

**MINUTES OF THE  
TUPELO PLANNING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
Monday, May 2, 2022  
6:00 PM Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Pam Hadley called the meeting to order. Scott Davis, Gus Hildenbrand, Patti Thompson Lindsey Leake, Leslie Mart, Chair Pam Hadley, Mark Williams, and Bentley Nolan were present. Staff members City Planner Jenny Savely, Director of Development Services Tanner Newman and Zoning Administrator Russ Wilson were also present.

Chair Hadley asked Gus Hildenbrand to open with a prayer and Leslie Mart to lead the pledge. Chair Hadley 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.

**REVIEW OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes for the April regular meeting since there was no meeting. Hadley asked for a motion to approve the March 7, 2022 meeting. Scott Davis motioned to approve, seconded by Leslie Mart and the motion was approved unanimously. Hadley asked for a motion to approve the March 21 Public Hearing for Medical Cannabis amendments to the Development Code. Motion to approve by Gus Hildenbrand and seconded by Mark Williams and the motion was approved unanimously. Hadley then opened the regular session section of the meeting.

**REPORT ON COUNCIL ACTIONS**

The March Planning Committee minutes were approved by the City Council at their April meeting.

**Old Business**

Butler Park Phase 2 development report - City Planner Savely reported that MDEQ had responded with the conditions required to modify the dam, and that the developer will be required to meet those requirements before any construction can begin.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**FLEX22-02 447 East Main Street - Dodge's Store HQ requests flexible use approval to change, re-establish, expand, alter or make major repairs to a non-conforming use.**

Planner Savely explained the staff analysis for the application. Nat Leathers, representing Dodge's Store/Savings Oil Company came forward and explained that they wanted to renovate the office portion of the facility and add storage space by taking down the existing brick building to the west and expand the office behind their current facility opening up the corner, and then landscaping that area. Savely indicated that this is expansion of a nonconforming use and is being considered before the committee to allow improvements on the property to accommodate the owner as well as the City's needs.

Hildenbrand asked if they intended to pave the parking area. Leathers said it was not their intention to pave all of that area. Mart asked if they would be agreeable to pave that area in order to do what they wanted to do. Leathers said they would consider that after looking at the cost because anything they spend would not

add additional revenue, but just add cost to the project. Williams asked if landscaping would be up to commercial code and Leathers responded yes. 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.

The committee wanted to see improvements at this Gateway entrance to the City, and thought that landscaping and paving should be brought up to City code according to commercial development standards. Davis made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the parking lot be paved and landscaped to current commercial development standards. Mart seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

#### **MSP22-01 Major Site Plan for 46-Unit Apartment Development off Colonial Estates Road in an MUE Zone.**

City Planner Savely explained 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.

Kurt Shettles with McCarty Architects came forward to explain the application. He introduced those present with him as Blake Farrar and John White. This is an 11.8 acre site proposing three 8-plex units, three 6-plex units and one 4-plex unit plus a community building onsite, a total of 46 units with 107 parking spaces including the ADA compliant spaces.

Hadley asked for questions from the committee. Thompson asked for info on their company and their apartments. Owner, developer and contractor Rick Jones came forward. Jones said they have done King Pines recently in Tupelo. This will be similar, but as a townhouse style. The front will face the street. This is similar to their development in Oxford. These apartments are meant for working families making less than \$55,000 a year. They thought this area was good, and already zoned for apartments.

Jones gave a history of the company and their developments including King Pines, which has a similar funding mechanism and target occupant base. Instead of single family as in King Pines, these are multi-family with parking in the rear with a community building. They felt it was a good site of the 3 sites they considered as possible locations. Hildenbrand clarified that these are rental only as opposed to lease purchase at King Pines. Jones said yes, these will not be for sale but rental only. Mart asked about any studies on the impact on Colonial Estates. Jones said he thought it would improve property values in the surrounding area. Mart asked about a traffic study. Jones said no traffic study had been done.

Williams asked about parking. Jones said basically two per unit would be 86 spaces and the remainder of the 107 would be overflow. Mark Williams asked about the length of the buildings, which are shown on the plans to each be either 150 feet or more. Williams stated that the code only allowed apartment buildings to be 120 feet or less. Jones said that if that's the regulation, they would redesign the plan to comply. Hildenbrand asked about the size of the units. Jones said they average 1200 square feet with 23 two bedroom and 23 three bedroom units. Hildenbrand expressed concerns about parking based on what he saw at King Pines.

Hadley then opened the floor to the public for comments. The following area residents came to the podium to speak about their concerns about a decrease in property values, safety and security, crime, or traffic issues in the area caused by this potential development. Those that gave their addresses included:

Mary Conner Adcock, Cottonwood Estates Developer (75 residents)  
Linda Collins, 2744 Prairie View Circle  
Lee Waldrop, 3598 Cotton Bowl Lane  
Nancy Adams, 3562 Cotton Bowl Lane

Wanda Stafford and Randy Stafford 2693 Prairie View Circle  
Joy Kilburn, 2040 Springfield Drive  
Julia Davidson, Prairie View Circle  
Michael Chester, 3594 Cottonwood  
Michael Moore, 3508 Cotton Bowl Lane  
Tommy Green, 2092 Springfield  
Johnathan Todd, 2686 Prairie View Circle  
Stan Holfield, 3544 Cotton Bowl Lane  
Sarah Phillips 2012 Springfield Drive  
Lisa Russell, 3580 Cotton Bowl Lane  
T. R. Darcy, 2747 Prairie View Circle  
Donny Elkin, 4146 South Bloom  
Linda Garner, South Bloom

Tom Wicker, representing the Town Creek Water Management District came to the podium to speak about the drainage infrastructure in the area. The district does not object to the project, but is concerned about recent flooding in the area due to storm water runoff and Colonial Estates coming very close to being underwater due to water backup and increased runoff from additional paving along the floodway. They are working with the developer to address their concerns.

Glenn McCullough, Jr. spoke as a co-developer of Cottonwood Estates along with his sister, Mary Conner Adcock. McCullough asked if anyone in the audience was in favor of the development, with none present in favor raising their hand except the developer. He said there could be another area somewhere in the city where this development would raise property values, but not this location on Colonial Estates.

A petition was also presented afterwards from area residents opposed to the project.

Hadley asked Rick Jones if he had any comments in response to the opposition. Jones mentioned the quality of his other projects and ensured those present that their project would not hurt their property values. Mart asked if the developer looked at other properties. He said this was one of two locations they were considering. Hildenbrand asked if the Oxford locations were for students. Jones said no. Someone asked about the funding source for this project. Director of Development Services Tanner Newman asked to make some points, assuring those present that their Council Representative Mims had listened too. Newman made it clear that this was not a City of Tupelo, or City of Tupelo-endorsed project. The Committee has the vote. But the decision is not whether or not they can build apartments at that location, but to review the site plan for the project to insure compliance to city code. This is a private project with private funding, and Mr. Newman asked the developer to clarify the funding. Jones explained that this was funded by private investors who receive tax credits for a federal/state program administered by MS Home Corp. In order to offer affordable rents, private investors invest and get tax credits which makes the funding possible. Jones offered to be available after the meeting to answer any questions from anyone. Hadley then closed the public input portion of the meeting and asked for comments from the committee.

Davis clarified that the building lengths don't meet city requirements, and that with all the concerns with traffic, a traffic study should be done. Williams agreed and suggested that this be tabled until these issues could be resolved. Mart made a motion to table pending a traffic study, redesign to meet building length, and a water management plan to address flooding concerns. The motion was seconded by Davis. The vote to approve was unanimous. The following requirements were placed before the developer for site plan amendment:

1. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), per section 12.5, of the City of Tupelo Development Code, must be conducted within 90 days of the date of decision
2. A storm water management plan must be conducted with a certified engineer within 90 days of the date of decision) and all requirements of the plan be included in an amended site plan for final review for approval by City Engineering
3. Amendment of the site plan to meet City of Tupelo Development Code requirements and other requirements as presented by Plan Review, including
  - a. Representation in site plan and all other documentation that no building included as part of the development exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) feet in length
  - b. Representation of required open space, 10% for Mixed Use Employment Zoning, equaling 51,400 square feet of a 11.8 acre developed area
  - c. A six inch (6") fire protection line should be looped in to the main line
  - d. Turning radius of the access road should be a minimum of twenty-five feet (25')
  - e. Representation on the site plan at that a six inch (6") water line is looped throughout the development and a separate 2" water meter is installed on each building

City Planner Savely said that the Developer would have 90 days to update the plans and re-submit for site plan approval, following the same process as before. Zoning Administrator Wilson stated that the 7 day notification requirements would be in effect so residents within 500 ft. will be sent notifications as to when the follow up meeting will be held. DDS Director Tanner Newman assured residents that they would know about the meeting.

#### **TA22-02 Text Amendments to the Development Code**

City Planner Jenny Savely asked the committee to table this item until later.

Motion to table was presented by Bentley Nolan, seconded by Mark Williams, with the vote in favor of approving unanimous.

The June work session was set for Tuesday, May 31 due to that Monday being Memorial Day and the June meeting was set for June 6, 2022.

Staff reported that there could one application for the June meeting, with one more potential item that has not been confirmed at this time.

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