

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE MADISON COUNTY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD AND CONDUCTED ON
THURSDAY, THE 9th DAY OF APRIL 2026 AT 9:00 A.M. AT THE
MADISON COUNTY COMPLEX BUILDING**

BE IT REMEMBERED that a meeting of the Madison County Planning and Zoning Commission was duly called, held and conducted on Thursday, the 9th day of April 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in the Madison County Complex Building.

Present: Dr. Keith Rouser
 Rev. Henry Brown
 Mandy Sumerall
 Jean McCarty
 Amanda Myers

Scott Weeks, Planning and Zoning Administrator

The meeting was opened with prayer by Commissioner Brown, and all present participated in pledging allegiance to our flag, led by Chairman Rouser.

There first came on for consideration the minutes of the March 12, 2026, meeting of the Commission. Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with all voting “aye,” the March 12, 2026, minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission were approved.

There next came on the need to open the meeting for public hearing of certain matters. Upon motion by Commissioner McCarty, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with all voting “aye,” the public hearing was so opened.

There next came on for consideration the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel Nos.: 081F-13-004/00.00 and 081F-13-004/00.00 from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District. LFP, LLC simultaneously submitted an Application to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel No.: 082D-18-001/00.00 from its current designation of (SU-1) Special Use District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District. The subject properties are both located east of Autumn Crest and Falls Crossing subdivisions on Catlett Road and is in Supervisor District 2.

Scott Shoemaker appeared on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Shoemaker advised that the Applicant’s intent is to rezone the properties in order to continue the adjacent Autumn Crest development. Mr. Shoemaker advised that there are two separate petitions because of the currently separate zoning designations, but that the petitions are identical in content and intent.

Mr. Shoemaker quoted Section 806 of the Madison County Zoning Ordinance as to the required criteria for re-zoning, and advised that he was seeking re-zoning based on Section 806.03

(B) being the change in the character of the neighborhood and public need. Mr. Shoemaker argued that the change in the character of the neighborhood started a while back and directed the Commission to the included map in Attachment “D” of his Application which shows the current zoning of properties adjacent to the Subject Property. Mr. Shoemaker argued that there have been four (4) properties re-zoned since the adoption of the 2019 Ordinance and directed the Commission to a map of those properties and included dates of re-zoning for such properties on Attachment “E” of his Application. Mr. Shoemaker further directed the Commission to the timeline of the rezonings of these properties as set forth in Attachment “F” of his Application. Mr. Shoemaker next directed the Commission to the minutes of the Board of Supervisors in Attachment “G” of his Application which correspond to the re-zonings of these properties. Mr. Shoemaker argued that these re-zonings demonstrate the required change in the character of the neighborhood needed to justify the rezoning of the Subject Properties since the adoption of the Ordinance in 2019.

Mr. Shoemaker next turned to the reason that the Subject Property has an R-1 zoning designation in the first place as being the result in the change of Mississippi law regarding agricultural property, and that the certain agricultural properties were comprehensively re-zoned to the least restrictive residential designation, and that it would be up to the owner of any such property to seek re-zoning of any such property.

Mr. Shoemaker then directed the Commission back to the map included as Attachment “D,” and asked the Commission to consider whether an R-1 zoning fits the area. Mr. Shoemaker then directed the Commission to the Comprehensive Plan and its language that the Land Use Plan should not be regarded as being cast in concrete and instead is subject to change as the County grows and may be amended at any time following the necessary public hearing.

Mr. Shoemaker next argued that one of the reasons for R-1 designated areas to remain as such is because sewer is not available in such areas and treatment plants must be utilized. However, Mr. Shoemaker advised that sewer is available at the Subject Property and directed the Commission to a letter from Bear Creek Water Association attached to his Application as Attachment “M” and stating that water and sewer are available at the Subject Property. Mr. Shoemaker next argued that an R-1 designation does not work for the Subject Property as infrastructure costs are too high for too few number of lots in such a designation.

Next, Mr. Shoemaker argued that there is a public need for the re-zoning of the Subject Property. Mr. Shoemaker directed the Commission to Attachment “H” which is recent data from the Central Mississippi Realtors and a demonstrated decrease in housing inventory of 2.3% and a months supply of inventory decreased 2.4% to 4.1%. Mr. Shoemaker argued that a six month inventory is a healthy market and that Madison County falls below that number. Mr. Shoemaker next argued that the data shows a specific days on the market analysis for residential new construction in the 39110 area code in the Madison County School District for 2024-2025 and a demonstrated decline in number of sales and days on the market. Mr. Shoemaker further argued a demonstrated decline in number of sales and days on the market for homes in the 1800-2200 sf range. Mr. Shoemaker next argued a demonstrated decline in the number of sales and days on the market in the specific neighborhoods of Belle Terre, First Colony, Autumn Crest, and Falls Crossing which are all in closed proximity to the Subject Property.

Mr. Shoemaker next produced a demonstrative plat of the proposed development to the Commission. Such demonstrative plat is attached hereto as **Exhibit "1."** Mr. Shoemaker advised that development of properties takes time and asked the Commission to look at Attachment "F" of his Application. Mr. Shoemaker directed the Commission to a re-zoning of +/-34 acres that occurred in March of 2021, and noted that the first building permit issued on that same property was not issued until May of 2024.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sumerall, Mr. Shoemaker confirmed that there is one way in and one way out to the Subject Property, but added that there are other neighborhoods, such as Grayhawk, with the same means of ingress/egress. Mr. Shoemaker further advised that the demonstrative plat shows a total of 87 lots for the Subject Property, that number could fluctuate at the time of actual platting, and that he simply wanted something for the Commission to look at. Mr. Shoemaker further advised that the current homes in Autumn Crest are 1800 sf and above, and that the plan is to continue the same with the Subject Property. Mr. Shoemaker further advised that he had spoken with individuals about traffic studies, but that he did not have any data to submit to the Commission today.

In response to question from Commissioner Myers, Mr. Shoemaker advised that he did not have current plans to expand beyond the Subject Property as the property adjacent to the west is Ashbrooke, the property adjacent to the south is not for sale so far as he is aware, and to the east is Falls Crossing and Autumn Crest.

Amy Odom appeared in opposition and advised that she purchased her home in Autumn Crest in 2025, and that her home is in the cul-de-sac where the street leading to the Subject Property will be located. Ms. Odom stated that her concern was for her child with the increased traffic, and the one way in, one way out for Fall's Crossing and Autumn Crest with the increased traffic. Ms. Odom stated that she was not aware of the potential for future expansion or development when she purchased her home, and did so in order to have a cul-de-sac where her child could play. Ms. Odom expressed further concern over the time for daily commute, the neighborhood road conditions with increased traffic, and if there would be any added amenities to help bring in other families.

Megan Schultz appeared in opposition and advised that she lives approximately four (4) houses in on Autumn Drive. Ms. Schultz echoed the same concerns as Ms. Odom and further advised that she is concerned with the amount of trash that comes with construction. Ms. Schultz further advised that she is concerned that the grass around the pond across the fence in the rear of her house only gets mowed twice a year, and that she can see it from her backyard. Ms. Schultz advised that she does not believe that there is a functioning HOA to maintain this area.

Jason Peterson appeared in opposition and advised that he lives at the end of Autumn Crest where the proposed road would continue into the Subject Property. Mr. Peterson expressed concern that the proposed road is going directly underneath an energy transmission line, and that he was unaware of whether Entergy had been contacted or given approval for this road. Mr. Peterson also expressed concerns of increased traffic and its effect on the kids that play in his yard. Mr. Peterson further expressed concern over the effect of the development on his property value and the length of time the proposed development would take.

James Goodman appeared in opposition and advised that he owns a home on Autumn Hill. Mr. Goodman advised that he bought his home because it was on a cul-de-sac and it was a nice quiet neighborhood. Mr. Goodman argued that the proposed development of the Subject Property would decrease the value of his property. Mr. Goodman advised that he had only gotten a letter regarding the re-zoning and that he would like more information about what is proposed. Mr. Goodman further echoed the concerns raised by those prior to him.

Carolyn Goodman appeared in opposition and advised that there are currently empty lots next to her that are not being properly maintained and that are available for homes to be built on. Ms. Goodman advised that she lives in Cleveland but bought this home in order to see her grandchildren. Ms. Goodman also argued that there needed to be an additional entrance for the neighborhood.

Mr. Shoemaker reappeared and advised that at the closing of all of the lots in Autumn Crest, each purchaser executed a consent to modification of plat and protective covenants for Autumn Crest subdivision. As such, Mr. Shoemaker argued that it was never disclosed that he wanted to expand the neighborhood. Further, Mr. Shoemaker distributed a copy of the actual plat of Autumn Crest (attached hereto as **Exhibit "2"**) and explained that Autumn Drive simply dead ends, and that there was never any illusion that it would not be expanded. Further, Mr. Shoemaker advised that upon execution of contracts on lots closer to the Subject Property, he included a mock up of potential expansion of the Subject Property. Accordingly, Mr. Shoemaker argued that he has been very upfront about additional properties and disclosed same.

Elaine Saxton appeared and advised that she, Mr. Peterson, and Ms. Schultz are original purchasers from Mr. Shoemaker, and that Ms. Odom and the Goodmans are second owners of their homes. As such, the Odoms and Goodmans may not have had such disclosures made to them at their closings.

In response to question from Commissioner Sumerall, Attorney Clark advised the Commission that Mr. Shoemaker's drawing (Exhibit "1") is only an exemplary drawing and that the only thing currently before the Commission is the re-zoning application. Mr. Clark further advised that Mr. Shoemaker had correctly articulated the criteria for re-zoning, but that the evidence supporting such criteria is a Commission decision on whether to approve, deny, table, approve with conditions is up to the Commission.

In response to question from Commissioner Myers, Mr. Clark advised that preliminary platting of any proposed development is a separate submission process.

Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall to table the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel Nos.: 081F-13-004/00.00 and 081F-13-004/00.00 from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District until such time as Applicant produces a traffic study, approval from Entergy to construct a road under the existing transmission line, and comments, if any, from the County Engineer, seconded by Commissioner Myers, with all voting "aye," the matter was so tabled.

Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall to table the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel No.: 082D-18-001/00.00 from its current designation of (SU-1) Special Use District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District, until such time as Applicant produces a traffic study, approval from Entergy to construct a road under the existing transmission line, and comments, if any, from the County Engineer, seconded by Commissioner Myers, with all voting “aye,” the matter was so tabled.

There next came on for consideration the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District. The subject property is on Old Canton Road and is in Supervisor District 5.

Upon motion by Commissioner Brown to table the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, with all voting “aye,” the matter was so tabled.

There next came on for consideration, the need to close the public hearing. Upon motion by Commissioner McCarty to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with all voting “aye,” the public hearing was so closed.

There next came on for discussion, the setting of the May 2026 meeting. May 7, 2026, was suggested. Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall, seconded by Chairman Rouser, with all voting “aye,” the motion to set the May 2026 meeting for May 7, 2026, was approved.

With there being no further business, the April 9, 2026, meeting of the Madison County Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned.

Date

Dr. Keith Rouser, Chairman

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE MADISON COUNTY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD AND CONDUCTED ON
THURSDAY, THE 7th DAY OF MAY 2026 AT 9:00 A.M. AT THE
MADISON COUNTY COMPLEX BUILDING**

BE IT REMEMBERED that a meeting of the Madison County Planning and Zoning Commission was duly called, held and conducted on Thursday, the 7th day of May 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in the Madison County Complex Building.

Present: Dr. Keith Rouser
 Rev. Henry Brown
 Mandy Sumerall
 Jean McCarty

Scott Weeks, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Absent: Amandy Myers

The meeting was opened with prayer by Commissioner Brown, and all present participated in pledging allegiance to our flag, led by Chairman Rouser.

There first came on for consideration the minutes of the April 9, 2026, meeting of the Commission. Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, with all voting “aye,” the April 9, 2026, minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission were approved.

There next came on the need to open the meeting for public hearing of certain matters. Upon motion by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, with all voting “aye,” the public hearing was so opened.

There next came on for consideration the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District. The subject property is on Old Canton Road and is in Supervisor District 5. This matter was tabled at the meeting of the Commission on March 12, 2026.

Sharon Hardigree appeared as the owner of the subject property. Ms. Hardigree advised that she had recently reached out to the surrounding property owners and advised them that the Hardigrees understand their concerns and that their proposal includes measures to minimize disruptions and enhance the area. Ms. Hardigree further advised that they desired to work together to make the proposal beneficial to everyone. Ms. Hardigree advised that the improvements to the neighborhood would be upgraded infrastructure, local service and job creation, and restricted hours of operation for public access. Ms. Hardigree advised that aesthetically, any commercial buildings would compliment and not take away from the neighborhood. Ms. Hardigree further advised that commercial development would boost property values in the area.

Ms. Hardigree further advised that she would agree to grant a fifteen (15) year access easement to the adjacent property owners, George and Wanda Carmeans.

Attorney Clark advised the Commission that Mr. James T. Carmeans was at the April meeting of the Commission and advised that he would not be able to attend the May meeting, but that he did draft a letter of objection and provide it to counsel for distribution to the Commission. Such letter is attached to these minutes as **Exhibit "A."**

George Carmeans appeared in opposition and advised that he did receive a text message from Ms. Hardigree, but that it only asked what they could do to make this easier. Mr. Carmeans further advised that he had a petition signed by adjacent property owners that are in opposition to the re-zoning. Such petition is attached hereto as **Exhibit "B."** Mr. Carmeans further advised that he had been approached by property owners in Harvey Crossing that wished to express their opposition to the re-zoning.

Mr. Carmeans argued that people do not move that far out of town to be next to a shopping center, but do so for the peace and quiet of a residential area. Mr. Carmeans read the letter that his son had sent to counsel (**Exhibit "A"**) aloud to the Commission. Mr. Carmeans reiterated that he is opposed to the re-zoning and desires for the property to remain residential. Mr. Carmeans further argued that, pursuant to the deed to his property, he has permanent access to his property through the subject property, no matter who owns it.

Wanda Carmeans appeared in opposition and argued that the re-zoning affects them more than it does anyone else because they live directly behind the subject property and have no road frontage. Ms. Carmeans argued that there is nothing positive to come from the re-zoning, and that she felt if the Commission were in her shoes, they would be opposed.

Dale Barnes appeared in opposition and advised that she lives right around the corner from the subject property and had lived there since 1985. Ms. Barnes advised she did not know the subject property had ever been considered commercial and had always been residential. Ms. Barnes further argued that with all of the planned work in the area, including the widening of Yandell Road, the area would be used for a variety of purposes, but that it seemed silly to place a commercial property in the middle of residential properties.

In response to question from Commissioner McCarty, Mr. Carmeans stated that he has a 20' perpetual easement along the edge of the subject property and that was conveyed to him in the deed to his property. Mr. Carmeans further advised that numerous utilities come up the easement to his house, and that he has improved the easement for use as a driveway to his house. Mr. Carmeans further advised that North Old Canton Road is approximately 400' from the front of his house and that he has allowed trees to grow on the front of his property between his house and the road.

Ms. Hardigree reappeared and advised that Mr. Carmeans does have another means of access through his son's adjacent property but that they have no objection to Mr. Carmeans using the easement through their property and if the property ever sold, the owners would have to allow the Carmeans' access as well. Mr. Carmeans responded that the only access to his son's property

from his is a four wheeler trail that his grandchildren use, and reiterated that his deed contains a perpetual easement across the subject property.

In response to question from Commissioner McCarty, Attorney Clark advised that if Mr. Carmeans purchased his property along with a dedicated easement along and across the subject property, then that is a perpetual easement. Mr. Clark further advised that he would assume that the Hardigrees purchased their property subject to the easement.

In response to question from Chairman Rouser, Mr. Carmeans advised that his son's house is on the corner of Cedar Grove Lane and North Old Canton Road, and that he accesses his property by public road.

Commissioner McCarty stated that remote neighborhoods need a commercial hub, but that they also need a neighborhood-friendly commercial hub and C-2 does not match that. However, Commissioner McCarty noted that there are two (2) adjacent parcels that have already been rezoned to C-2. Commissioner McCarty further noted that neighborhood amenities help drive increased property values of homes in a neighborhood. Commissioner McCarty stated that a neighborhood-friendly commercial hub that 1) buffers the residential district, and 2) enhances the residential district would be beneficial. Commissioner McCarty stated that it seemed the Commission is stuck with C-2, but that she would like to see it restricted.

Upon motion by Commissioner McCarty to approve the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District with conditions to include an 8' tall landscaped evergreen buffer, or an 8' fence along the west boundary, and half way up the north and south boundary of the subject property in order to completely buffer the adjacent residential properties; and the following specific restrictions and uses to be strictly prohibited: veterinary clinics and pet shops, supermarkets, hotels and motels, bowling alleys, skating rinks, motion picture theaters and similar indoor recreational or entertainment enterprises conducted entirely within fully-enclosed buildings, mortuaries and funeral homes, convenience stores, vehicle sales, rental or lease, vehicle service centers, garages/body shops, big box retail establishments, heavy equipment sales and service, building material sales where some or all building materials, such as bricks, lumber, concrete culverts, etc. are displayed/ stored outdoors or are visible from adjoining thoroughfares, fireworks stands, outdoor advertising (billboards), recreational vehicle parks, rental housing, used (pre-owned) vehicle sales, fully enclosed storage or warehouse, check cashing businesses, payday loan businesses, car title/cash for titles loan businesses, pawn shops, tattoo and/or body piercing parlor, vaporizer stores, smoke lounges or similar businesses where cigarettes/vaporizers are sold or used, palm reading or fortune telling businesses, sports betting/wagering/gaming establishments or businesses whether operated independently of other business purposes or jointly, adult entertainment uses, recreational or entertainment uses that encourage high traffic and parking or produce noise, either outdoor or fully enclosed buildings such as theatres, bowling alleys, musical venues, retail sales uses where bulk inventory is stored outdoors (except for Yard and Garden Centers), patio homes, new and used vehicle sales or rentals, including ATV, RV, golf carts, etc., and quasi-public systems/substations/equipment yards/outdoor storage, seconded by Commissioner Sumerall, with all voting "aye," the motion to approve the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate

District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District with the conditions and restrictions listed immediately above, was approved.

Commissioner McCarty amended the motion to approve the Application of Sharon and David Hardigree to rezone +/-4.4 acres from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (C-2) Highway Commercial District with the conditions and restrictions listed immediately above, and to add that hours of operation will not to exceed 10:00 p.m. Commissioner Sumerall seconded the motion, and with all voting “aye,” the amended motion was approved.

There next came on for consideration the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel Nos.: 081F-13-004/00.00 and 081F-13-004/00.00 from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District. LFP, LLC simultaneously submitted an Application to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel No.: 082D-18-001/00.00 from its current designation of (SU-1) Special Use District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District. The subject properties are both located east of Autumn Crest and Falls Crossing subdivisions on Catlett Road and is in Supervisor District 2. This matter was tabled at the April 9, 2026, meeting until such time as Applicant produces a traffic study, approval from Entergy to construct a road under the existing transmission line, and comments, if any, from the County Engineer.

Scott Shoemaker appeared on behalf of the Applicant, and advised that the intent is to rezone the properties in order to continue the adjacent Autumn Crest development. Mr. Shoemaker next produced a demonstrative plat of the proposed development to the Commission. Such demonstrative plat is attached hereto as **Exhibit “C.”**

Mr. Shoemaker then quoted Section 806 of the Madison County Zoning Ordinance as to the required criteria for re-zoning, and advised that he was seeking re-zoning based on Section 806.03 (B) being the change in the character of the neighborhood and public need. Mr. Shoemaker argued that the change in the character of the neighborhood started a while back and directed the Commission to the included map in Attachment “D” of his Application which shows the current zoning of properties adjacent to the Subject Property.

In response to question from Chairman Rouser, Mr. Shoemaker advised that he had fulfilled each request that the Commission had made, but that he understood that he was to go back through his Application again, and wanted to make certain that his previous argument and presentation regarding the change in character of the neighborhood and public need were included in the record.

Mr. Shoemaker next turned his attention to three items of concern that were raised at the last meeting, and being 1) Is driving under a power line safe? 2) What about traffic concerns? and 3) review of County Engineer. Mr. Shoemaker argued that none of these are factors to effect re-zoning, but that he had addressed each matter.

Mr. Shoemaker distributed an email received from Entergy confirming that there is no issue with a road being constructed under a power line, as long as Entergy requirements are met. Such email is attached hereto as **Exhibit “D.”** Mr. Shoemaker also distributed pictorial examples of

Hampton Hills Subdivision and the neighborhood road going under a power line. Such examples are attached to these minutes as cumulative **Exhibit “E.”** Mr. Shoemaker further distributed a map depicting roads going under power lines at Stribling, Catlett, Gluckstadt Roads and I-55. Such map is attached to these minutes as **Exhibit “F.”** Mr. Shoemaker also noted that there is a power line across Lake Caroline that people boat and fish underneath.

Next, as to the issue of traffic, Mr. Shoemaker distributed a traffic study to the Commission. Such traffic study is attached to these minutes as **Exhibit “G.”** Mr. Shoemaker directed the Commission to page 6 of the traffic study noting planned improvements to Catlett Road and signalizing Stribling Road Extension. Mr. Shoemaker argued that this is doubling the capacity of southbound traffic, and reminded the Commission that although construction is to begin soon, he will probably not begin any homes until sometime in 2029. Next, Mr. Shoemaker next directed the Commission to pages 8 & 9 of the traffic study stating that the future year 2023 levels of service are forecast to be at acceptable levels of service.

Lastly, Mr. Shoemaker advised that he had provided the County Engineer with the traffic study and that Mr. Bryan had stated that based on his initial review, the traffic congestion is essentially unchanged with the construction of new houses and the road construction improvements that are planned on Catlett Road in the coming years, and that this is today’s forecast and there can always be additional improvements to county road infrastructure in the coming years.

Mr. Shoemaker argued that the elements required for a re-zoning had been met.

In response to question from Commissioner Sumerall, Mr. Shoemaker advised that the plan was still to have a one way in and one way out from the proposed neighborhood and that there are 87 lots depicted on his conceptual plan, that that number could go up or down, but that he has a history of actually having less than the maximum number of allowable lots. Mr. Shoemaker further stated that if he saw an opportunity for another entrance/exit to this portion of the neighborhood, then he would do that, but that he does not see that opportunity because the land is not available to do so.

In response to question from Commissioner McCarty, Mr. Shoemaker advised that there are currently 61 houses in Autumn Crest, and over 200 in Falls Crossing.

Clyde Hines appeared in opposition and argued that the traffic is already a concern, but that if you compound that with construction of homes, then it will be an additional concern. Mr. Hines advised that he is not against growth, but that there has to be a better way for traffic to flow.

Jason Peterson appeared in opposition and stated that he is not against the growth or addition to the neighborhood, and that their main concern is the traffic with the one way in and one way out. Mr. Peterson distributed a community petition to the Commission and read the same to the Commission. Such petition is attached to these minutes as **Exhibit “H.”**

Mr. Peterson also referenced the traffic study and the plans to widen Catlett Road to three (3) lanes, and inquired to what the acceptable levels of service actually are and what qualifies them

as such. Mr. Peterson further opined that adding a lane is not going to make much of a difference with the number of homes to be built.

In response to question from Commissioner McCarty, Mr. Shoemaker stated that there are 377 homes in Grayhawk Subdivision, that they do have an emergency exit, but that it is only a vacant lot with no road. Mr. Shoemaker further reiterated that he has thus far been unable to negotiate the purchase of property to the south or north of the subject property.

Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall to approve the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel Nos.: 081F-13-004/00.00 and 081F-13-004/00.00 from its current designation of (R-1) Residential Estate District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District with the condition that the County Engineer, Zoning Administrator, and Board of Supervisors consider the one way in/one way out ingress/egress, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, with all voting “aye,” the motion was approved.

Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall to approve the Application of LFP, LLC to rezone certain property being Madison County Tax Parcel No.: 082D-18-001/00.00 from its current designation of (SU-1) Special Use District to (R-2) Medium Density Residential District with the condition that the County Engineer, Zoning Administrator, and Board of Supervisors consider the one way in/one way out ingress/egress, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, with all voting “aye,” the motion was approved.

There next came on for consideration, the need to close the public hearing. Upon motion by Commissioner Sumerall to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with all voting “aye,” the public hearing was so closed.

There next came on for discussion, the setting of the June 2026 meeting. June 11, 2026, was suggested. Upon motion by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Commissioner Sumerall, with all voting “aye,” the motion to set the June 2026 meeting for June 11, 2026, was approved.

With there being no further business, the May 7, 2026, meeting of the Madison County Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned.

Date

Dr. Keith Rouser, Chairman