



CITY OF TUPELO

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Date: October 5, 2026, 6:00 P.M.

Location: City Council Chambers, City Hall, 71 East Troy Street, Tupelo, MS

CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairman Victor Fleitas called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

- **Invocation:** Mr. Scott Davis
- **Pledge of Allegiance:** Ms. Patti Thompson

Committee members and staff introduced themselves for the record.

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Victor Fleitas, Ms. Leslie Mart, Mr. Lindsey Leake, Ms. Patti Thompson, Mr. Scott Davis, Mr. Aaron Washington

Staff Present:

Mr. Tanner Newman, Director of Development Services, Mr. Pat Falkner, Planning Consultant, Ms. Kim Rushing, Community Development and Outreach Coordinator, Mr. Patrick Reagan, Chief Building Inspector

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Action:** Motion made by Ms. Patti Thompson to approve the minutes of the August 31, 2026, meeting as submitted.
 - **Second:** Ms. Leslie Mart
 - **Vote:** Approved by show of hands; motion carried.
-

REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

Mr. Newman reported that the City Council was scheduled to consider the rezoning request for the Coley Road parcel the following evening. He also reported that the City Council had remanded appeal FLEX26-03, concerning the proposed Kids World Daycare at 205 Commerce Street, to the Planning Committee for further review.

OLD BUSINESS

1. FLEX26-04 (PARCEL 072N-09-046-01) (Flexible use for a 240-unit apartment complex off McCullough/I-22) No new action or information was received from the applicant. The item will remain on the table unless the applicant formally withdraws it.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Motion by Ms. Thompson that FLEX26-04 continues to be tabled.
- **Second:** Mr. Leake
- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

The application remains tabled until the next Planning Committee meeting.

2. Flex26-03: Flexible Use - 205 Commerce Street (Parcel 089L-32-013-00)

- **Request:** Flexible use to allow an established daycare (Kids World Daycare of Tupelo) to occupy space previously used by Tupelo Academy of Cosmetology.
- **Notifications:**
Mr. Newman confirmed surrounding property owners were notified. No additional responses were received.
- **Applicant:**
Melissa (Missy) Bell, 1279 CR 87, New Albany, Owner of Kids World Daycare.

Missy Bell, owner of Kids World Daycare, presented the revised site plan and addressed concerns regarding parking and traffic circulation. She explained that relocating the playground fencing could provide approximately 22 on-site parking spaces without relying on parking across Huntington Arena/Commerce Street. She stated that the facility would generally operate Monday through Friday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., with later hours being considered but not currently planned.

Ms. Bell explained that employees and visitors would use the on-site parking, while parents would follow a drop-off and pick-up procedure similar to the facility's current operation. She questioned the applicability of the City's parking requirement to children who do not drive.

Staff clarified that the applicable standard requires 0.35 parking spaces per approved occupant. Based on 159 students and 13 employees, approximately 61 spaces would be required. Staff explained that the standard applies to daycare centers and includes all approved occupants.

Public Comments:

The public hearing was opened, and the following comments and concerns were presented:

- **Michael Walden, property owner:** Supported approval and expressed concern about the additional parking requirement being identified late in the review process. He stated that the project had been under consideration since July, that previous discussions had addressed parking, and that the applicant had responded to earlier concerns. He maintained that the proposed 22 spaces would adequately serve the facility's anticipated employees and visitors, with parents using the drop-off procedure. He also questioned the consistency of parking requirements for other downtown businesses and raised concerns about shared parking arrangements and children crossing the street.
- **Carla Enis, Gumtree Realty:** Supported the proposed daycare and encouraged the City to reconsider zoning regulations along Commerce Street. She stated that the area contains a mix of businesses and that a daycare would be compatible with nearby uses, including Tupelo Ballet. She also emphasized the community's need for more childcare options and noted that existing parking and zoning restrictions could limit the property's future uses.
- **Louise Pearson, 178 Prairie Cove:** Expressed support for additional childcare services, particularly for families in East Tupelo, and questioned whether the parking requirement was practical for daycare facilities.

Staff Review and Committee Discussion:

Mr. Newman explained that the previous approval was contingent upon meeting applicable parking standards. The precise parking requirement was clarified during the subsequent review process. Staff stated that the Coliseum subdistrict does not qualify for the general downtown parking exemption and that shared parking agreements cannot cross a thoroughfare. Adjacent property owners may establish shared parking arrangements where permitted by code, but staff confirmed that the neighboring property owners had declined to provide additional shared parking.

Staff further explained that a change in occupancy or use triggers review under applicable development-code requirements. Staff also clarified that state law does not permit daycare centers, kindergartens, or schools to waive their protected status regarding liquor sales as previously contemplated. Although the applicant had agreed to waive the applicable distance requirements, that agreement could not eliminate the statutory restriction. Staff confirmed that the proposed daycare could affect nearby properties' ability to pursue certain alcohol-related business uses within the protected distance.

Committee members discussed the two principal issues affecting the application:

- **Parking compliance:** The revised site plan provided approximately 22 spaces, which remained below the 61 spaces calculated under the applicable standard. Clarified that any shared parking agreement must be written, must be with adjacent properties, and cannot cross a designated thoroughfare.
- **Protected status and surrounding development:** The daycare's location could restrict future liquor-related uses on nearby properties, and the applicant could not waive the applicable statutory protection under state law.

Members also discussed whether the City should review its parking regulations for daycare centers and the Coliseum subdistrict in the future. The Chair acknowledged that these issues may warrant further consideration but emphasized that the committee must evaluate the application under the existing code. Staff recommended denial based on the revised findings.

Before the vote, Mr. Walden was given an additional opportunity to comment. He reiterated that the applicant had addressed prior concerns, questioned the consistency of parking enforcement among nearby businesses, and requested a variance from the parking and distance requirements.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Ms. Mart moved to **deny** FLEXVAR26-03 based on the revised information provided (parking deficiency and inability to waive liquor-license setback)
- **Second:** Mr. Leake
- **Vote:** Five members voted in favor. Ms. Thompson abstained. No one opposed.

Next Steps: Mr. Newman advised the applicant and interested parties that an appeal of the Planning Committee's decision could be filed with the City Council Clerk within three days.

NEW BUSINESS

There were four applications and one text amendment on tonight's agenda. Acting Chairman Fleitas reviewed public comment procedures for applicants and citizens.

1. Development Plan- MSP26-01 and MAJSUB26-04 (PARCEL(S) 113E-06-139-00, 113E-06-137-00, 101H-01-076-00, 101H-01-142-00, and a portion of 101H-01-079-00) 836 Circle, 805, 901, and 915 Garfield St.

Request: Approval of a major site plan and major subdivision for the first phase of Garfield Commons, a proposed mixed-use residential development.

Notifications:

Mr. Newman confirmed surrounding property owners were notified. No responses had been received.

Applicant:

Ann Ellis, 41190 US HWY 231, Steele, AL, Representative for the applicant IBCP Garfield, LLC, 997 Morrison Dr., Charleston, SC, 29403

Ann Ellis, representing the applicant, presented the proposed Garfield Commons development as a multiphase neighborhood revitalization project intended to provide housing and services near the hospital. The development would combine multifamily housing, duplex residences, healthcare services, open space, and supporting infrastructure.

Phase One includes:

- **Podium building:** An approximately 82,000-square-foot building with a medical clinic and commercial space on the first floor, four stories of residential units above, and associated support and storage areas. The building would contain 56 dwelling units.

- **Cottage and duplex residences:** A planned series of duplexes within the development, totaling 48 dwelling units.
- **Parking:** The applicant proposed 125 spaces for the podium building, using shared parking provisions based on differing peak-use periods for residential and commercial uses. The duplexes would have two parking spaces per unit.
- **Site design:** A walkable neighborhood layout with the podium building closer to Garfield Street and the residential cottages positioned farther behind it. Landscape buffers and site infrastructure were included in the overall plan.

Ms. Ellis reported that discussions with Tupelo Power and Light regarding electrical easements and transformer locations had occurred the previous week. The applicant was preparing an updated plat reflecting the electrical plan for submission.

Committee Questions and Discussion:

Committee members asked whether the proposed retention ponds and wet areas could be modified if additional parking were required. Ms. Ellis said underground parking was unlikely, but the retention ponds could potentially be deepened to reduce their footprint and accommodate additional parking.

The committee clarified that the application before it was for major site plan and major subdivision approval (development plan), not a rezoning request or a parking or landscaping variance.

Mr. Newman explained that the City had entered into a development agreement with the developer and the hospital addressing streets, sidewalks, and related improvements. The plat identified public and private streets, sidewalks, and curbs. He further explained that the MUE zoning district permitted the multifamily residential component by right as upper-story residential and that the development also included single-family cottage uses.

Staff expressed support for the project, noting its compliance with applicable development-plan standards and its potential benefits to the surrounding area. The City had also agreed to provide certain sidewalk and parking connections between the development and the hospital.

Ms. Mart emphasized that the City would need to address any necessary parking modifications separately and that the current approval did not grant variances for parking, sidewalks, or landscaping.

Public Comment:

The public comment period was opened. No members of the public spoke for or against the request.

The public comment period was closed.

Staff Analysis:

Mr. Pat Falkner explained that the development-plan process allows flexibility not otherwise available under standard code provisions and includes review of both the site plan and subdivision. He noted that the project incorporates pedestrian-scale development principles, recognizing that some trips may occur on foot and allowing reduced parking requirements where applicable.

Mr. Falkner also described the project as part of the broader redevelopment of South Gloster Street. He cited the area's major employment center, the housing needs of hospital employees, and potential benefits to the nearby West Lee Acres residential neighborhood.

Staff confirmed the plans showed sidewalks and that they would review landscaping details during construction planning. No variances for sidewalks or landscaping were proposed.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Mr. Davis moved to approve MSP26-01 and MAJSUB26-04 for Garfield Commons, Phase One.
- **Second:** Ms. Thompson
- **Vote:** Approved by show of hands. Motion passed unanimously.

Next Steps:

The applicant was directed to submit completed construction plans and an updated plat incorporating the electrical plan. Mr. Newman advised that the plat would be forwarded to the City Council for approval in the coming weeks. Ms. Ellis stated that the updated electrical information was available for review and that the applicant intended to submit for a permit the following day.

The committee confirmed that one motion could cover both the major site plan and major subdivision because the application was processed as a development plan.

2. RZ26-05: Rezoning Request – (Parcel 079K-30-057-00) tract adjoining Prairie Cove off Chesterville Rd.

Request: Rezone 4.56 acres of the 36.60-acre parent parcel from A/O to LDR to allow continuation of the adjoining existing residential subdivision along Prairie Cove.

Notifications:

Mr. Newman reported that surrounding property owners had been notified of the request and that no responses had been received by staff.

Applicant:

Larry McCord, 6201 Chesterville Rd., Tupelo, MS.

Applicant Larry McCord addressed the Committee and explained that he was requesting rezoning of 4.56 acres adjoining Prairie Cove to allow for potential additional residential development.

Committee members clarified that the request was limited to rezoning the property and did not include approval of a subdivision plat.

During questions, Ms. Mart asked about the pond located within the requested area. Mr. McCord estimated the pond covers approximately 1.4 to 1.5 acres and said he did not intend to fill it. He indicated that portions of the pond could be included within individual lots.

Public Comment:

The public hearing was opened, and the following comments and concerns were presented:

Carol Palmer – 154 Prairie Cove

- Asked whether existing neighborhood deed restrictions regarding minimum home sizes would apply to future development.
- Expressed concern about drainage, explaining that ditches along her property direct water beneath the road and into the pond.
- Raised concerns that filling or reducing the pond could affect drainage for surrounding properties.
- Expressed concern that smaller homes or lots could negatively affect existing property values.

Staff explained that the current request was only for rezoning. Staff will review specific lot sizes and subdivision details during the future platting process. Mr. Newman stated that new lots would need to be compatible with the existing neighborhood, including consideration of surrounding lot sizes.

Robert Hurdle – 146 Prairie Cove

- Expressed concern about existing drainage problems and described water flowing from portions of Chesterville Road and surrounding properties toward the area.
- Raised concerns about the capacity and width of the existing streets to accommodate additional traffic.
- Asked that future development preserve the character of the neighborhood and avoid creating lots that would negatively affect surrounding property values.
- Noted that he would miss the existing pasture and horses on the property.

Phil and Donna Timmons – 172 Prairie Cove

- Expressed concern about losing the existing pasture, pond, and rural views from their home.
- Raised concerns about the potential placement and height of future homes, including the possibility of two-story houses obstructing their view.
- Asked about applicable roof-pitch requirements. Mr. Newman confirmed that the applicable requirements had not changed since 2013.

Louise Pearson – 178 Prairie Cove

- Expressed concern about the pond's appearance and condition during periods when water levels are low.
- Noted that the pond can appear attractive during wetter seasons but may become muddy during late summer and early fall.
- Emphasized the importance of considering the pond's maintenance and drainage function when future lots are designed.

Mr. Newman explained that the pond and its use would be evaluated during the future platting and development review. He noted that ponds may be divided among lots or retained as a separate parcel, depending on the proposed development.

Staff and Committee Discussion:

Mr. Davis clarified that rezoning approval would not authorize the applicant to subdivide or develop the property without further review. The applicant would be required to return to the Committee with a preliminary plat for the proposed subdivision.

Staff explained that the next review would allow evaluation of proposed lot lines, lot sizes, drainage, and other development considerations. Engineering staff may also need to assess the existing street conditions and determine whether additional analysis, such as a traffic study, is necessary.

Mr. Newman stated that the Department of Development Services had no objection to the rezoning request. He reiterated that rezoning would allow the applicant to seek future subdivision approval, and that the proposed lots must be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Committee members acknowledged that rezoning was the first step and that they would address detailed development concerns during subsequent reviews.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Motion by Mr. Davis to **approve** RZ26-05 rezoning request.
- **Second:** Mr. Washington
- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

Next Steps:

Mr. Newman explained that the rezoning request would proceed to the City Council for consideration, likely at the first meeting in November. Development Services will contact the applicant about the meeting schedule, and property owners who received notice of the Planning Committee hearing will also receive notice of the City Council hearing.

If the rezoning is approved by the City Council, the applicant may submit a preliminary plat for the proposed subdivision. Staff would review the plat and present it to the Planning Committee, and surrounding property owners would be notified of the subsequent hearing.

The future review will provide an opportunity to consider subdivision layout, lot sizes, drainage, the pond, street conditions, and compatibility with the existing neighborhood.

3. RZ26-06: Rezoning Request – (Parcel 076K-23-064-00) landlocked tract adjoining McCullough Blvd.

Request: Rezone 1.023 acres to MUCC to allow coordinated use with the adjoining MUCC property fronting McCullough Blvd.

Notifications:

Mr. Newman reported that surrounding property owners had been notified of the request and that no responses had been received by staff.

Applicant:

Dennis Bonds, Bonds Properties, LLC, 5072 Lackey Lane, Tupelo

Applicant Dennis Bonds explained that the subject property is a landlocked, triangular tract that became separated from the original property during development of the Northshire subdivision to the east. The

frontage property along McCullough Boulevard was subsequently developed for commercial use and is now occupied by Busy Lad.

The owner of the adjoining commercial property expressed interest in purchasing the landlocked tract. Mr. Bonds explained that rezoning would be necessary to facilitate the potential sale and coordinated use of the properties.

During questions, Ms. Mart asked whether the prospective purchaser understood the landscaping buffer requirements between the commercial property and the adjoining residential lots.

Mr. Bonds confirmed that he had discussed the requirement with Zoning staff and that the prospective purchaser was aware of and agreeable to maintaining the required **30-foot landscape buffer**.

Public Comment:

The public hearing was opened, and the public was invited to speak for or against the application. No public comments were received.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

Staff and Committee Discussion:

Mr. Newman stated that the Department of Development Services had no objection to the request. He explained that the parcel is currently zoned Low-Density Residential but is landlocked between an established residential subdivision and the commercial development along McCullough Boulevard. The existing subdivision plat has left the property without direct frontage access.

Staff supported rezoning the parcel to Mixed Use Commercial Corridor to accommodate its potential combination with the adjoining commercial property.

Ms. Mart asked whether the motion should specifically address the required landscaping buffer. Mr. Newman responded that the Committee could include such a notation, but staff would enforce the buffer requirement as part of the applicable development review process.

No further questions or discussion were recorded.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Motion by Mr. Davis to **approve** RZ26-06 rezoning request.
- **Second:** Mr. Washington
- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

Next Steps:

Mr. Newman stated that Development Services would notify the applicant of the City Council hearing date. Staff anticipated scheduling the matter for the first Tuesday in November.

4. FLEXVAR26-06: Flexible Variance Request – (Parcel 089P-31-228-00) 300 Elliott St.

Request: Flexible variance from the 100- foot residential separation requirement for a proposed establishment with on-premises beer and light wine activity at 300 Elliott St.

Notifications:

Mr. Newman confirmed that surrounding property owners had been notified of the application. Staff had received inquiries from individuals seeking information about the request, and neighborhood residents were present at the meeting.

Before the applicant's presentation, Mr. Newman clarified that the Committee was considering only the requested variance from the 100-foot residential separation requirement, not approval of the overall project. Five residential units were identified within the applicable 100-foot buffer.

Applicant:

David Jones, 211 Second Ave., Saltillo, Architect and representative for the applicant (Kem Coleman)

Mr. Jones explained that 1817 Brewery, currently located in Okolona, plans to relocate its microbrewery operations to The Mill in Tupelo. The project has been divided into phases. The initial phase would focus on beer manufacturing and distribution, without a taproom or on-site beer sales.

Although the taproom and restaurant components are not part of the initial phase, the applicant requested that the board consider the variance now, anticipating a potential second phase that could include a bar and restaurant.

Mr. Jones identified the proposed brewery space as being in the northeast portion of The Mill, near the railroad tracks and the existing event center. He also discussed potential future development on the building's eastern side, including a restaurant and a possible beer garden.

During questions, Mr. Jones clarified that distribution would occur through the parking lot, with trucks loading and unloading products and receiving deliveries of brewing materials. He anticipated relatively infrequent truck activity, possibly about twice per week, and generally involving local delivery or cargo trucks rather than semitrailers. He noted that the brewery's owner was not present to provide exact distribution-volume estimates.

Public Comment:

The public hearing was opened, and the following comments were received:

Jimmy Blaylock – 350 Elliott Street

- Stated that he has lived in the Mill Village neighborhood throughout his life and that his home is among those closest to the project.
- Asked about the location of distribution activities, anticipated truck traffic, and operating hours.
- Mr. Jones explained that distribution would take place in the parking lot and that deliveries and pickups were expected to be relatively infrequent.
- Mr. Blaylock stated that he did not object to the initial distribution operation but wanted clarification that future bar and restaurant phases would receive any additional review required by city code.

The Chairman explained that the Committee would review future phases according to applicable city requirements and return to the Committee if needed.

Greg Pirkle – 4216 Ridgemont, Belden

- Supported the project and stated that the brewery's initial operations would involve distribution.
- Noted that a variance had previously been granted for The Mill in 2017 for the same type of use.
- Expressed confidence that the proposed location would not increase activity in a manner detrimental to surrounding residents.
- Stated that efforts were being made to reduce noise and improve conditions for the surrounding neighborhood.

Laura Dickey – 543 Magazine Street

- Expressed enthusiasm for the proposed development but raised concerns about neighborhood safety, pedestrian safety, traffic, and existing infrastructure.
- Noted that the traffic signal previously located at Elliott and Green Streets had been removed.
- Reported water-main leaks near Magazine and Madison Streets and along the 500 block of Green Street.
- Also raised concerns about playground equipment recently removed from Mill Town Park and the lack of a clear plan for replacement or future park improvements.

The Chairman encouraged Ms. Dickey and other residents to contact Public Works regarding infrastructure concerns. Ms. Mart suggested that Development Services follow up with the appropriate department concerning the park equipment.

Deborah Tierce – 510 South Broadway Street

- Expressed support for the proposed development.
- Stated that the brewery and potential future restaurant would be positive additions to the neighborhood and could attract visitors to Tupelo.
- Expressed interest in seeing the project advance to include a restaurant or similar gathering place.

No further public comments were received, and the public hearing was closed.

Staff and Committee Discussion:

Mr. Newman explained that the property is located in the Mixed-Use Downtown zoning district, while the residential properties within the 100-foot buffer are located in the Mixed Use Residential district. He noted that the separation requirement would not apply in the same manner if the affected residences were located within the Mixed-Use Downtown district.

Staff also confirmed that a variance had been issued in 2017 for The Mill involving the same use. Based on that precedent, the Department of Development Services had no objection to granting the requested variance.

Committee members expressed support for the proposal. The discussion acknowledged that the variance was an initial step in a potentially multiphase development.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Motion by Mr. Leake to **approve** FLEXVAR26-06.
- **Second:** Ms. Mart
- **Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

Next Steps:

Mr. Newman explained that any appeal must be filed with the City Council Clerk within three days, beginning the day after the meeting. If no appeal is filed, the application will proceed to the City Council for consideration.

Future project phases, including any proposed taproom, bar, restaurant, or beer garden, will be subject to applicable city requirements and any additional review required under the city code.

5. Proposed Text Amendment

TA26-05- Amend Table 5.3.4.3(2), regarding permitted nonresidential uses within the Mixed-Use Downtown Overlay, specifically the Coliseum Subdistrict.

Notifications:

Mr. Newman confirmed that the required public notice had been published in the newspaper in accordance with applicable requirements. He clarified that individual property-owner notification was not required for this proposed text amendment.

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Newman presented the proposed amendments on behalf of the Department of Development Services. He explained that staff had been working with Downtown Main Street and Lucia Randall to identify needed revisions to the allowed uses within the Coliseum Subdistrict.

Staff indicated that the proposed changes were intended to correct omissions from previous code amendments, streamline development review, and better accommodate existing and anticipated commercial uses in the downtown area.

The following amendments were presented:

Land Use	Proposed Classification
Retail Sales	Use by Right
Restaurants	Change from Compatibility to Use by Right
Financial Institutions	Change from Compatibility to Use by Right
Offices	Change from Compatibility to Use by Right
Medical Offices	Change from Compatibility to Use by Right
Outdoor Dining	Change from Compatibility to Use by Right
Microbreweries and Brewpubs	Add as Use by Right
Offices with Storage	Add as Use by Compatibility
Drive-Through Services	Add as Use by Compatibility

Mr. Newman provided the following explanations:

- **Retail Sales:** Currently not listed as an allowed use within the Coliseum Subdistrict. Staff believes this was an unintended omission from the 2022 code amendments and recommended allowing retail sales by right.
- **Restaurants, Financial Institutions, Offices, Medical Offices, and Outdoor Dining:** Staff recommended changing these uses from compatibility review to uses by right to eliminate unnecessary public hearings for routine commercial activities.
- **Microbreweries and Brewpubs:** Staff recommended adding these uses by right to support downtown commercial development.
- **Offices with Storage:** Staff recommended allowing these uses by compatibility to accommodate existing downtown buildings with office frontage and rear storage areas while retaining oversight.
- **Drive-Through Services:** Staff recommended allowing these uses by compatibility rather than by right, permitting case-by-case review. The proposed bank development in the Coliseum Subdistrict was cited as an example of the need for this provision.

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Mart questioned whether allowing medical offices by right could create conflicts with alcohol-sales distance restrictions, particularly when medical facilities serve children.

City Attorney Ben Logan clarified that pediatric medical offices are not considered protected places under the applicable city ordinance or state law for these purposes. He further explained that medical marijuana establishments are not permitted within the Downtown Overlay District.

Mr. Logan distinguished between local beer-related variance provisions and state statutory restrictions involving protected places such as schools and kindergartens. He confirmed that allowing medical offices by right would not, in itself, create the alcohol-sales conflict raised by Ms. Mart.

Ms. Mart also asked whether the proposed amendments would permit churches. Staff confirmed that the proposed amendments did not add churches as an allowed use within the Coliseum Subdistrict.

Mr. Logan provided additional clarification regarding religious uses within the city, explaining that churches are permitted in various zoning districts but are not listed as allowed uses in certain Downtown Overlay subdistricts and other specified districts. He stated that staff and legal counsel had reviewed these provisions in connection with previous inquiries and potential federal religious land-use considerations.

No additional questions were raised.

Public Comment

The public comment period was opened. No members of the public spoke for or against the amendment. The public comment period was closed.

Motion and Vote:

- **Action:** Motion by Ms. Mart to **approve TA26-06** the proposed text amendments to Table 5.3.4.3(2) as presented.
 - **Second:** Ms. Thompson
 - **Vote:** Approved by show of hands.
-

Additional Business

City Council Review

Acting Chairman Fleitas stated that the City Council would review the Committee's decisions and that Development Services would report the Council's actions at the next Planning Committee meeting.

Upcoming Applications

Mr. Newman reported that at least one application involving the Spring Lake Overlay Design District was anticipated for the next meeting.

Next Meeting Schedule

The following meeting dates were confirmed:

- **Work Session:** Monday, October 26, 2026, at 5:15 p.m.
 - **Regular Public Meeting:** Monday, November 2, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.
-

ADJOURNMENT

- **Action:** Motion by Ms. Mart to adjourn
- **Second:** Ms. Thompson
- **Vote:** Motion carried

Meeting adjourned.