

**SPECIAL CALLED MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF HOMEWOOD, ALABAMA**

August 29, 2016

The City Council of the City of Homewood, Alabama convened in Special Session on Monday, August 29, 2016 at City Hall at 6:00 p.m. The invocation was given by Brian Powell of the Homewood Fire Department, after which the pledge of allegiance was led by Boy Scout Troop 95/Shades Valley Lutheran Church.

The meeting was called to order by Council President Bruce Limbaugh.

Upon Roll Call, the following were present: Michael Hallman, Britt Thames, Fred Hawkins, Vance Moody, Patrick McClusky, Walter Jones, Barry Smith, Alex Wyatt, Rich Laws, Peter Wright and Bruce Limbaugh. Also present were: Mike Kendrick, City Attorney; and Melody Salter, City Clerk.

At this time, Mrs. Smith moved to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council of August 8, 2016 and approve them as distributed. Mr. Laws seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any recommendations or appointments to be made regarding board vacancies.

Mr. Moody moved to appoint Mr. Christopher Bailey to the Ward 2 Park Board position. Mr. Hawkins seconded the motion

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Wright stated that the Ward 5 BZA position was closed and interviews needed to be scheduled.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any further recommendations or appointments to be made regarding board vacancies. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Limbaugh amended the published Council Agenda to move the following item from the Committee Referral Agenda to the Other New Business Agenda: Item No. 24.08.16 – Request for consideration of Petition of Annexation for the property located at 1628 Dobbs Lane (Legal Description: Lot 1 Resurvey of Lakewood Hills, Lots 87-91, as recorded in Map Book 226, Page 54 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama) – Cara and Andrew Grooms/City Clerk – Planning and Development Committee.

Mr. Limbaugh further amended the published Council Agenda to modify the following item in the Committee Referral Agenda to read: Item No. 33.08.16 – Request for consideration of street lights on Dixon Avenue – Public Safety Committee.

Mr. Limbaugh further amended the published Council Agenda to add the following item to the Committee Referral Agenda: Item No. 42.08.16 – Request for consideration for making part of an alleyway, between Woodland and Broadway, pedestrian only – Katie McKibbon/Patrick McClusky – Public Safety Committee.

Mr. Limbaugh further amended the published Council Agenda to add the following item to the Other New Business Agenda: Item No. 41.08.16 – Request for consideration to repeal Resolution No. 15-123 (A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to designate J.H. Berry Risk Services to be the exclusive broker of record for the City of Homewood) – City Attorney/Mayor McBrayer.

Mr. Moody moved to approve the Council Agenda as amended. Mr. McClusky seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Hawkins left the Council Chambers at 6:05 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

04.08.16 Request for consideration for paint striping on Valley Avenue – **Michael Hallman/Randy Hambley/Traffic Maintenance Division/Police Department**

Action Taken: The Public Safety Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend dropping this Item. The motion was made by Mr. Laws and seconded by Mr. Hawkins. The Finance Committee met and voted 4-0 to recommend dropping this Item. The motion was made by Mrs. Smith and seconded by Mr. Wright.

20.08.16 Request for consideration to address parking concerns on Shades Road – **Walter Jones/Teresa Cole**

Action Taken: The Public Safety Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend dropping this item. The motion was made by Mr. Thames and seconded by Mr. Hawkins.

15.05.16 Request for consideration to construct barriers on east and west sides of interstate I-65 in Homewood City Limit due to safety concerns – **Walter Jones (Carried over 08/8/16)**

Action Taken: The Finance Committee met and voted 4-0 to drop this Item. The motion was made by Mr. Wright and seconded by Mr. Thames.

Mr. McClusky moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Mr. Wyatt seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

OLD BUSINESS

The first item on the Agenda under Old Business, was Item No. 34.07.16 – Request for consideration to authorize the Mayor to accept FEMA SAFER Grant Award in the amount of \$353,052.00, paid over two years, to fund three new firefighter positions for two years – Chief Bresnan/Homewood Fire Department.

Chief Bresnan addressed the Council and stated that a temporary position was six months long or less and the next provision that he found was that federally funded classifications were twelve months long or less but this was a two year program so neither of those would apply. Chief Bresnan further stated that he did speak to Mr. Crenshaw at the Personnel Board who assured him that there would be an understanding that the city was getting a grant to fund the positions and if the city chose to discontinue the positions that could be done with no problem with the Personnel Board so his objective was to try to get this approved and then if the grant was not available to continue after two years he would try to eliminate positions through attrition so as not to create a financial crisis to dissolve the positions.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-111

(A Resolution to authorize the Mayor to accept FEMA SAFER Grant Award in the amount of \$353,052.00, paid over two years, to fund three new firefighter positions for two years)

Mrs. Smith moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-111. Mr. Thames seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 10.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to consider declaring the property located at 1602 Ridge Rd., PID# 29-00-13-4-007-023.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance’s 1910 & 1750 “Excessive Growth” –Scott Cook/Code Enforcement/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Hawkins re-entered the Council Chambers at 6:11 p.m.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Scott Cook, Code Enforcement, addressed the Council, presented photographs, and stated that the property was owned by Mr. James Dobbs and there was a tax lien holder listed as Turner Farms Trust who was also listed on the tax records so notices went out to both parties but Mr. Dobbs’ letters were returned and as of today the property was still in bad condition.

Mrs. Smith asked if Mr. Cook had heard from the lien holder.

Mr. Cook replied yes and stated that they had a few conversations and the lien holder felt as though he was not responsible but if the city put a lien on the property the current lien holder would be the one responsible for paying it. Mr. Cook further stated that this property had been declared a public nuisance before.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Ben Traylor of 1600 Ridge Road addressed the Council and stated that he did believe the property was a public nuisance and was also concerned about the grass getting high because it attracted snakes so he was concerned for his children. Mr. Traylor further stated that the house looked like fire hazard and had open areas and it was a bad idea to have an unoccupied house in the neighborhood that had fallen into disarray this bad. Mr.

Traylor added that he was concerned about his property value and the property value of his neighbors' who were trying to sell their house. Mr. Traylor further added that they were fortunate enough to live in a great city and didn't want to keep referring to the neighbors as the ugly house.

Mr. Limbaugh asked Mr. Traylor if he had seen any indication of anyone living in the house.

Mr. Traylor replied no.

Mr. Limbaugh how long he would estimate since he had seen anyone living there.

Mr. Traylor replied it had been six months or more and if anyone was there it was for no more than an hour but there was no way anyone could live there with the heat and no electricity and no water.

Mrs. Smith stated that there had been a lot of concern expressed by several of the surrounding neighbors.

Mrs. Charla Brown of 1511 Ridge Road addressed the Council and stated that her house had been for sale since March and her family took great pride in the house and property but the house across the street for the three years she had been there had been an eyesore. Mrs. Brown further stated that the first year off and on the home owner lived there sporadically but then she noticed there was no power connected to the house but he would come and go at odd hours. Mrs. Brown added that the Traylor's lived directly across the street from her and they had a view of the back of the house which was worse than the view of the front of the house and they knew there were rodents and animals that came in and out of the property but the homeowner for whatever reason just left the property still furnished. Mrs. Brown added that he did not maintain the yard whatsoever and there had been several times that the city had intervened and mowed the yard. Mrs. Brown further added that she felt the property devalued the other properties on Ridge Road.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Limbaugh asked Mr. Kendrick what other options they had other than declaring the property a public nuisance.

Mr. Kendrick replied that if it was an unsafe building, then the building inspections department could declare that and set another Public Hearing pertaining to the structure but tonight was only pertaining to excessive growth.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding this Item. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-112

(A Resolution declaring the property located at 1602 Ridge Rd., PID# 29-00-13-4-007-023.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance's 1910 & 1750 "Excessive Growth")

Mrs. Smith moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-112. Mr. Wyatt seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Limbaugh asked Mrs. McGrath of the Building, Engineering and Zoning Department if the Building Inspections could address the structure.

Mrs. McGrath replied yes.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 11.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to consider declaring the property located at 2516 Mamie L Foster., PID# 28-00-07-2-009-015.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance's 1910 & 1750 "Excessive Growth"—Scott Cook/Code Enforcement/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Scott Cook, Code Enforcement, addressed the Council and stated that the property was owned by the Islamic Academy of Alabama and since the notices were sent and the property was posted it had been abated and did meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the Council.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Thames moved to drop this Item. Mr. Hallman seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 12.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to consider declaring the property located at 2522 Mamie L Foster., PID# 28-00-07-2-009-012.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance’s 1910 & 1750 “Excessive Growth”–Scott Cook/Code Enforcement/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Scott Cook, Code Enforcement, addressed the Council and stated that this property was owned by Mr. Samuel Sanchez and since the property was posted and sent notices the property had been cleaned up to comply with the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Hallman moved to drop this Item. Mr. Thames seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion.

Mr. Jones asked if there was anything in the ordinance that addressed repeat offenders.

Mr. Kendrick replied he could look into that.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any further questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 13.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to consider declaring the property located at 110 Acton Ave., PID# 29-00-14-4-015-026.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance’s 1910 & 1750 “Excessive Growth”–Scott Cook/Code Enforcement/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Scott Cook, Code Enforcement, addressed the Council and stated that this was the Griffin Cemetery property and volunteer had cleaned it up.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mrs. Smith moved to drop this Item. Mr. Jones seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 14.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to consider declaring the property located at 1624 Mtn Gap Cir., PID# 29-00-26-1-008-010.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance’s 1910 & 1750 “Excessive Growth” –Scott Cook/Code Enforcement/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Scott Cook, Code Enforcement, addressed the Council and stated that the property was owned by Joshua Sanders and the house was in bad shape with neighbors reporting that they see someone coming and going from time to time but no one living there. Mr. Cook further stated that the city had cleaned it up the property before.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. K.P. Caskey of 1589 Berry Road addressed the Council and stated that he had lived on the corner of Mountain Gap Circle and Berry Road for about ten years and for a large part of that time this property had been a problem. Mr. Caskey further stated that it appeared to be abandoned and was a blight on the neighborhood and affected property values.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council’s consideration:

Resolution No. 16-113

(A Resolution declaring the property located at 1624 Mtn Gap Cir., PID# 29-00-26-1-008-010.000 a public nuisance due to a violation of Ordinance’s 1910 & 1750 “Excessive Growth”)

Mr. Wright moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-113. Mr. McClusky seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Limbaugh asked Mrs. McGrath to send an inspector to that property as well.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 32.04.16 – Public Commentary August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration to review changes to the Appendix A: Zoning Ordinance Article II: Definitions and Article IV: District Uses in Section A: NPD Neighborhood Preservation District – Vanessa McGrath/Planning Commission.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Commentary opened.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that since there was several people who wished to speak on the subject he would ask that everyone limit their comments to three minutes.

Mrs. Vanessa McGrath, Building, Engineering and Zoning Department, addressed the Council and stated that the first change was the definition of building height to “The vertical extent of a building height. Limits do not apply to chimney flues, and elevator bulkheads. Building height shall be measured from the first floor at the front door to the building’s highest top of parapet or ridge of the roof.” Mrs. McGrath further stated that the Article IV, Section A: NPD Neighborhood Preservation District changed the side setbacks from 40 to 55 feet to anything less than 55 feet and removing 56-65 feet and changing 66 feet and over to anything greater than 55 feet and for widths less than 55 feet the minimum setbacks on the side would be five feet and nine feet and anything greater than 55 feet wide would be 10 feet on both sides. Mrs. McGrath added that the section was removed where the house would step in to 10 foot if it was on a nine foot setback since they took out the nine foot setbacks because if someone was going to a second floor they were just brining the whole house in rather than stepping in one foot. Mrs. McGrath further added that the maximum building height would be the next changes and again they used the same determination on the width of the lots and changed to anything less than or equal to 55 feet and anything greater than 55 feet being the only two options and after many meetings those were changed to anything less than or equal to 55 feet would be 32 feet high and anything greater than 55 feet would be 36 feet high and the minimum living area of the dwelling had been brought back in and everything was the same and a grammatical error on maximum area of ground coverage was changed to read “all structures” instead of “a structure.”

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Marcus Sparks of 1809 Lancaster Road addressed the Council and stated that the intent of the Neighborhood Preservation District Ordinance was to recognize the historical patterns and densities of residential subdivisions and to encourage the continuation of homogenous development patterns so in the past few years it seemed that there had been a brazen disregard for the aesthetics and the character of neighborhoods and that concerned him. Mr. Sparks further stated that they continued to see too much house and too little lot. Mr. Sparks added that the other thing that concerned him was that the tree ordinance also seemed to be disregarded and these two issues concerned him. Mr. Sparks further added that raising the height from 32 feet to 36 feet seemed to be uncalled for.

Mrs. Stephanie Banks of 137 East Hawthorne Road addressed the Council and stated that when her family moved to Alabama in the summer of 2000 they chose Homewood for two reasons, schools and the feel of the neighborhood, feel including the size and types of homes, but she realized those two things did not come with guarantees. Mrs. Banks further stated that she lived in a single family district therefore there was not a condo association where the residents had written rules; however, restrictions were not always negative. Mrs. Banks added that she trusted her city government to come up with restrictions that they could all live within and to protect her investment and why she moved here. Mrs. Banks further added that she was a long term investor and lived in the same house for 16 years and she had no intention of changing that, so, just as residents appeared before the Council when there might be commercial encroachment or home based businesses, it did matter what happened around her with other private, single family homes.

Mrs. Karen Kreamer of 506 Broadway addressed the Council and stated that she was in the Planning Commission meeting in July and it was decided at that meeting that the building height would be no higher than 29 feet but at some point it changed to 32 feet without any citizen input and she found that disturbing. Mrs. Kreamer further stated that it seemed to her that the discussions had become very political and that the builders were the ones who were dominating Homewood's future. Mrs. Kreamer added that she too bought her home in good faith that she would have a home that she could live in for the rest of her life and she wanted the Council to protect her.

Mrs. Connie Kohler of 1424 Ardsley Place addressed the Council and stated that she lived in her home for over 30 years and shared some of the feelings that were expressed earlier but she wanted to say that her neighbors extended the height of their house and they didn't go against any ordinances but because they were on a hill, she lost her view of the sky out of her kitchen window over her sink. Mrs. Kohler further stated

that this was a loss that was sad and she felt powerless because she would never be able to get that back.

Mrs. Lori Renkl of 1415 Ardsley Place addressed the Council and stated that she lived in Homewood for over 40 years and one of the things that set Homewood apart from neighboring communities was the charm of the neighborhood architecture. Mrs. Renkl further stated that ten years ago she and her husband added on to their home and took great pains and went to no small expense to make sure the addition kept to the character of the neighborhood. Mrs. Renkl added that once they started looking like the cookie cutter development seen in other communities some of the charm was lost like the history that made Homewood an appealing place to live and they would not be able to get it back. Mrs. Renkl further added that all over Homewood homes were springing up that were out of place so she was here to ask the Council to put restrictions in place that would preserve the character of the neighborhood such as relative restrictions because there were plenty of places in Homewood where big houses were appropriate even in her neighborhood there were rows of large houses where another large house would fit right in but there were other places where it wouldn't so they had relative restrictions in place for other parts of building and she thought it was appropriate for height as well and she understood it was a complicated way to do it but she felt they were up to the challenge and they had a precedent in place for it.

Mrs. Suzanne Clisby of 409 St. Charles Street addressed the Council and stated that she just recently bought her neighbor's house at 405 St. Charles Street simply because she did not want to see a two and half story McMansion go up under her nose and a 150 year old white oak tree come down. Mrs. Clisby further stated that her father and grandfather built a lot of homes in Homewood beginning around 1940 and her family had lived in and managed Homewood property for decades so it was very important for her to maintain the historical integrity and feel of the neighborhoods. Mrs. Clisby added that clearly people wanted and needed larger homes, which was understandable but she thought this needed to be accomplished in a thoughtful and responsible way. Mrs. Clisby further added that she was not aware of the height increase and measurement method until recently and she had been involved in many discussions regarding the proposal but admittedly she had been too complacent regarding matters that affected the course of Homewood's development but it was becoming increasingly clear that it was a big mistake because they all needed to show up and hold their elected officials accountable for what happened in their city and, though it was a complicated issue, she felt everyone needed more time to digest the details, discuss the options with well-informed professionals on ways to manage housing needs as well as preserve the historical integrity and charm of the neighborhoods in Homewood.

Mr. Joe Stephens of 1513 Valley Place addressed the Council and stated that while he would prefer that the Council remove the distinction between lot sizes he did believe that the proposed restriction especially in regard to the small lot of 32 feet was a reasonable one and it did offer a more restrictive code than what they had in place so they were heading in the right direction with many of the concerns that had been shared by people so far today but his concern was becoming overly restrictive. Mr. Stephens further stated that he did not support any efforts that would reduce the height restriction below 32 feet because he thought it was reasonable and rationale was given by all sides in this discussion mostly related to privacy, economics, and clarification of the code so rather than rehash all the previous discussion he would urge the Council to consider the following in voting, first the distinction between the viewpoints was actually very little and the last time they discussed this they were at 29 feet and now they were at 32. Mr. Stephens added that to say from an aesthetic standpoint that someone could stand in the street and make a distinction between those two without the two houses being side by side was a stretch so in regard to a privacy issue he could see into windows from a 29 foot house just as well as from a 32 foot house so he did think it did not restrict them in a way that they should not approach. Mr. Stephens further added that secondly, an overly restrictive code would likely result in unattended outcomes because the reality in construction meant that adding a second story home to the confines of what a lot of people were asking to restrict to a story and a half would carry a greater finishing cost due to the complexity of finishing outside in that complex space as opposed to simply just building a two story home so as residents considered making improvements to their homes an overly restrictive code, economics would likely encourage residents to begin true two story homes with flatter pitched roofs which might invite what they were trying to prevent aesthetically but nobody was going to change anyone's mind in regards to aesthetics because each person had a different perspective based on when they fell in love with Homewood, which for he and his wife was over five years ago and by that time Homewood was already a mix of cottages and larger homes and that diversity and home style was actually what attracted them to the community and the larger homes in the community were architectural show pieces and the reality was that the city was geographically small and he had concerns about their ability to meet the housing needs of families when they place overly restrictive heights and in closing he urged the Council to approve the changes to the building codes to allow for 32 foot and 36 foot height restrictions.

Mrs. Elaine Snow of 101 Woodmont Drive addressed the Council and stated that she lived in Homewood for 30 years and was married to a native of Homewood and she believed that the best, most successful communities that were healthy had a balance between being very mindful of what they were, where they came from and being very mindful of where they intended to go, so there had to be a mindful progress because they all knew places where things had run amok and they knew what they looked like and they

knew they didn't live there because they chose Homewood. Mrs. Snow further stated that they could not stop progress, and she would never want to, but she thought they needed to be extremely careful about how they planned for that progress because what they were deciding now would form what Homewood looked like in the next 40 to 50 years and to that end she believed what they needed to be talking about tonight was postponing this decision so that they could convene a group consisting of all parties, professionals and neighbors so they could hear all of the aspects and slow down to make this decision. Mrs. Snow added that she was proposing that they convened a committee and took time to really study what they were talking about before they moved forward.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that procedurally this was not a Public Hearing, it was a Public Commentary because they had already held one Public Hearing on this issue. Mr. Limbaugh further stated that this last meeting that the Planning and Development Committee had was attended by several citizens. Mr. Limbaugh added that any of the committee meetings by law, and by preference, were open meetings and anyone was welcome to attend those.

Mr. David Siegal of 205 East Edgewood Drive addressed the Council and stated that he felt there was some misunderstanding because right now people were looking at a 32 foot limit and a 25 foot number but they were being measured differently because one was an average around the home and one was being measured off a grade and he did think some additional time would be helpful to be able to explain that to everyone so they would not be as concerned. Mr. Siegal further stated that the height of the home was not the only thing that made a home look tall but he wanted to preserve the character of Homewood because he lived in Homewood for 15 years, did a lot of construction in Homewood, and built houses that looked big but he hoped that more of them than not had fit well into the neighborhood. Mr. Siegal added that they were responding a lot to the demand of what people were wanting but what was being missed was that clients drove 99 percent of their projects so they were responding to what people who wanted to live in Homewood were asking for. Mr. Siegal further added that he felt that, concerning height requirements, additional discussion would be advantageous because even some of the side setbacks would be even more important to how a home looked than the height requirements so if everyone understood that they could work together and find a happy medium on it because he could build every house needed under 32 feet which had crept up from 25 feet but 32 feet which was a lot and especially in some of the lots that were elevated or some of the lots that had small houses next door.

Mr. Joel Blackstock of 1742 Kensington Road addressed the Council and stated that he had lived on Kensington Road for over 30 years and raised his family there and he was also an architect but he thought they should be deeply concerned about what was wonderful about Homewood that no other municipality had and that was the charm and

the scale of the homes as well as livability and ability to walk downtown, and the schools. Mr. Blackstock further stated that, speaking as an architect and as a resident, there was a very strong correlation between the scale of the façade of homes and the charm of the city and the last thing they wanted was to do something that would harm what it was that had attracted people to live in Homewood for years and years. Mr. Blackstock added that 25 to 28 feet which was recommended by the BZA and the Planning Commission was plenty tall to be able to do a two story façade in Homewood and a façade should be limited to two stories so it should be a simple and clear written rule with a few diagrams that clearly showed what kind of front elevation might be that would work within that distance and he heard a lot of confusion about how to measure the 32 feet so he thought it needed to be well illustrated. Mr. Blackstock further added that a story façade in Homewood on a 50 foot lot, a 32 foot high house started to become ominous approaching the width of a 55 foot lot so he thought this needed to be entered into carefully because they could lose what was great about the city that had really drawn them all here and around town there was a lot of really nice, new modern houses that fit the city context really nicely but it could be done in a scale that fit in really nicely and there were also some that did not fit in that looked like they belonged in Greystone or another municipality that were not put in with much thought but it had to do with scale so they really needed to respect that scale by clearly defining the height.

Mr. Geoffrey Ketcham of 408 Cliff Place addressed the Council and stated that he lived in Homewood for the last nine to ten years and made his living in construction buying and selling houses in Homewood and recently started his own construction company and he was concerned with a couple of things but thought they needed some reform on the way it was done so he agreed with what had been said earlier because as far as the way it was calculated now was confusing and could lend itself to some manipulations where a house from the street would look above and beyond what aesthetically fit so he did think they were heading in the right direction of finding a height that they could set off of the point of entry into the house. Mr. Ketcham further stated that 32 feet was more than enough and they could get away with building a good designed house a story and a half and they could get down below that 29 number relatively easy but it would take some skill and some thought and he saw a lot of houses that looked like the plans had been rushed and there was no thought in it but there could have been easy ways to get the heights down. Mr. Ketcham added that the other concern he had was in regard to the grade of the lot because he thought some type of wording needed to be put in there if it was on a lot that sloped there would be cases where the house on the down side of the slope of the lot could in affect be six or seven inches feet below that way that the proposed amendments were reading to measure the height but his concerns were that if they made it too cut and dry off of 29 or 32 feet there needed to be something that took into account what the grade of the lot was.

Mrs. Mary Ellen Snell of 902 Stuart Street addressed the Council, representing herself and her neighbor, Theresa Thrasher of 910 Stuart Street and stated that they continued to see changes proposed in the Neighborhood Preservation District which had alarmed residents because the NPD Building Height revision, while it attempted to define some limits, concerned her as were expressed by Mr. Blackstock who spoke about measurements. Mrs. Snell further stated that she measured a house this week and it was measured two ways, the old way and the new way and this house was on a flat street with no elevation and the house was 23.5 feet measured the old way with the average at the grade, four corners, up to the highest point and then averaging down with the lowest point and most of the homes on that side of the street were small homes so it would be a little bit taller on that end of the street, but when they measured the house with the new measurement which was from the threshold to the tallest point, that house was actually 25.8 feet tall so it was not necessarily the case that the measurements would be lower heights. Mrs. Snell added that there were a lot of things in the ordinance that were not addressed because this was a time of big change for Homewood and the homes were what made Homewood a city of neighborhoods and homes were at the center of growth so at this time in their history they needed a more comprehensive ordinance revision with additional limits and reduced height. Mrs. Snell further added that the 29 foot height was a compromise that she thought was more acceptable but it also seemed to be slightly taller than residents wanted but she thought they should consider several ideas to deal with the increased volume and challenges of housing construction such as increase the staff of Engineering, Zoning and Inspections to help this department with basic daily work plus follow up with new construction and enforcing ordinances proactively since this was an unusually busy time in the city; involve the contract resources and professionals who were familiar with historic communities and a research committee that could work together with the public and Council through the planning process and then add some architectural requirements for doing additional setbacks and how they impacted height so they might need setbacks so that a front side appeared not as tall and could build back also if there was threat of flat roofed homes she thought they should consider adding that to the ordinance as well to limit flat roofed homes.

Mr. Chris Tucker of 507 Yorkshire Drive addressed the Council and stated that a lot of people were confused about how long this had been going on because it wasn't something new as this was about the fifth meeting he had been to where the builders and architects had told the Council what they thought and a lot of them were not trying to bully the Council but were residents of Homewood as well but the grade issues were causing a lot of the issues because if someone was on the high side it made the house look a lot bigger, for example there was one on Broadway that was being built and had to get the back of the house out of the ground so the front of the house looked huge. Mr. Tucker further stated that they should not restrict Homewood to where they started getting people who felt like they had to move away to get the house they wanted and

should not have a lot of height restrictions where a lot of people would do flat roofs because if they limited to 25 or 29 they would end up with a lot of flat roofs because people would build a two story house to get the size they needed and, if they could not get the size, they would not build there and their lender would not give them the money. Mr. Tucker added that from an economic standpoint he did not want to run people off that wanted to stay in Homewood who did not want to move to Mountain Brook or Vestavia to build a bigger house so he wanted them to find a medium to make everyone happy.

Mrs. Catherine Pittman Smith of 215 East Edgemont Drive addressed the Council and stated that she was a 20 year resident of Homewood, was from Mountain Brook and was appointed to the Homewood Preservation Commission in April and she wanted to thank the Council and Mayor for giving them a voice and a budget for the first time because Homewood was a very significantly historic community and she was proud to live here and thought that the Preservation Commission had tremendous support in the community for preserving their historical and architectural integrity and authenticity and it was their goal as a Commission to promote mindful growth and not limit it but to do it responsibly, reasonably, mindfully and with integrity. Mrs. Smith further stated that they needed to recognize context, scale and walkability and they needed to preserve and protect the historic heritage and character of Homewood and, according to the Jefferson County Historic Commission, Homewood proudly had 275 to 300 Historical Markers that were in residences and businesses which was more than any other municipalities outside of Birmingham which tells that they value their character, charm, and significance. Mrs. Smith added that as a Commission they were concerned that the proposed height of 32 feet would be dramatically out of scale to existing neighborhoods on small lots of 50-55 feet, which her house sat on, and most of Edgewood was made up of 50-55 foot lots and was a Cottage/Bungalow neighborhood and the other historic districts in Birmingham, Anniston, and Fairhope had very thriving districts that brought a great deal of value to the community so they 32 foot height increase would tower over existing homes and block out natural light to existing neighbors which could negatively dominate the surrounding homes. Mrs. Smith further added that she was at the meeting where they had agreed that 29 feet was reasonable and then it increased to 32 feet so she would like for the Council to table the issue so they could do some research and due diligence and really form an insightful plan that protected and preserved the architectural character for the future because looking at what Homewood would look like in 20, 50 or 100 years, would they have regrets such as the destruction of the train station in downtown Birmingham so she hoped they could create a vision and long range plan that could truly reflect all the concerns of the Homewood residents.

Mr. Scott Dean of 1013 Queensbury Road addressed the Council and stated that tonight they sat through five Public Hearings declaring properties public nuisances for

excessive growth so though this was not the exact same thing, the underlying premise was, their property affected their neighbor's property and they had a responsibility not to infringe upon that. Mr. Dean further stated that he did not know the difference between 29 foot or 32 foot height and that was better left to the people on the Historical Commission and builders but from what he had heard from more than one builder was that the reason it had changed to go higher was not because they could not make the houses conform, but they just did not want to because it might be hard but the things that they cherished in life the most did not come easy, such as raising kids or being on the City Council, but to him simplifying the code seemed important but finding a point that limited excess and being able to do so without restricting progress was possible. Mr. Dean added that his brother and sister-in-law just built a house on Kennilworth, which was five bedrooms, three bathrooms, and falls at about 30 feet and they did lower the roof and they could have gone lower, and all five bedrooms were bigger than his parents master bedroom and his parents had a half a million dollar home and the house was on a 50 foot lot and had a 16 foot pitched ceiling on the second floor but was still a mansion but just more inconspicuously so than some of the others that they saw. Mr. Dean further added that the house they just bought in West Homewood they had put a lot of money into renovating and didn't touch the roofline or the foot print of the house and right now he thought this was mostly about Edgewood but the day was coming very soon and the most logical place for builders to go was his neighborhood so they needed a code that respected the rights of their neighbors instead of the desires of the builders because without one there could soon be a house two and half times the size of his little 14 foot gem that he just purchased.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the Council.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Commentary closed.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that in listening to the 15 people who spoke who wanted to say that they had looked at this issue and discussed it, and debated it with public input all the way through.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding this Item.

Mr. Hawkins stated that they could table the item and let things keep going the way they were going and they could have McMansions everywhere or they could pass something, maybe not tonight, but they got to 32 feet in a public meeting and he had been to several public meetings where there had been compromises because they were at 25 feet and he voted for that and then they were at 29 feet and it was not coming out of committee at 29 feet, it was going to be tabled but all the people kept asking them to put a

cap on it so they got to 32 feet to get it at this point so they were trying to find the right number and he did not know if they had it or not but they had to start somewhere. Mr. Hawkins further stated that they had to put a legitimate cap on it somewhere so builders could not keep on using an average and fuzzy math and getting big houses built so he wanted everyone to know that they were trying to get there and he had been in many meetings and had voted on it five times at different heights so they were working hard to try to get somewhere where they had a consensus and it was going to be hard to get there but they were trying.

Mr. Wright stated that he agreed with a lot of the sentiment that if we needed to slow down even now after five or six meetings and labor put into it he would be for that but he wanted everyone to understand that they were talking about a new limitation, not a new increase, they were talking about changing numbers and came about to get a more certain measuring tool in place to measure these houses because what there was now was not effective and was an open door so they were here to place a new limitation on houses throughout Homewood. Mr. Wright further stated that a lot of people had been through a lot of meetings and Mr. Hawkins had been through more than anyone else so it was probably crystal clear in his mind but it might not be clear in everyone else's minds but he wanted everyone to know it was a matter of where they put the new limitation but there was going to be a limitation so houses that used to be built aren't going to be built anymore and that was a good thing. Mr. Wright added that the limitations might be 32, 29, or 25 feet but that was what they were working through and he wanted to clarify that because a lot of people were saying they were increasing the height but that was not correct, they were actually placing new limits on the height.

Mr. Thames stated this was a restriction that they were adding which people wanted and wanted to point out that the BZA was getting a lot of grief because people were assuming they were granting height variances, but they were not. Mr. Thames further stated that the houses that were being built were being built under the current code so he could build a 40 foot tall house and put an 11 foot porch on it and be in compliance so they were trying to figure out a way to make it easier to determine and at the same time get their arms around what was going on now. Mr. Thames added that number 32 that was being discussed now was debatable but the reason they got there was that one thing that was so great about Homewood was the variety of architecture they had because a lot of the houses looked different and some people asked what was the style of Homewood and he didn't know because there was so many and that was a good thing but he could ensure that if they made the height restriction too low people would continue to build what they needed to build and the roof lines would become flatter and flatter and they would have no character from house to house because there would not be enough room to vary so that was one of the reasons that number was arrived at and, though it was

debatable and should be talked about a bit more, but they needed room for houses to look different.

Mr. McClusky stated that he agreed that they needed more discussion on this because they were trying to be sensitive to the long term residents and the ones who he hoped were going to be long term residents that were moving in and were asking these companies to build these houses and to be clear they had heard two or three separate builders say that they could do what everyone wanted to do at 30 feet so there was room to work so they were just trying to come up with that number and were trying to be sensitive. Mr. McClusky further stated that one thing that Mr. Ketcham brought up was the percentage between the grade and the threshold and how that could make a big difference on what size houses they were building if these measurements changed was that if they had six steps that were leading up to the front door and then they went 30 feet up it would look a lot bigger so that was something they needed to discuss in the next meetings to find the right number because the grade did change in the city a good bit and that could have a big effect so this was a very important issue and they thanked everyone who came out and they would do their best to make it work for everybody.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any further questions or comments regarding this Item. There was no response from the Council.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be referred back to the Planning and Development Committee and encouraged everyone to attend.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 11.07.16 – Public Hearing September 12, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration of the zoning application from Eric Rogers on behalf of the property owner(s) Progressive Columbiana LLC to rezone the property located at 822 Columbiana Road/Parcel ID No. 29-00-23-1-002-008.002 from C-1 (Office Building District) to R-7 (Attached Dwelling Unit District) for the proposed purpose to permit the construction of four residential townhouse units (Note: this request was considered by the Homewood Planning Commission at its meeting of July 12, 2016 resulting in a favorable recommendation by a vote of 8-0) – Vanessa McGrath/ Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that the Public Hearing was set for September 12, 2016.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 12.07.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration for one-way traffic on Rumson Road – Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Greg Cobb, Building, Engineering and Zoning, addressed the Council, presented drawings and stated that this was a request for a one-way in the 500 block only. Mr. Cobb further stated that on the drawing there was a red line on Rumson between Rumson and Yorkshire which was the only part they wanted to one-way and the reason was that it was a very steep, blind hill and it was very dangerous for pedestrians so they wanted to put sidewalks in on the east side of the road and make it a one-way street. Mr. Cobb added that the traffic study indicated they could go north or south for the one-way and his proposal was to make it go one-way to the south. Mr. Cobb further added that the green line was where traffic would go around the block to go in the other direction.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Cobb if he was proposing a one-way going south, toward Brookwood.

Mr. Cobb replied yes, and that it would go down the hill toward Brookwood because that would put people driving in the normal lane they would normally be driving in and also in the event that there was a fire truck run, most likely they would be coming from the north, which was the location of station 1. Mr. Cobb further stated that it would narrow the road by about five feet on the east and put a sidewalk in and have a much safer situation because there were a lot of pedestrians there and coming over the blind hill was a bad situation. Mr. Cobb stated that on the east side there was only two homes so they would not have as many driveway issues.

Mr. Thames left the Council Chamber at 7:18 p.m.

Mr. Joe Joseph of 647 Rumson Road addressed the Council and stated that he was a frequent pedestrian on all three of the roads in the drawing and it was unsafe on Rumson; however, he thought it was more unsafe on Hampton at the narrower street and people parked their cars on Hampton but Windsor was also a narrow street and people parked their cars on that street as well so there might be a more effective solution for Hampton such as speed bumps or signage warning of pedestrians but people did drive too fast on Rumson so he applauded the efforts of the city to make that area safer but he was concerned that would shift the problem over to one of the other streets.

Mrs. Jennifer Address of 421 Windsor Drive addressed the Council and stated that she agreed with Mr. Joseph and thought they needed a thorough study of traffic through that area because Windsor Drive was narrow and windy and cars parked on the side of the road with blind hills and Hampton was the same way so she was wondering if there was a comprehensive study that could be done before they spent a lot of money to

make a change that may just drive the problem over to Hampton which was equally hilly and narrow.

Mr. Thames returned to the Council Chamber at 7:20 p.m.

Mr. Cobb stated Skipper and Associates had done a study and they recommended a one-way that could go in either direction but he had a discussion with them about whether to go north or south but they did not think it would matter, so it was a matter of what the Council decided.

Mr. Jones asked if the study addressed the fact that it would cause more problems on Hampton.

Mr. Cobb replied that he did not have a hard copy of the study yet but had just had conversations with Ms. Lenore but it had been looked at. Mr. Cobb stated that the desire was to have a sidewalk all the way down the hill all the way to Shades Creek Parkway and Rumson was very wide once it got south of Yorkshire so there was room to do it by narrowing the street which also had an effect of slowing traffic down. Mr. Cobb added that they could not use speed humps there because they did not work on a hill and was not advised because it caused cars to break traction.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion.

Mr. Wright stated that all of Rumson all the way down to Lakeshore had gotten attention over the past several years in an effort to slow down traffic but it was a lengthy sidewalk project which he hoped would be accomplished one day but it was actually a lot easier than the side walk project they were considering and the reason they chose to consider this sidewalk project was because of the danger of the hill so they decided to look at this one first and they had been looking at it a long time. Mr. Wright further added that just this one block area was studies with the hope of doing a sidewalk and keep it two-way but the cost was not reasonable for the city to do that so they were now looking at a one-way and one question was if they made it one-way if it would create a bigger problem for Hampton or Windsor and he would like to have that information before they made a decision.

Mr. Cobb stated that they should be getting a hard copy of the study soon but they could certainly postpone the vote until they did have the hard copy and looked at the numbers of the traffic counts.

Mr. Laws stated that he was not opposed to carrying it over and thought that was the right thing to do to make sure they went in the right direction because going downhill was uncomfortable so a one-way would be good to do. Mr. Laws further stated that when they were discussing cutting the sidewalk into the neighbors' yards there were two residents on the east side who were concerned about losing trees but did see it as a public safety issue and then on the west side he had spoken to three of the home owners who were in favor of having it one-way because backing out of the driveway over the blind hill was very difficult and they were in favor of it being one-way uphill.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be carried over.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 16.07.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration for a variance to the sign ordinance at 103 Citation Court – David Brandt/Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Greg Cobb, Building, Engineering and Zoning, addressed the Council, and stated that this was a request for a multiple sign variance and the sign was not oversized but there was one on the side of the building and one on the face of the building.

Mr. David Brandt addressed the Council and stated that the sign ordinance stated they could have one free standing sign and one building sign and they had an existing free standing sign that aside from being a pole sign which was no longer allowed in Homewood it was in rough shape so they were wanting to get rid of that free standing sign and putting a second building sign on the building and each sign was built the same way and were non-illuminated panel each on adjacent sides of the property.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding this Item. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-114

(A Resolution for a variance to the sign ordinance at 103 Citation Court)

Mr. Thames moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-114. Mr. Hawkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 05.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for a variance to the sign ordinance at 800 Green Springs Highway – Wes Daniel/Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department (Report – Special Issues Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Hawkins stated that the Special Issues Committee met and voted 5-0 to send this Item back to the full Council without recommendation pending the Public Hearing.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Greg Cobb, Building, Engineering and Zoning, addressed the Council and stated that this request was for an unattached sign which was oversized that would go on the site behind the former Mazer's so the request was for additional square footage.

Mr. Limbaugh asked how much the square footage was.

Mr. Cobb replied 175 feet.

Mr. Wes Daniel of Daniel Signs addressed the Council and stated that the sign would be an internally illuminated channeled letters which was a table sign that was seven feet high and 26 feet long.

Mr. Moody asked if this variance was in scale of previous variances granted for this building because of the setback from the street.

Mr. Cobb replied yes and stated that this one would be hard to see from the street and the businesses on the front all had oversized signs that were closer to the street as well as next door at Mission Possible.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-115

(A Resolution for a variance to the sign ordinance at 800 Green Springs Highway)

Mr. Hawkins moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-115. Mr. Laws seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 06.08.16 – Public Hearing August 29, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for a variance to the sign ordinance at 2921 18th Street South – Bertha Styslinger/ Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department (Report – Special Issues Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Hawkins stated that the Special Issues Committee met and voted 5-0 to send this Item back to the full Council without recommendation pending the Public Hearing.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item.

Mr. Greg Cobb, Building, Engineering and Zoning, addressed the Council, and stated that this was a multiple sign variance request with three signs involved which were each oversized so it was a size request as well as a multiple attached sign request because two were on the face of the building and one was on the end of the building.

Mrs. Smith stated that during the committee meeting they discussed the sign on the side of the building and they were not fans of that. Mrs. Smith asked if they were still asking for that.

Mr. Culpt of At Home Furniture replied that their preference was to have the ones on the front but if they could have the one on the side they would like that as well.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, this Item. There was no response from the audience.

Mr. Limbaugh declared the Public Hearing closed.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-116

(A Resolution for a variance to the sign ordinance at 2921 18th Street South)

Mr. Wright moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-116 approving the two signs on the front of the building only. Mr. Wyatt seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 17.07.16 – Request to set a Public Hearing September 12, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration for a variance to the sign ordinance at 1831 28th Avenue South, Suite 160 – Christene Mello/Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department (Report – Special Issues Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Limbaugh stated that the Public Hearing was set for September 12, 2016.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 29.07.16 – 29.07.16 Request to set a Public Hearing September 12, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. for consideration for fence variance at 612 Hambaugh Avenue – Leisha Hultgren/Walter Jones (Report – Special Issues Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Limbaugh stated that the Public Hearing was set for September 12, 2016.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 33.07.16 - Request to set a Public Hearing September 26, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. to reconsider the Home Energy Section of International Building Code – Jeremy Strickland/City Clerk (Report – Special Issues Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Limbaugh stated that the Public Hearing was set for September 26, 2016.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 05.06.16 – Request for consideration of an ABC 050 – Retail Beer (Off Premises Only) and 070 Retail Wine (Off Premises Only) for Freds Stores of Tennessee Inc d/b/a Freds Store 1780 located at 234 Greensprings Highway – David Bowen/City Clerk (Report – Public Safety Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee had not received anything from the Fire Department and they had gone over to the business several times and had

tried to contact the owner but were getting no responses and that had not taken care of what they needed to do.

Mr. Moody moved to drop this Item. Mr. Thames seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 13.07.16 – Request for consideration for an ABC – 040 – Retail Beer (On or Off Premises) and 060 – Retail Table Wine (On or Off Premises) for Mi Pueblo Greensprings LLC d/b/a Mi Pueblo Supermarket located at 216 Green Springs Highway – Joel Rivera/City Clerk (Report – Public Safety Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee met and voted to have no objection to the issuance of the ABC license.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Public Safety Committee's recommendation. There was no response from the Council.

Mr. McClusky then moved to have no objections to the issuance of the ABC – 040 – Retail Beer (On or Off Premises) and 060 – Retail Table Wine (On or Off Premises) for Mi Pueblo Greensprings LLC d/b/a Mi Pueblo Supermarket located at 216 Green Springs Highway. Mr. Moody seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 31.07.16 - Request for consideration to address continued parking/traffic concerns on Broadway Street – Chad Williamson/Chandler Graham/Walter Jones (Report – Public Safety Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend a three-way stop with a painted crosswalk at the intersection of Carr Avenue and Broadway Street with the recommendation to put signs up in advance.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Public Safety Committee's recommendation. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the first reading of the proposed Ordinance for the Council's consideration:

Ordinance No.

(An Ordinance to address continued parking/traffic concerns on Broadway Street)

Mr. McClusky moved for unanimous consent of the proposed Ordinance as read. Mr. Moody seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones., Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion for unanimous consent carried.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Ordinance for the Council's consideration:

Ordinance No. 2625

(An Ordinance to address continued parking/traffic concerns on Broadway Street)

Mr. Hawkins moved for the adoption and enrollment and publication according to law of Ordinance No. 2625. Mr. McClusky seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones., Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 16.08.16 – Request for consideration of a directional sign to the middle school on the corner of Mecca Avenue and Oxmoor Road – Kris Griffin/Barry Smith (Report – Public Safety Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend posting directional signs to the middle school on the corner of Mecca Avenue and Oxmoor Road and Mecca and Valley Avenue.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Public Safety Committee's recommendation. There was no response from the Council.

Mr. McClusky moved to post directional signs to the middle school on the corner of Mecca Avenue and Oxmoor Road and Mecca and Valley Avenue. Mr. Thames seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion.

Mr. Thames stated that in speaking with the couple on the northeast corner of Mecca Avenue and Oxmoor they had a well maintained hedge and they had concerns that if it was placed on their corner to let them maintain the hedge.

Mrs. Smith stated that they should be able to speak to Mr. Randy Hambley about the hedge maintenance.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any further questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda was Item No. 17.08.16 – Mid-year report from Chief Ross and the Homewood Police Department – Patrick McClusky (Report – Public Safety Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee met and heard the report from Chief Ross.

Mr. McClusky then moved to accept the Mid-year report from Chief Ross. Mr. Jones seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 32.07.16 – Request to consider Economic Development Incentives for Wildwood South Development –Mayor McBrayer/Bill Oldacre (Report – Finance Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Jones stated that the Finance Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend approving Economic Development Incentives for Wildwood South Development pending Mr. Kendrick's approval.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Finance Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Kendrick stated that he was waiting on the development agreement.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be carried over.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 01.08.16 – Request for consideration of a fiber optic franchise agreement with Southern Light, LLC for permission to work in City Right-of-Way – City Attorney (Report – Finance Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be carried over.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 03.08.16 - Request for consideration to amend the FY 15-16 Budgets – Melody Salter/Finance Director (Report – Finance Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Jones stated that the Finance Committee met and voted 4-0 to recommend amending the FY 15-16 Budget as presented.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Finance Committee's recommendation. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-117

(A Resolution amending the FY 15-16 Budget)

Mr. Jones then moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-117. Mr. Thames seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 19.08.16 – Request for consideration for a street light at 913 Shades Road – Walter Jones/Gilpin Family (Report –Public Safety Committee and Finance Committee Meetings held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee met and voted 5-0 to recommend adding three street lights on Shades Road and to send this Item to the Finance Committee for funding.

Mr. Jones stated that the Finance Committee met and voted 4-0 to recommend funding out of the Seven Cents Gas Tax Fund for \$140.04 for each.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the Public Safety and Finance Committees' recommendations. There was no response from the Council.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-118

(A Resolution for three street lights on Shades Road)

Mr. Jones moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-118. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Old Business was Item No. 10.07.16 – Request for consideration of a crosswalk signal at the intersection of Oak Grove and Oxmoor Road – Chief Tim Ross (Report – Finance Committee Meeting held on August 15, 2016).

Mr. Jones stated that the Finance Committee met and voted 4-0 to recommend funding of \$18,641.00 out of the Small Infrastructure Fund but they were going to check the State Bid List as well.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be carried over.

COMMITTEE REFERRAL AGENDA

22.08.16 Request for consideration to review Waste Water Facility Ordinance – Walter Jones/Fred Hawkins – **Planning and Development Committee**

23.08.16 **Request to set a Public Hearing and Referral to Planning and Development Committee** for consideration of Petition of Annexation for the property located at 913 and 1400 Shades Crest Road (Legal Description: A part of Lots 15-A and 16-A, according to the Resurvey of

Lots 15 and 16, Block 7 Shades Cliff, as recorded in Map Book 242, Page 61 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama – Melba Kane/Jolene Mills/City Clerk – **Planning and Development Committee**

- 25.08.16** **Request to set a Public Hearing** and Referral to the Special Issues Committee for consideration of a variance to the sign ordinance at 2900 Linden Avenue – Regina Theo/Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department – **Special Issues Committee**
- 26.08.16** Request for consideration of a West Homewood Street Festival – Justin Limbaugh/Vance Moody – **Public Safety Committee**
- 27.08.16** Request for consideration of additional lighting on Valley Avenue – Britt Thames – **Public Safety Committee/Finance Committee**
- 28.08.16** Request for consideration to coordinate and synchronize traffic lights on Lakeshore Parkway – Randy Hambley/Traffic Maintenance Division/Police Department – **Public Safety Committee/Finance Committee**
- 29.08.16** Request for consideration of additional trash cans for Downtown Homewood – Britt Thames – **Finance Committee**
- 30.08.16** Request for consideration of declaring the following vehicles surplus property: 2015 Freightliner M2-106 VIN: 1FVACXDT3FHGK4580 with Terex Aerial Device TC 55 and 2016 Ford F550 VIN: 1FDUF5GT7GEA73517 with Aerial Device LT 40 for the purposes of trading for 2017 trucks of equal or greater value – Gordon Jaynes/ Fleet Maintenance Superintendent – **Finance Committee**
- 31.08.16** Request for city to make improvements behind alley at 509 Edgeland Place – Walter Jones/Laura and Kevin Patton – **Public Works Committee/Finance Committee**
- 32.08.16** Request to Amend the FY15-16 Budgets – Melody Salter, Finance Director – **Finance Committee**
- 33.08.16** Request for consideration of street lights on Dixon Avenue – Walter Jones/Jason Biggs – **Public Safety Committee**
- 42.08.16** Consideration for making part of an alleyway between Woodland and Broadway, pedestrian only - Katie McKibbon/Patrick McClusky – **Public Safety Committee**

Mr. McClusky moved to approve the Committee Referral Agenda as amended. Mr. Moody seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

OTHER NEW BUSINESS

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 24.08.16 – Request for consideration of Petition of Annexation for the property located at 1628 Dobbs Lane (Legal Description: Lot 1 Resurvey of Lakewood Hills, Lots 87-91, as recorded in Map Book 226, Page 54 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama) – Cara and Andrew Grooms/City Clerk – Planning and Development Committee.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the first reading of the proposed Ordinance for the Council's consideration:

Ordinance No.

(An Ordinance to accept the Petition of Annexation for the property located at 1628 Dobbs Lane (Legal Description: Lot 1 Resurvey of Lakewood Hills, Lots 87-91, as recorded in Map Book 226, Page 54 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama))

Mrs. Smith moved for unanimous consent of the proposed Ordinance as read. Mr. Wright seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion for unanimous consent carried.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Ordinance for the Council's consideration:

Ordinance No. 2626

(An Ordinance to accept the Petition of Annexation for the property located at 1628 Dobbs Lane (Legal Description: Lot 1 Resurvey of Lakewood Hills, Lots 87-91, as recorded in Map Book 226, Page 54 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama))

Mr. Moody moved for the adoption and enrollment and publication according to law of Ordinance No. 2626. Mr. McClusky seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 23.08.16 – Request to set a Public Hearing and Referral to Planning and Development Committee for consideration of Petition of Annexation for the property located at 913 and 1400 Shades Crest Road (Legal Description: A part of Lots 15-A and 16-A, according to the Resurvey of Lots 15 and 16, Block 7 Shades Cliff, as recorded in Map Book 242, Page 61 in the Probate Office of Jefferson County, Alabama) – Melba Kane/Jolene Mills/City Clerk – Planning and Development Committee.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that this Item would be carried over.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 25.08.16 – Request to set a Public Hearing and Referral to the Special Issues Committee for consideration of a variance to the sign ordinance at 2900 Linden Avenue – Regina Theo/Greg Cobb/Building, Engineering and Zoning Department.

Mr. Limbaugh stated that the Public Hearing would be set for September 12, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 34.08.16 – Request for consideration of closing Montessori Way on October 2, 2016 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for Creative Montessori's Grand Opening Event – Britt Thames.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-119

(A Resolution closing Montessori Way on October 2, 2016 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for Creative Montessori's Grand Opening Event)

Mr. Thames moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-119. Mr. Hawkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 35.08.16 – Request for consideration of approval of vouchers for the period of August 8, 2016 through August 28, 2016 – City Treasurer/Finance Committee.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-120

(A Resolution approving vouchers for the period of August 8, 2016 through August 28, 2016)

Mr. Wright moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-120. Mrs. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 36.08.16 – Request to declare intent to issue Warrants and use proceeds from sale of same to make capital expenditures in an amount not to exceed \$4,250,000 – City Attorney and Mayor McBrayer.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-121

(A Resolution to declare intent to issue Warrants and use proceeds from sale of same to make capital expenditures in an amount not to exceed \$4,250,000)

Mr. Thames moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-121. Mr. Wright seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried on a 10-1 vote. Mr. Hallman voted no.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 37.08.16 - Request to authorize Mayor McBrayer to sign a letter of intent to purchase 123 West Oxmoor Road, Homewood, Alabama – City Attorney and Mayor McBrayer.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-122

(A Resolution to authorize Mayor McBrayer to sign a letter of intent to purchase 123 West Oxmoor Road, Homewood, Alabama)

Mr. McClusky moved for unanimous consent of the proposed Resolution as read. Mr. Wyatt seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion for unanimous consent carried.

Mr. Thames moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-122. Mr. McClusky seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 38.08.16 – Request to Amend FY 15-16 Budgets for purchase of 123 West Oxmoor Road, Homewood, AL – Mayor and Melody Salter/Finance Director.

Mrs. Smith moved for unanimous consent of the proposed Resolution as read. Mr. Laws seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion for unanimous consent carried.

Mr. McClusky moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-123. Mr. Hawkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a roll call vote, the votes were Yeas: Mr. Hallman, Mr. Thames, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Moody, Mr. McClusky, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Laws, Mr. Wright and Mr. Limbaugh.

The motion carried without dissent.

The next item, taken out of order, under Other New Business was Item No. 41.08.16 – Request for consideration to repeal Resolution No. 15-123 (A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to designate J.H. Berry Risk Services to be the exclusive broker of record for the City of Homewood) – City Attorney/Mayor McBrayer.

At this time, Mr. Kendrick presented the following Resolution for the Council's consideration:

Resolution No. 16-124

(A Resolution to repeal Resolution No. 15-123 (A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to designate J.H. Berry Risk Services to be the exclusive broker of record for the City of Homewood))

Mr. Wyatt moved for the adoption and enrollment of Resolution No. 16-124. Mrs. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Limbaugh asked if the Council had any questions or comments regarding the motion. There was no response from the Council.

On a voice vote, the motion carried without dissent.

The next item on the Agenda under Other New Business was Item No. 39.08.16 – Presentation of Mayor's Fiscal Year 2016-2017 proposed budgets for General, Capital, Debt Service and Special Revenue Funds – Mayor Scott McBrayer.

Mayor McBrayer addressed the Council and stated that each year the Mayor presented the budget to the Council but the goal of his budget was to give a history so for every single line item from purchasing vehicles to dog food there was a history of that

purchase over the last three years so he had a proposal that was needed for next year that he would be asking for and then ultimately passed by Council. Mayor McBrayer further stated that a lot of times this was a contentious issue but it was not for him because he had a Council that he felt like were looking out for the best for the City so he always asked them to not let him make a mistake so he did not have to be right on every single issue because it was hard to get something wrong when there was eleven Council members, a Mayor and the Finance staff all working to try to do the right thing. Mayor McBrayer added that tonight was just a budget presentation and then the budget meetings would be set after the presentation.

Mayor McBrayer stated that the first thing was the Fund Balance which was just the accumulation of revenues over expenditures so Unassigned General Funds were almost \$12 million, General Fund/Committed, Assigned and Non-Spendable was just over \$15 million, Assigned Capital was \$3.8 million, Debt Service Fund was \$11.2 million and Special Revenue Funds which included restricted, committed and assigned was a little over \$4.2 million, bringing the total Fund Balance to \$46,457,000.00. Mayor McBrayer further stated that the Operating Results for 2015 was \$285,574.00 which just went back to 2011 that showed surplus from each year so from 2011 all the way to 2015 there were surpluses that were revenue over expenses and excess exist after paying employee bonuses of \$375,000.00 and transferring \$1 million to Capital Projects Fund, which was for Fiscal Year 2015 and going back to Fiscal Year 2014 that surplus existed after paying employee bonuses of \$350,000.00 that year and transferring a half a million to the Capital Projects Fund. Mayor McBrayer added that the Cash Balance on hand in General Fund Checking was \$8.6 million, General Public Funds Investment was \$7.1 million, Rainy Day Fund reserved for Economic Uncertainty was almost \$11 million as of June 30, 2016. Mayor McBrayer further added the Seven Cents Gas Fund, Debt Service Fund was \$9.9 million, Capital Projects was \$1.8 million, and rounding out with Escrow and Insurance.

Mayor McBrayer stated that the 911/Jail Corrections/Court Corrections/Sales Tax Fund was almost \$3 million and there was \$123,000.00 in Special Court giving a total cash balance on hand of \$51,892,334.00. Mayor McBrayer further stated that Payroll was Budgeted with Merit Increases with the city absorbing the entire cost of the projected 6.5 percent increase in SEIB premiums amounting to approximately \$179,000.00 annualized. Mayor McBrayer added that his budget did not have any money allocated for annual bonuses although he would ask the Council to consider that before year end if they continued to have the surplus that they anticipated if they could keep expenses where they were. Mayor McBrayer further added that due to the city reaching its goal on Employee Wellness Screens the city received the best rate of Preferred and will receive a Wellness discount but they had been told they were going to have a 6.5 percent increase

in premiums and his budget included several promotions and premium upgrades due to consolidating and un-funding certain positions after talking with the Department Heads.

Mayor McBrayer stated that the General Fund Budget for 2016 and 2017 total budgeted revenues was almost \$42 million, Other Sources/Reduction of Fund Balance was \$1.3 million giving a total expenditures of \$43.2 million. Mayor McBrayer further stated that Total Budgeted Revenue on Capital Projects was \$3.2 million, Reduction of Fund Balance was \$3.8 million, giving the total Expenditures a total of \$7.1 million. Mayor McBrayer added that the Capital Projects that he was looking to fund and proceed with for the upcoming year was continued funding of the Greenway construction, continued street paving from the money approved to be transferred from Capital Project Funds to Debt Service Fund in the amount of \$2.3 million, continued funding of the I-65 Diamond Interchange Fund and a city match of \$56,000.00 for funding the City Master Plan which came out of committee and was asked by the Council to place that in the Budget. Mayor McBrayer further added that upon receiving the departments' requested budget he asked the departments to review the General and Capital Fund Budgets and make voluntary reductions where possible and most did that and those that did not were reviewed for further reductions as well as reductions of over \$1.5 million in Capital Projects, Expenditures from the Departments.

Mayor McBrayer stated an overview of all funds was General Fund of \$43 million, Seven Cents Gas Tax and Four and Five Cent Gas Tax was \$548,000.00, Debt Service Fund-11 was 6.3 million, Capital Projects was \$7.1 million, Escrow/Insurance/E911/Corrections/Jail/Court/Special/IT Fund/Judicial Administrative Fund totaled \$61,011,000.00. Mayor McBrayer further stated that Board of Education was budgeted to receive net revenues from the city of Homewood \$8.1 million for sales tax collections of the city and another \$8.3 million for 14.2 mills of property tax, personal property tax, net collection of cost, and expected payments to Homewood City Schools was in excess of just over \$16.5 million. Mayor McBrayer added that in closing, Ms. Salter would pass out the budget after the meeting and though it was a tough time of year to do the budgets with the election and Ms. Salter having a dual role as Finance Director and City Clerk, this could not have been done without a lot of people helping such as Mr. Kendrick and Mr. Robert Burgett and the Finance Department but with everyone's help he believed he had given good, honest numbers.

Mr. Wright stated that the Planning and Development Committee would meet on September 6, 2016 at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the Special Issues Committee would meet on September 6, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Moody stated that the Public Works Committee would meet on September 6, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. McClusky stated that the Public Safety Committee would meet on September 6, 2016 at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Jones stated that the Finance Committee would meet on September 6, 2016 at 6:45 p.m. and at 7:15 p.m. for the Budget Hearing Overview.

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was, on a motion duly made, adjourned.