

**MINUTES OF THE
TUPELO PLANNING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, June 6, 2022
6:00 PM Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pam Hadley called the meeting to order. Committee members Scott Davis, Gus Hildenbrand, Patti Thompson Lindsey Leake, Leslie Mart, Chair Pam Hadley, Mark Williams, and Bentley Nolan were present. Staff members present included City Planner Jenny Savely, Director of Development Services Tanner Newman and Zoning Administrator Russ Wilson. Chair Hadley asked Mark Williams to open with a prayer and Patti Thompson to lead the pledge. Chair Hadley then presented an opening statement of the committee purpose and reviewed how the committee conducts its business. The Staff and Committee were then asked to introduce themselves and did so.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Hadley asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2022 meeting. Leslie Mart motioned to approve, seconded by Mark Williams and the motion was approved unanimously. Hadley then opened the regular session section of the meeting.

REPORT ON COUNCIL ACTIONS

City Planner Jenny Savely reported that the May Planning Committee minutes were approved by the City Council and that the Council would take up the Major Site Plan review for Butler Park 2 at their June 7th meeting.

Old Business

City Planner Savely also reported on the tabled Text Amendments to the Development Code. Instead of having one big proposal with all the text amendments, she has elected to break them down by section of the development code and as the Planning Committee moves through them, she will present them to the City Council during their work session and then request final approval from the Council when all those documents have been approved by the Planning Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

FLEX22-03 5315 Purnell Road – Estes Garage requests flexible use approval to change, re-establish, expand, alter or make major repairs to a non-conforming use in an MDR Zoning District.

Planner Savely presented the staff analysis for the application and showed a Google Earth Map onscreen of the street view of Estes Garage on Purnell Road. Vehicle Service is not an allowed use in a residential zone so any expansion would require flexible use approval by the Planning Committee. This expansion also required a change in the lot lines to accommodate setbacks for the new addition. This change in lot lines has already been done. Current code requires that the garbage dumpster be enclosed, but staff is recommending as a condition of approval, that the fence along the front east side of the storage area be slatted in order to block the view of the storage yard as well as the dumpster, thus no enclosure will be required around the dumpster which is now located inside the fenced in area.

Hadley asked the applicant to step forward. Mr. Kevin Walls, owner of K&S Services, DBA Estes Garage stepped to the podium. Walls purchased the business in 2006. The front building was built in 1978, was added

onto in 1983. Their business has grown so much and the area surrounding them has grown. They want to add 3 more bays. They have 10 lifts, two flat bays and are one of NAPAs largest dealers, in the top 4 in the state. Walls explained their business standards, employee training and how they have grown four-fold since they started, have six families represented on staff, and are staying on top of current auto technology and have to add on. Wall added that he had already moved the dumpster inside the fence, and has already ordered the slats that will go into the current fence to shield the view. Walls said he has changed the lot lines and owns both lots. Tanner Newman thanked Walls for how clean they keep their property. Walls encouraged the Committee to approve the addition.

There were no questions from the public so Hadley closed the public input portion of the meeting and opened up discussion between the committee members. Scott Davis made a motion to approve with the condition that the applicant install the slats across the front portion of the fence as discussed. Bentley Nolan seconded the motion which was approved unanimously by the committee.

MSP22-02 Major Site Plan for 48-Unit Apartment Development off North Eason Boulevard in an MUE Zone.

City Planner Savely presented the staff Analysis to the committee. This is already an approved use in this zone, but a Major Site Plan must be approved by the Planning Committee before the applicant can proceed. Everything has been presented as requested and Staff recommends approval contingent upon a tree survey being submitted. This is a Use by Right in this zoning district so the site plan is what is before the committee. It is a 4.5 acre development on a 14 acre lot in an MUE Zoning District. The remaining land surrounding the development will be kept as a tree buffer. The other uses surrounding the parcel are primarily industrial but there are 4 residential parcels within 500 feet.

Jay Bryan with McCarty Architects came forward to explain the application. This is a six building 48 unit apartment complex with two and three bedroom units with a shared community building off of North Eason. Bryan mentioned they are in the process of getting the tree survey done.

Chairman Hadley opened the public input portion and asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak. Hearing none she closed the public input portion and opened the meeting to discussion by the members of the committee.

Gus Hildenbrand asked about tree harvesting. The applicant said they had not done that yet since they planned to leave most of the trees as a landscape buffer surrounding the development from the industrial area adjacent to the property. The applicant also wanted to wait until they had received permission from the committee first. Gus Hildenbrand also asked about a traffic study and stated that one was needed and that it should be done by a third party. Bryan said that they were not against doing that. Leslie Mart asked about what appeared to be two mounds on the property, which she thought could possibly be burial mounds. City Planner Savely said that this is not in a Chickasaw Review area but if a developer finds anything during development, work would stop immediately and they would be notified for further review. Mart asked if a dual lane divided entrance with landscaping was required. Savely deferred to Zoning Administrator Wilson who stated that the code does require that any entrances to an apartment development must be dual lane divided by a landscaped median. Since there is only enough frontage for one point of entry/exit, that one will be required to meet this requirement and is shown as doing so on the plan provided.

Savely clarified that a traffic impact analysis is not required by code, but that the Committee can require one if it feels it is appropriate. Mart stated that she felt that it should be done as Hildenbrand suggested and that it be done by a disinterested third part. Scott Davis agreed and thought that it should be required on any apartment development.

Mart asked developer Britton Jones about ADA parking. Jones said that they were required to have 5% ADA parking for the development. Mart thought that they should be spread out, such as two per building even while not required to do so by code. The developer agreed to look at that. Jay Bryan asked how the Traffic Impact Study could be required since it is not required by code. Director of Development Service Tanner Newman stated that while it is not required by the Department of Development Services, it can be required if the Planning Committee made that as a condition of approval. Bryan said they had no problem with that but asked if their own people who are actually outside consultants could be doing the study. It was clarified by Patti Thompson that it should be done by a disinterested party.

Leslie Mart made a motion to approve the major site plan, contingent upon review and acceptance from the Department of Development Services of a Tree Survey and the Traffic Impact Analysis performed by a disinterested third party. The motion was seconded by Gus Hildenbrand. All voted in favor for a unanimous vote to approve the motion.

The July work session was set for Monday, June 27 at 5:15PM and the July meeting was set for Tuesday July 5, 2022 due to the fact that Monday July 4th is the Independence Day Holiday.

Staff reported that there could be one application for the July meeting, but that item has not been confirmed at this time.

Patti Thompson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Leslie Mart with a unanimous vote to approve. The meeting was adjourned.