

# CITY OF TUPELO

## PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** April 6, 2026, 6:00 P. M.

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

---

### CALL TO ORDER

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

- **Invocation:** Ms. Pam Hadley
- **Pledge of Allegiance:** Mr. Mark Williams.

Board and staff introduced themselves for the record.

### Committee Members Present:

Chairman Victor Fleitas, Mr. Mark Williams, Mr. Aaron Washington, Ms. Leslie Mart, Ms. Patti Thompson, Ms. Scott Davis, Mr. Lindsey Leake, Ms. Pam Hadley.

### 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:** Mr. Davis moved to approve the April 2, 2026, meeting's minutes, seconded by Mr. Leake.
  - **Vote: Approved** by a show of hands. **Motion carried.**
- 

### REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

Mr. Newman reported no updates from the City Council regarding prior Planning Committee actions.

---

---

**FLEXVAR 25-03: 1718 Briar Ridge Rd (Parcel - 112B-04-003-02)**

**Location: 1718 Briar Ridge**

**Request:** Flexible variance to allow a 4.2-foot setback instead of the required 10-foot setback.

**Notices:** Mr. Newman confirmed that adjoining property owners were notified. There have been no responses since the matter was tabled.

**Applicant: Tony Moore, 109 Belwood Cove, Belden, MS**

- Tony Moore is the general contractor for 1718 Briar Ridge Road. He stated they began building approximately a year ago with investors.
- Mr. Newman asked to clarify that Mr. Moore is the general contractor for this project. Mr. Moore confirmed that he was, yes.
- Mr. Newman asked Mr. Moore if he had acquired or was acquiring this property. Mr. Moore stated that he had reached out to the individual several times, along with the investors, over the last year, with no response.
- Mr. Fleitas asked about efforts to purchase adjoining property to resolve the setback issue and clarified that it is who he is speaking about, not returning his calls, therefore nothing could be done. Mr. Moore stated that the individual never returned his calls.
- Mr. Moore explained the lot line adjustment form and its purpose to resolve the issue.

**Public Hearing:** Chairman Fleitas opened the public portion of the meeting. No one was present to speak, so the public portion of the application review was closed.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:** Chairman Fleitas opened the floor for committee discussion.

- Mr. Newman stated that the Department of Development Services' original recommendation was denial due to the 58% variance. They acknowledge the owner's efforts in acquiring the adjoining property
- Mr. Reagan stated he had spoken with the owners and contractors numerous times. It is his understanding that there was an agreement on the price, but no further feedback from the adjoining landowner. The only remedy is to tear off 8 feet of the house and move the laundry room to the back. This is achievable but requires a great deal of work and is the only option at this time. He recommended that they receive the committee's decision before moving forward with the project.
- Mr. Fleitas asked if Mr. Reagan was involved in any of the efforts of outreach to the adjoining landowner in order to resolve the situation. Mr. Reagan stated he had contacted the homeowner, and then there was no further response after that discussion.
- Mr. Fleitas asked if the landowner was deployed or unavailable. No one was aware of his location.

- Ms. Thompson felt he had come up with the only solution he could come up with, but they could not grant a variance for this particular situation.
- Mr. Davis stated that while mistakes happen, granting the variance will cause others to “make mistakes” and ask for other variances.
- Ms. Mart apologized that a costly mistake had been made, but granting the variance would set a precedent and snowball.
- Mr. Fleitas stated he was hopeful for a resolution with the adjoining owner and crestfallen that one could not be made, but in agreement with the other committee members, did not think there was a basis in the code to make the modifications asked by Mr. Moore without drastic measures being made. Mr. Fleitas stated that the committee has been consistent and feels the necessity to uphold the city code as it is written and reasonably interpreted.

**Motion and Vote:**

- **Action:** Motion was made by Ms. Mart to **deny FLEXVAR 25-03** request for variance. Ms. Thompson seconded the motion.
- **Vote: Approved** by a show of hands. **Motion carried** (denial).

**Appeal Notice:**

- Mr. Newman announced a three-day appeal period, beginning the day after the meeting, for any party wishing to appeal the committee’s decision to the City Council. If no appeals are made, the decision will be considered final.

**MAJSUB 26-01: Major Subdivision – Treetop /Locust Lane (Parcels 079L-32-005-02 & 079L-32-005-20 through 00523) (175 lots)**

**Location:** Locust Lane Area

**Request:** Preliminary major subdivision plat for **175 lots** with an internal street network.

**Notices:** Mr. Newman confirmed that adjoining property owners were notified.

- This is an old matter, and there have been no new responses. The applicant has a solution to last month's application and a new proposal.

**Applicant: Ms. Stephanie Thomas, 1317 RD 41, Tupelo**

- Stated she felt the changes had been made that would meet the requirements asked of them by the committee, and were here to present the changes.

**Staff Analysis:** All staff requests and questions have been answered (see details below), and the recommendation is approval.

- After the committee's decision, a finalized development agreement will be created and go to the city council for approval.
- Details of the Blue Line stream and other details will be worked out based on the committee's decision.

The original proposal was 37.52 acres with 140 lots. There were issues with fire access, questions about green space, and questions about mailbox locations. The proposal now covers 51.45 acres, with 174 lots, divided into five phases. All five phases are identified on the preliminary plat. Phase 1 has 30 lots, which meet the fire code threshold. There is a second entrance on Locust Lane. This proposal meets the intent of the code. The 13% green space has been identified. They have inserted a 10-foot pathway easement between Lot 157 and 158 (Previously lots 40 and 41). There were questions about a couple of the lots near the back as far as their location to the center line of the blue line stream. That has also been corrected.

### **Committee Questions to Applicant:**

- Ms. Mart asked about garage access and the depth of the driveways. Ms. Thomas stated that they will be front-entry garages.
- Ms. Mart asked whether or not there were minimum driveway lengths so there would not be car parking in the street. Ms. Thomas stated that restrictive covenants will be in place, stating that there is no overnight parking on the street.
- Ms. Mart asked about the proposed driveway length. Ms. Thomas said they have not gotten that far, as they do not have house plans yet.
- Ms. Mart asked if there would be enough length to have two cars parked end to end and not extend to the street. Ms. Thomas stated, Yes, there would.
- Mr. Newman asked what style or type of housing and square footage they intended to build. Ms. Thomas stated 1,000 to 2,200 maximum square footage, single family homes, 3/2 or 4/2 with an enclosed two-car garage with front access.
- Ms. Mart asked if the street name issue was resolved. Ms. Thomas stated that she spoke with Charlie at Lee County 911 and discussed the names and locations of the streets.
- Mr. Davis asked whether the ditch would be open or closed. Ms. Thomas stated that the green space around the ditch would be left as is for now, and would close it later if needed. Mr. Newman stated that those will come later with the development agreement and with the city engineer, and the details will be worked out.
- Ms. Mart suggested a drainage swale to help with overflow.

### **Public Hearing:**

Chairman Fleitas opened the public portion of the meeting. No one was present to speak, so the public portion of the application review was closed.

## **Motion and Vote:**

**Action:** Motion was made by Ms. Mart to **approve MAJSUB 26-01**, based on the latest plat, with the notation that there will be a driveway length of a minimum of two cars deep, based on there not being the requirement for sidewalks, and to minimize or eliminate on-street parking overnight. Ms. Hadley seconded the motion.

- **Recusal:** Mr. Leake recused himself from consideration and voting.
- **Vote: Motion carried;** the matter was **approved**.

## **Next Steps:**

Mr. Newman announced a three-day appeal period, beginning the day after the meeting, for any party wishing to appeal the committee's decision to the City Council. If no appeals are made, the decision will be considered final. This will also coincide with the rezoning of this particular property. The rezoning period for the city council is scheduled for April 21<sup>st</sup> and this will be added to the agenda as well.

---

## **MAJSUB 26-02: Major Subdivision – Gateway Landing (Parcel 072N-09-046-00)**

**Location:** 3990 McCullough Blvd. Tupelo, MS

**Request:** Commercial subdivision located off McCullough Blvd.

**Notices:** Mr. Newman stated that this application did not require notification due to no rezoning and a preliminary plat that had been previously approved and had not been finalized with the chancery clerk.

**Applicant: Greg Carrico 6363 Poplar, Memphis, TN**

•Mr. Carrico is here as a representative of their client, the owner of the property. They wish to create one large lot based on property sale.

**Staff Analysis:** The staff recommends approval. All requirements and guidelines of the planning department, staff and other departments have been met.

## **Committee Questions to Applicant:**

- Ms. Mart asked what special use standards were as marked on the application. Mr. Carrico stated it was a typo and there were no special use standards.
- Mr. Carrico stated that they do have MDOT approval for the driveway and curb cut.
- Ms. Mart asked if all of the signage would be part of the actual construction submission. Mr. Newman stated yes, as this will be a commercial subdivision.

**Public Hearing:**

Chairman Fleitas opened the public portion of the meeting. No one was present to speak, so the public portion of the application review was closed.

Mr. Newman would like to note that a street name is required and advised the applicant to contact E911.

**Motion and Vote:**

**Action:** Motion was made by Mr. Davis to **approve MAJSUB 26-02**, and that the street name be labeled. Mr. Washington seconded the motion.

**Vote: Motion carried;** the matter was **approved**.

**Next Steps:**

Mr. Newman announced a three-day appeal period, beginning the day after the meeting, for any party wishing to appeal the committee's decision to the City Council.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- **Work Session:** Monday, **April 27, 2026**.
- **Next Regular Meeting:** Monday, **May 4, 2026**.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Action:** Motion was made by Ms. Thompson to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Hadley. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

---