

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE OXFORD PLANNING & ZONING BOARD

The Oxford City Planning and Zoning Board met in a regular meeting at the Oxford Public Works Building
Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 5:30 pm

Members Present:

- Mayor Alton Craft
- Bill Newman, Chairman
- Lance Turner, Vice Chairman
- Charlotte Hubbard, Council Member
- Hunter Cain
- Jimmy Sparks

Members Absent

- Melissa Craven
- Jane Cunningham
- Clyde Huckleba

Visitors: See sign in sheet, Ben Watson, Todd Davis, Pat Kirk, Landon Embry, Stan Bush, Jonathan Roberts with the Oxford Fire Department, Deputy Chief Daniel Phipps with the Oxford Police Department, Kristi Durham with the Oxford Building Department

1. Noting that a quorum was present, the meeting was called to order by Chairman, Bill Newman. Following a review of the minutes of the regular meeting of, 2026. Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to approve the minutes. Jimmy Sparks seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas: 6; Nays: 0; Abstained 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
2. Public Hearing –Todd Davis requesting a preliminary plat approval for a subdivision off Alabama Highway 21. Ben Watson with Live Oak Engineering stated this is the property we were here three months ago getting rezoned. Last week, Rusty Gann, City Engineer and the Alabama Department of Transportation(ALDOT) had a conversation about getting a connection to Alabama Highway 21. Ultimately, this is a decision for the Alexander City office but the local office is in favor of an entrance of Alabama Highway 21. The plat at this stage does not show the entrance off Alabama Highway 21. The cul-de-sac to right on the plat will be the one that will change with a right in, right out onto Alabama Highway 21. There will not be a median cut. We all want the connection but we have to get ALDOT to bless it. Mayor Craft asked which cul-de-sac. Mr. Newman stated the one furthest to the south. Mr. Watson stated we do not own the 1.5 acres that is the gap on the plat. That gap lines up with the median cut. Mr. Newman asked how many total lots. Mr. Watson stated 36 lots. Mr. Newman stated I spoke with Mr. Gann today and he said he thought ALDOT would approve that for the southern most part of the property. Mrs. Hubbard asked is this going to be an expense to you. Mr. Watson stated really it should be a net zero. It is not an expense issue but an ALDOT Access Management Plan. Mr. Newman stated I think we are going to need that on the southern most entrance to help with Reaves Drive traffic. Mr. Watson stated it is our intent to do it as long as we get the approval from ALDOT. We are arguing for it just like Mr. Gann is arguing for the city. We are at the mercy of ALDOT since it is their connection. Locally they have said they will fight for us. Mrs. Hubbard asked about the cost of making this change. Mr. Watson stated it may be a \$10,000.00 cost. It is not free but at the most that is what it would cost and this is not a cost issue for us. Jimmy Sparks asked if they do get the approval will there be a merge lane onto Alabama Highway 21. Mr. Watson stated in terms of a subdivision this is a low traffic area and deceleration lanes are generally a quarter of a mile long. Mr. Newman stated the right turn in would have some of a lane, right. Mr. Watson stated yes about 75 feet. After discussion, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to approve the preliminary plat with the condition that access is granted for an entrance onto Alabama Highway 21 from ALDOT. Mayor Craft seconded the motion. Upon vote

on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.

3. Public Hearing –Pat Kirk requesting a site plan approval for an expansion at Kobay at 5470 McIntosh Road. Pat Kirk stated this is Patrick McCray, Plant Manager at Kobay and Cal Munroe, Architect for the project. This will be a 54,000 square foot addition to the Kobay plant. Mr. Newman stated this will come 270 feet from the back and this will be 25 jobs. Jimme Sparks stated I know when Associated Metal Cast came about their building, there was an issue with the water. Is that something that is needed with this addition. Cal Munroe stated they had to put in a fire pump and luckily this building is at the front of the property. After discussion, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to approve. Mayor Craft seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
4. Public Hearing – Landon and Kennedy Embry requesting to zone their property Residential (R-1) at 2414 Gunnells Lane. Landon Embry stated they are interested in being in the school system. Kristi Durham, Oxford Building Department stated the property has already been annexed by the City Council and just needs to be zoned. After discussion, Lance Turner made a motion to recommend to the Council to zone the property to R-1. Charlotte Hubbard seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
5. Public Hearing – PAC Enterprises/Stan Bush requesting to change an existing billboard from static to digital at 1814 US Highway 78 East. Stan Bush stated there is a structure there now that has static on both sides. Now, we have the ground lease and are wanting to put up digital. After discussion, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to approve. Hunter Cain seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
6. Public Hearing – PAC Enterprises/Stan Bush requesting to remove existing digital board and install a billboard on the property at 2111 US Highway 78 East. Stan Bush stated this one is a 7 foot by 14 foot on the front of TV24. Mrs. Hubbard stated this is on the structure. Mr. Bush stated yes. What our ask is, was approved at one point by ALDOT, we want to move the structure onto a standard billboard post, double sided digital to get it off the front of the building. We have had several new tenants and will probably end up splitting that unit. We would like to have a space there for a sign. We want to go behind, same billboard structure. Ms. Durham stated this does not meet the requirements of the ordinance. There is one less than 2,000 foot radius from this location. Mr. Bush stated the way I am looking at it is that we already have it there now. It would be a modification or moving it. Mr. Sparks stated you are wanting to remove it off the front of the building. Mr. Bush stated yes and move it behind. It would be on our property. Ms. Durham stated when I measured it this afternoon, from the current billboard to the back of the building was about 600 feet. It does state in the ordinance that off-premise signs may only be permitted in ASC (Area Shopping Center), GB (General Business), M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and M-2 General Manufacturing). Most everything is zoned Central Business District (CBD). If it was existing it would be fine like the other one. This one is not. Ms. Hubbard stated you need to go to the Board of Adjustments. Ms. Durham stated it specifically states in the ordinance that all billboards come to the Planning Board. Mr. Newman stated which way will it face. Mr. Bush stated you will be able to see it from the overpass. Lance Turner asked if it will be the same size. Mr. Bush stated no it will not. Mr. Sparks asked Ms. Durham when you measured from the existing billboard to this one it was 500 feet. Ms. Durham stated when I measured from the existing billboard to the back of the building it was over 500 feet but maybe closer to 600 feet. Mr. Turner stated I thought it was a circumference. Ms. Durham stated it is. It is a 2,000 foot radius. Just to remind you, we had someone several years ago who wanted to put one on the parkway and they were denied because they didn't meet the ordinance. Mrs. Hubbard stated I like the idea of getting it off the building. Mr. Bush stated we could put it on a monument sign out front. Mr. Turner asked if it is in working order now. Mr. Bush stated no that is the reason we are asking for this. It needs to be replaced so we decided to see what our options are before we replace it. We are in talks with someone to replace it. Mrs. Hubbard asked if you did a monument sign where would it be. Mr. Bush stated if we did a monument sign it would be where you turn into the parking lot, it would be right there. Mr. Turner asked if it would replace the current sign. Mr. Bush stated we don't have any signs advertising the stores. Mr. Turner stated so all you have is what is on the building. Mr.

Bush stated yes. Mr. Newman stated our problem is we did deny one. Mr. Newman stated we want to work with you.

7. Public Hearing – Amending Article 4, Residential Uses Section 4.06 Garden Homes 1. D, Section 4.07 Townhouse District 1. D and J, and Table 4-2 Area and Dimensional Regulations, Residential Districts. Mr. Newman stated you should have a current and a proposed change page. Article 4, Section 4.06 Garden Homes item 1. D states forward of the front building line, driveways may not be wider than 12 ft. The proposed change is forward of the front building line, driveways may not be wider than 20 ft. Article 4, Section 4.07 Townhouse District item 1 D states Townhouse buildings may contain no less than three and no more than 12 attached dwelling units. A minimum spacing of 40 ft must be provided between the front façade of a townhouse building and any other building façade, or between the rear facades of opposing townhouse buildings. The proposed change is 50 feet instead of 40 feet. Mrs. Hubbard stated we have discussed this. Mr. Newman stated last year. Ms. Durham stated I was out and Chris Callahan, Building Department came and presented this to you. Everything you have is what was presented last year. This is changing some of the setback requirements and parking requirements to make it where they have to have more space for parking. This will make them have to move the houses back further but lessen the setbacks on the rear. This is also something we came across looking at the townhomes and garden homes. There are things we didn't know were in here until we started looking at it. We believe it will help with the parking situation. Chris Callahan stated we currently have people parking in driveways in newer subdivisions whose vehicles are sticking out in the road today. What we are hoping is by taking 5 feet and setting them back a little bit, taking some off the backyard, same size lot, different placement. At the time we were looking at about a \$2,000.00 difference in concrete versus making someone re-draw plat. Trying not to have another Light Lane where you can't get a school bus or an ambulance down through there but try to keep the same size lot lines. Mrs. Hubbard stated we talked about this when we spoke with Mr. Watson. He is grandfathered in. Mr. Newman asked if everyone was clear on what the changes were. Mrs. Hubbard stated making the front setbacks for all residential zones the same, I like that. Mr. Callahan stated it makes it easier on me being the one looking at them. Mr. Gann was instrumental in making it from the right-of-way. After discussion, Mayor Craft made a motion to recommend to the Council. Charlotte Hubbard seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
8. Public Hearing – Amending Article 6, Section 6.03 Planned Development District, Table 6-3 PD Development Standards. Mr. Newman stated again you have a current page and a proposed changes page. Ms. Durham stated there is no minimum lot width in Planned Development and in summer of 2024 when first met with Joey Callahan about the subdivision in Eastaboga, he came to us wanting 40 foot wide lots. There is no minimum in Planned Development 1 (PD-1). PD-1 is the only one that is truly single family dwellings. We are wanting to implement a minimum lot width in PD-1 to curb such small lots. The other changes are similar to what we are wanting to do in the residential zoning with the setbacks as well as changing the width of the driveway. Mr. Newman stated that if my math is correct and you have a 40 foot lot with a 20 foot wide driveway that is half the lot. A minimum of 60 foot wide makes sense. Mr. Callahan stated the one place in the city that we have 40-foot-wide lots is Park Place. Mr. Newman stated so we are going from 40 to 60. Ms. Durham stated no we didn't have a minimum in PD-1. After discussion, Mayor Craft made a motion to recommend to the Council. Hunter Cain seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.
9. Public Hearing – Amending Article 8 Parking, Table 8-1 Residential Uses, Multifamily Developments and Single-Family Dwellings, Section 8.02 Required Off-street Parking Spaces Parking Restrictions c. Mr. Newman stated Article 8, Section 8.02 item 3 C states any commercially zoned property wishing to have a gravel parking lot must meet city standards and be approved by the city engineer. Ms. Durham stated this was due to when Ryan Varnum came about the building he is wanting to put up and was asked about the parking lot. He stated he wanted a gravel parking lot. We need to make sure that whatever is put there can hold a fire truck. Not knowing how the soil is under the gravel is what brought this to our attention. You also have a chart to making changes to some of the parking requirements for multi-family and single family dwellings. Mr. Turner asked is there anything there but gravel. Ms. Durham stated no, you all ended up tabling that request and it hasn't come back to the board yet. Mr. Callahan stated I think the worry is that the tanker trucks are really heavy and

without any way of having a certain base coat or knowledge, we could get into a pickle. Especially knowing how much we have to spend on a truck. Mr. Sparks asked is this just for residential. Mr. Callahan stated no. Ms. Durham stated this is just for commercial but the chart is for residential. Mrs. Hubbard stated this makes sense to match the parking to the bedrooms. Mr. Callahan stated it doesn't seem too important until you get two teenagers living in that house. Unfortunately, if you ride around and look most of us no longer use our garages to park our cars in. After discussion, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to recommend to the Council. Mayor Craft seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.

10. Public Hearing – Amending Article 3, Section 3.10 Accessory Structures (7). Mr. Newman stated the proposed change is for uses involving a principal structure, no accessory structure may be established on a property unless such principal structure has been constructed or is being constructed under a valid permit. For uses of land that do not involve or require a principal structure, such use of land must be lawfully established prior to the construction, installation, or placement of any accessory structures. What happens a lot of the times is someone has a piece of property or lot and want to build a detached garage with an apartment, a barndominium, a storage building before they build their house. That has become an issue. Mrs. Hubbard stated she received a call about this a week ago. Ms. Durham stated we have worked for the last two years under the assumption based on the definition of an accessory structure, any detached minor building consisting of masonry or frame walls and roof, one or two stories in height necessary as an adjunct to the use or occupancy of a principal or main structure. We have worked off the assumption based on the definition that you can't have an accessory structure without a principal structure. Mrs. Hubbard stated because it is an accessory to something else. Ms. Durham stated I spoke with Jason Fondren with KPS Group, who the board worked with on this ordinance, he said there was definitely nothing in the ordinance that states you have to have the principal structure before the accessory structure. So he gave me this wording to make that change. After discussion, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to recommend to the Council. Jimmy Sparks seconded the motion. Upon vote on the motion, the following votes were recorded: Yeas 6; Nays: 0; Abstained: 0. Chairman, Bill Newman announced the motion passed.

Mr. Newman called for any old business.

There being no further business, Charlotte Hubbard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Lance Turner seconded the motion.

Respectfully,

Kristi Durham, Secretary