackberry Lane and the north side of 11th Street. (Council District 4)

*This is where Gertrudes Florist used to be. This is here for a subdivision/conversion from apartments into condominiums. I didn't really understand what the process was that made these apartments to begin with because when it was presented in March it was definitely presented as condos.<sup>1</sup> It appears that the "subdivision" at that time was actually the erasing of several lots lines to create one parcel of property. This subdivision is to separate each of the individual condo units so they can have separate ownership.*

Approved.

S-51-07: A RESURVEY OF LOTS 17 AND 18, BLOCK "A" MOTON COURT NO. 1,

---

<sup>1</sup> Notes on this item from March 2007: S-23-07: THE CHIMES, consisting of one (1) lot located between 6th Avenue and Hackberry Lane and on the north side of 11th Street. (Council District 4)

This rezoning and subdivision were considered together. The petitioner plans to clear everything off of the block across Hackberry from the Aquatic Center and the football practice field where Gertrude's Flowers is located and build 51 condominium units. The whole block is to be redeveloped; all existing buildings will be removed. The rest of the block is already zoned "correctly." RMF-2U allows apartments in the University area such that the density is the same as in the rest of the city, but the building height is restricted to 60'.

Gilbert Sentell speaks for the project. He said the complex is planned to be 6 stories with the first two being parking and the other four being residential. It will have a flat roof. They plan to have it open by fall 2008. The owner, Kenny Short, of Clanton was also present. Commissioner Aaron Christian asked him what the asking prices were going to be for the units. Short told him that the 2,600 sf penthouse was going to go for \$900,000 and the one-bedroom units would go for \$350,000. (I guess Tennessee will buy the penthouse so they can watch the football team practice. This brings a whole new level to Game Day Condominiums!)

APPROVED

consisting of one (1) lot located on the north side of 19th Street, between Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and Foster=s Ferry Road. (Council District 1)

*Approved as part of the Consent Agenda. No discussion was held.*

S-52-07: RESURVEY OF LOT 4 MONTICELLO ESTATES NO. 1, consisting of two (2) lots located at the intersection of U.S. Highway 82 and Jefferson Drive in the Northeast Quarter (NE 3) of Section 21, Township 22 South, Range 9 West. (Out of City)

*This was a hot item. The room was full of people from this neighborhood and there were attorneys present to represent the petitioner and to represent the neighborhood. There was extreme hostility in the audience among the neighbors toward the petitioner, whose name must be Cooper because they kept referring to Cooper Properties.*

*Here again, this is in the County. There is no zoning, so there is nothing other than subdivision covenants preventing people from having inconsistent uses of their property. Apparently the petitioner owns several lots in a certain section of this subdivision. He has cleared the lots of all trees and has been doing quite a bit of excavation work that has adversely impacted one person in particular, who has filed a lawsuit over the situation. It seems that the erosion he has caused by his tree removal and excavation has really damaged her house and possibly made it or parts of it unstable and has washed away so much of her property that it is going to cost something like \$75,000 to repair.*

*The petition is to subdivide one of the petitioner's lots ostensibly so that he can build a shop building on it. This is weird though because there is nothing in a subdivision that makes that permissible. He could build the shop building on his property without subdividing the lot (although it might be in violation of the covenants). So no one really knows why he wants to subdivide the lots, but a reasonable assumption would be so that he could sell the lots separately.*

*The commission voted AGAINST the subdivision based explicitly on the grounds that it will be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the community.*

S-53-07: HARBOR RIDGE AT NORTHRIVER PHASE TWO B SECTION TWO, consisting of 7 lots located along the north side of Harbor Ridge Way and west of New Watermelon Road. (Council District 3)

*This was here about 1 ½ years ago, but the development wasn't started in time and they lost their approval. Westervelt is asking for the same approval they had before.*

*Approved.*

S-54-07: LEGACY POINT CONDOMINIUMS, consisting of 55 detached condominium units along with open-air pavilions, outdoor fireplace patios, a community pool, boat storage facility, and other amenities to be located between House Bend Road and Lake Tuscaloosa

in Sections 11 and 12, Township 20 South, Range 10 West. (Proposed annexation and Council District 3) (Companion Cases An-2007-13 and OZ-6-07)

*This is a "relatively unique" 55-acre, community maintained, multi-family type development up on the lake. It is far from the nearest sewer line so it will have its own on-site sewage treatment facility. Most of the time spend on this petition was spent discussing the sewage facility. The director of the Tuscaloosa Water system, Maurice Sledge, spoke in favor of the on-site facility. Joe Robinson, City Engineer, wants the management company to negotiate a perpetual bond in favor of the City of Tuscaloosa in case the system fails and the City is called upon to remediate.*

*Approved. Rumsey recused himself.*

S-55-07 FIRE STATION #1 RELOCATION SITE, consisting of one (1) lot located at the southeast corner of 15th Street and Greensboro Avenue. (Council District 1)

*Approved as part of the Consent Agenda. No discussion was held.*

S-56-07: RESURVEY OF LOT 5 PEACH GROVE, consisting of two (2) lots located west of Hargrove Road East and northwest of Woodland Forest Elementary School within the existing Peach Grove subdivision. (Council District 6)

*Approved as part of the Consent Agenda. No discussion was held.*

S-57-07: MAYERS SUBDIVISION, consisting of two (2) lots located at the southeast corner of U.S. Highway No. 11 North and Industrial Drive. (Proposed annexation and Council District 5) (Companion Cases AN-2007-14 and OZ-9-07)

*Approved as part of the Consent Agenda. No discussion was held.*

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE

The Planning Commission considered amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Amend ARTICLE IX. OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING by adding a new Section 24-125, Parking in Front Yards Prohibited.

*As presented now this is the same as the draft a few months ago except that it only applies to certain parts of town. It applies only to R1, R2, R3 and R4 in Greater Alberta, Forest Lake and the University Area because these areas have adopted specific plans that state that parking in front yards has a detrimental effect on their community. Commissioner/Councilman Howard pointed out that West Tuscaloosa has a unique situation because some neighborhoods simply couldn't comply (due to their lack of space) and therefore they have opted to not have the ordinance apply to them.*

*Much of the discussion was the same as was heard last time this was on the agenda. The only new argument **against** the ordinance was from Jeb Green who argued parking in yards must be allowed as a safety issue. He said that students park in their grass because it is too dangerous for them to walk to their front doors from the street or driveway.*

*Commissioner Rumsey made an impassioned plea. He said we all want Tuscaloosa to look better, but he thinks it's inherently unfair to apply the ordinance to part of the city and not other parts. He argued it will make it more dangerous because of having more cars in the streets. He wants to be able to opt his properties out of the ordinance like West End has opted out, but he is not being given that option. He suggests forming a committee to reach a solution that is not bigger government. He thinks people: landlords, stakeholders and government can come up with solutions. He is not for cars in yards. He will serve on the committee. If the committee cannot reach a conclusion then he will throw his hands up and vote for the ordinance.*

*Commissioner Reynolds disagrees with Rumsey. He lives in a historic district. He says that absentee landlords could care less whether their tenants are parking in the yards. Some landlords, including those in the room, are very responsible and prohibit parking in the yard. He says that recourse to the Zoning Board of Adjustments is available for those who cannot comply.*

*Commissioner Christian asked the city attorney if it is legal for the City to pass an ordinance to apply to parts of town and not others. I didn't get his response written down, but in the past it has been pointed out that we already have that situation with the Historic Districts.*

*Commissioner Rumsey said that health, safety and welfare wasn't identified as a problem with yard parking.*

*Commissioner Dooley asked if the rest of the commission is concerned with health, safety and welfare city wide and he asked if financial inability to comply with the ordinance is a consideration at ZBA.*

*City attorney Jimbo Woodson said that not being able to afford it is not a hardship that ZBA can consider. They are limited to things like the terrain or layout of the property that is peculiar to the land itself.*

*Commissioner/Councilman Howard recused himself because he represents a constituency that is excluded from the ordinance and it wouldn't be right for him to then vote on the issue for other areas. He did say that he sympathizes with the people who are trying to get rid of yard parking because "we don't like it either."*

*Commissioner Christian said that the University of Alabama's parking policy is pushing cars off campus and making this a harder call.*

*Commissioner Reynolds disagreed referring to the ample parking in lots and parking decks.*

*Commissioner Warren asked if people who currently park in their yards would be grandfathered in?*

*Jimbo Woodson said that only paved parking areas would be grandfathered in.*

*Commissioner Warren said that he is for the ordinance, but he is afraid of those places where people cannot comply and that the only grounds for an exception for them are topographical.*

*Commissioner Rumsey moved that they continue this amendment for 60 days and form a committee of up to 12 people to review it in the meantime.*

*That motion was approved with all voting in the affirmative except Commissioner/Councilman Howard who abstained.*

<p><b>Note:</b> The first meeting of the committee will be on September 5<sup>th</sup>. The people on the committee to date are various members of the City's Planning and Legal Departments, George Harris (Forest Lake Neighborhood Association), Lee Garrison, Steve Rumsey, Brock Corder (The Builders Group), Brian Hurd and Jon Anderson (East Tuscaloosa Neighborhood Association).</p>
--

- Amend ARTICLE III. RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS, Section 24-144, Parking or Storage of Major Recreational Equipment.

*This simply adds to the existing ordinance regulating the storage of RVs, etc. It adds to the items regulated: construction equipment, utility trailers, other types of trailers, buggies, wagons, tractors and street sweepers.*

*Approved.*

- Amend ARTICLE VIII GENERAL REGULATIONS, by adding a new Section 24-115, Temporary Parking of Recreational Vehicles.

*This ordinance is specifically to accommodate RVs on game day.*

*Approved.*

- ARTICLE X. SIGNS, CANOPIES, AWNINGS, MARQUEES, Section 24-131 Through Section 24-140, To Be Amended In Its Entirety.

*It was somewhere around 11:00 p.m. when this agenda item was reached. The crowd had thinned considerably, but there were still a number of people present about half of which were business/industry people opposed to the ordinance and the rest of which were individuals and neighborhood representatives who support the ordinance.*

*Commissioner Reynolds, who was running tonight's hearing in Gary Phillips' absence, said that since this was such an important ordinance with so many people interested in it and also due to the length of the agenda and the late hour at which this item was reached, the P&Z Commission is going to hear comments on the proposed ordinance tonight and reconvene at 4:00 p.m. on September 17<sup>th</sup> to finish hearing comment and to actually vote on the ordinance. That day they are also scheduled to take up the proposed new Riverfront Zone ordinance in addition to all their regular business, so September promises to be another marathon session.*

*First John McConnell, city planner, made an extensive presentation with slide illustrations and photographs explaining why the City was proposing a new sign ordinance and how that ordinance would work. (Download the proposed ordinance: <http://www.tuscaloosa.com/DocumentView.asp?DID=751>)*

*The first person from the audience to address the ordinance was Sonny Richardson of the Tuscaloosa Home Builders Association. He addressed specific items in the proposed ordinance quickly and I couldn't catch all of them. One of his complaints was that real estate agents would be hampered in their efforts because the new ordinance would only allow a for sale sign on the actual property being sold. After he spoke an attorney representing the Lamar Sign company spoke against the ordinance.*

*A representative of the newly-formed North Tuscaloosa Neighborhood Alliance rose to speak in favor of the sign ordinance. He was interrupted by Commissioner Rumsey who asked him to state exactly who it was that he represented. The citizen said he represented the North Tuscaloosa Neighborhood Alliance. Commissioner Rumsey asked if that included the Lauderhill subdivision. The answer was yes. Rumsey persisted, asking whether the citizen was saying that he represented Jim Flemming, the CEO of the Bank of Tuscaloosa, and whether he was really going to tell Jim Flemming that he couldn't have a sign as large as his current sign. The citizen replied that Jim Flemming doesn't live in Lauderhill anymore, to which Rumsey answered that he knew that. His point seemed to be: the folks who own the businesses with the signs live in the neighborhoods north of the River so how can NTNA legitimately oppose the sign ordinance? Wow!*

*Stay tuned, to be continued at 4:00 on September 17th.*