

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
PIPERTON PLANNING COMMISSION
February 09, 2021, 6:00 P.M.**

The Piperton Planning Commission met on February 09, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., at City Hall, with Board members: Chairman John Henszey, Mayor Henry Coats, Vice-Mayor Mike Binkley, Commissioner Bob Archer, and Commissioner Mimi Ragon. City Planner Brett Morgan, City Engineer Harvey Matheny, Fire Chief Reed Bullock, and City Recorder Beverly Holloway were also present along with Vicki Hancock, Jim Ragon, Joe Moberley (Mueller), Russell Pehl (Centurion Planning & Design-Mueller) Josh Burnette and Carson Hardwick in the audience.

Agenda item 1. Call to order, establish quorum

Action taken: Chairman John Henszey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., and established that a quorum was present.

Agenda item 2. Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag

Action taken: Fire Chief Reed Bullock led in the opening Prayer and Chairman Henszey led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

Agenda item 3. Any changes to Agenda; Additions/Deletions; Motion to adopt Agenda

Action taken: There were no changes to the published Agenda and Vice-Mayor Mike Binkley moved to adopt the Agenda as presented, seconded by Commissioner Bob Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 4. Any changes to the Minutes of the Regular Session of January 12, 2021 and to the Minutes of the Special Called Session of January 28, 2021; Motion to approve the Minutes of the January 12, 2021 and the Minutes of the Special Called Session of January 28, 2021

Action taken: There were no changes to the Minutes of the Regular Session of January 12, 2021 and the Special Called Session of January 28, 2021, Commissioner Archer moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Session of January 12, 2021 and the Special Called Session of January 28, 2021 as written, seconded by Commissioner Mimi Ragon. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 5. Yancey Land Disturbance Application – Yancey Commercial PD-O

City Planner Brett Morgan stated the Planning Commission and the Board of Mayor and Commissioners approved the Yancey Commercial PD-O on the east end of Hwy 57, that PD-O has not had a site plan submitted on it as yet and typically the full land disturbance permits are not issued until a final site plan has been approved by this body, the applicant is requesting to do some clearing and grubbing to the site to make the site more presentable to the market, and staff came up with wording for a limited land disturbance permit which is in your packet and the main objective of it is that staff recommends the approval by the Planning Commission the land disturbance permit “limited to the activities of site clearing and grubbing” as outlined in the statement and that means that they can do no grading or anything that preps the site for development and then once the site plan comes through then they will be issued a full land disturbance permit and do grading according to the approved site plan of the Planning Commission.

Action taken: Vice-Mayor Binkley moved to approve the limited land disturbance permit limited to activities of site clearing and grubbing as outlined in the statement, seconded by Commissioner Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 6. Mueller Piperton Project Application, Lot 8, Piperton Business Center – Site Plan
City Planner Brett Morgan stated the applicant (Mueller, Inc.) is requesting Planning Commission approval of its application for final site plan of a facility on lot 8 of Piperton Business Center and additional requesting Design Review Commission approval of the site design elements, the site is 5.2 acres, a total of 27,700 square foot building structure that is divided into office retail and general warehousing, Mueller is a manufacturer of steel buildings, metal roofing products and other various accessories and fits into the B-2 district and there is 35 parking spaces on site that meets the City's requirements, the building height is 32'-4" and the maximum impervious area ration of .75 and under the review of the proposed site plan by staff, the plan was found to be generally in conformance with all City requirements with several issues needing further discussion and clarity, namely: 2) there is an outdoor display area that was shown on the plans and this area was to put fabricated mock ups and product models but Article 6.2.15 (**Display and Storage of Merchandise and Other Materials**) specifically prohibits any outdoor displays beyond the front line of the principle building and I have already spoken with them concerning this and about the need to take this out as a condition of approval of this site plan, 3) the impervious surface ration as previously discussed is not on the plan but I would like to see a calculation of it as all of our B-2 commercial developments have to show that there is 25% open space on site and looking at it they probably meet that but we need to have that calculated and if it doesn't meet it just make the appropriate adjustments until we have 25% common open space area, 4) the site plan shows a 10' x 15' dumpster pad but does not detail an enclosure and in retail development we require enclosures around dumpster pad and 5) the location of HVAC is not illustrated on the site plan and if it is on the roof the Planning Commission generally wants to hide those things.

Chairman Henszey inquired on the location of the HVAC to the Mueller representatives to which the reply it is not on the roof, it is on the northside of building on the sidewalk.

Chairman Henszey inquired is it sprinkled?

Joe Moberley (Mueller) stated it is a noncombustible product so we don't have sprinkler systems in any of our warehouses.

Chief Bullock stated with ISO grading they do not look at product, they look at that as a structure and therefore it must be protected, and you can also have a dry system.

Mr. Morgan stated those are basically the four things site planning wise that the Planning Commission might want to make comments on but as far as the design aspects of it are concerned whether it be the dumpster or the HVAC needs to be covered that would be pushed to the design review portion of the site review, they are providing fencing that screens what happens in the back.

City Engineer, Harvey Matheny stated the services are stubbed out for the site except for the fire protection main which will need a new line put in for the fire system that is shown on their plans, there is detention in the southwest corner as shown on this site plan and they have covered all the bases from what I can tell.

Josh Burnette inquired to Mr. Matheny didn't we install a 6" stub for fire protection months ago to which Mr. Matheny stated he went back to review the plans and may have looked at the old version and Mr. Burnette stated there should be a 6" stub and a 1" meter, Mr. Matheny stated to Mr. Burnette's point-he is correct a 6" stub out was provided for each lot including this lot so we will coordinate with the designers and make sure that is addressed and as Mr. Matheny mentioned early we have recently acquired the as built drawings for the subdivision so I can make those available to the designer of this site and make sure that those services coordinate with the as built drawings.

Mr. Morgan stated staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Mueller application for Final Site Plan subject to 31 conditions (that includes Piperton's 28 standard conditions that are attached to any site plan) and the first three were previously touched on at the beginning: 1) the applicant shall address all staff markups prior to recording of the Final Site Plan,

2) Applicant shall remove outdoor display area and update all plans accordingly which they have agreed to do and 3) add note to Final Site Plan regarding the Impervious Ration of the proposed development.

Chairman Henszey inquired if the applicant has any comments or questions at this point.

Russell Pehl (Centurion Planning and Design) stated most of them are more related to some of the standard comments, item 16 regarding identifying, size and location of trees, there are no trees on the property, item 17 regarding the final plat being provided on a CD disk using the state plane coordinated system, we are not actually platting the property at time that should be completed prior to this, Mr. Morgan stated you can refer to that at site plans, item 18 refers to 15 ft utility easement along front, rear and side lines of the site and within these easements no construction shall be placed or permitted to remain which will in any way damage or interfere with the installation or maintenance of utilities-we are happy to do that but I am not aware of any construction in the easement or know existing utilities within the easement that should be effected.

Mr. Matheny stated they are available for utilities if they are needed to be put in.

Mr. Pehl inquired on providing screening instead of trees with a 6 foot chain-link fence.

Mr. Morgan stated that will be addressed in the DRC section, I recommend we leave that standard condition as is and then if you prefer to do the slated fence or trees we can make it work in the unlikely event that something does go through.

Mr. Pehl inquired on item 20 talking about the 100-year storm event making sure the finished floor elevation is above that, are you referring to the flood plain in that comment.

Mr. Matheny replied yes.

Chairman Henszey stated these are standard conditions with all applications, so if it applies it applies and if it doesn't it doesn't.

Mr. Matheny stated there is a condition that says this may go to the Board of Mayor and Commissioners for a development contract, it will not need to go to the Board for a development contract, and this will be a fees only project since there is no public improvements involved they will not need a development contract.

Chairman Henszey inquired to Chief Bullock if he has circulation around the whole building which Chief replied yes, there is room.

Action taken: Mayor Henry Coats moved to approve Mueller's final site plan based on the 31 staff recommended conditions, seconded by Commissioner Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Design Review for Mueller, Inc.:

Mr. Morgan stated the elements of the design review consists of the building facade, landscape plans, lighting plan and signage plan. The Building façade includes tan metal panels, tan EIFS panel (synthetic stucco), gray concrete masonry units (CMU), dark aluminum cladding (accent band, signage area), white metal panel roofing panels (warehouse area), and orange metal panel roofing panels (retail/office area), color used is the Company Color.

Chairman Henszey inquired if samples were provided, to which the applicant stated we did not provide samples, we didn't know we need to bring samples and will provide samples.

Mr. Pehl stated our intent was to try to have similar materials to what was in the surrounding area, the idea was to blend into the area and to look good.

Mr. Moberley stated we have 34 branch locations and that is part of our branding also to make the branches look very similar.

Mr. Morgan stated the applicant has submitted signage, the front sign is above the signage allowance in height, we allow 32 square feet, 6 feet high so it is more of a monument sign that the City allows they will have redo the signage and then the signage that is on the building, they are allowed a total of 200 square feet so 32 square feet would be their monument sign so they are left with 168 to put on the building but they are allowed only one building sign, it cannot be split as shown in the plans, it must be combined all together and if the DRC approves staff can review the revised signage, and the site plan shows the landscaping, this plans shows metal fencing and chain-

link and I have suggested to them that they are going to need to extend their metal fencing or full panel metal fencing across the front as we do not allow chain-link to be across the front of any lot but they have chain-link in other areas connecting to existing chain-link and they are willing to modify their plans to make that the metal fencing which I am sure will also be the tan color as the rest of the metal building and the landscaping is made up of basically of Nuttall Oaks and Red Cedars with some smaller junipers in the landscape areas as well and lastly they did submit a lighting plan, this plan consists mainly of down lighting from the building only and does not propose lighting dedicated to parking areas, it is my suggestions to add 2 poles to light the retail parking area and then we would have to review the photometrics and it could be that more lighting is needed and read **Article 11.1.6.D.5** "the use of building mounted light fixtures shall not be used to illuminate a parking area" for the benefit of the all, they are just basic down lighting and we don't want to consider that in our photometric analysis, the cut sheets for lighting need to be submitted for review and knew the Planning Commission would want to see some lighting for safety purposes in this parking area.

Chairman Henszey stated we can have staff approve the lighting changes as they come in and the color samples are a little bit of a hang-up.

Mr. Morgan stated when received the sample board with corresponding PMS (RGB) color numbers will be placed in the Admin office and this Body can review them, and we can move forward with the condition that if it needs to be changed we can change it and then the only other question is additional wainscoting, is that a condition of approval or are we fine with it the way it is to which the Commission was fine with it the way it is.

Mr. Morgan stated to include in your motion that staff will review and approve the additional materials that are requested by the PC/DRC or other Planning Commission conditions to be submitted by the applicant and so there are four conditions of approval so we can add this as number 5 and so staff recommends with those 5 conditions for the DRC.

Action taken: Vice-Mayor Binkley moved as the Design Review Commission that we approve the Mueller, Inc. application for DRC approval subject to the following five conditions and the 5th condition is the staff will review and approve additional materials required by the Planning Commission/DRC or other PC conditions, seconded by Mayor Coats. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 7. Any other old/new business, questions or matters from the audience

Mr. Matheny stated I want to bring something to your attention that will be discussed or decided upon at the next meeting, the radius that is going to be applied to Keough Road as it extends to the east and southeast is an 825 foot radius but that is really not the main point here but the main point here is that Crown Vista fence which goes along the frontage of their property and at this point their recorded plat has this line angled to the southeast so that the road curvature would work however when the fence contractor installed the fence he just continued going on due east (straight line) these are not surveyed column location but they are brick columns and a wood fence that continues on to the east so it protruding into the right of way as we speak.

Mr. Morgan stated he feels it is less than 5 post if they are 50 foot on center it wouldn't be that many in there I don't think.

Chairman Henszey stated probably four.

Mr. Matheny stated is this line is correct it is 216 feet, it maybe 5 poles with the corner so the developer of Crown Vista has not formally requested relief on this but they may ask could there be a change in this geometry for Keough Road so that it would minimize how much has to be replaced, this 825 foot radius is based on Keough Road being designated as a major collector, our subdivision regs say that a major collector minimum radius is 825 feet, technically right now Keough Drive is classified as an arterial which would require an 1125 foot radius which does work at all, that curves down into this lot and so we would recommend that Keough Drive be reclassified as a major collector, it still going to be an 84 foot right of way and it still can accommodate a future five lane section which nobody anticipates but certainly a three lane section and a radius of 825 feet does

work with the Piperton Hill development, it does hit the box culvert that is further south that was installed years ago, it works geometrically with the design speed on this roadway, I believe it is posted as 35mph but we would want to look a design speeds of probably 45mph and classifying it as a major collector doesn't change the future potential build out of the road but it does allow us by the sub regs specifications for this to be an 825 foot radius which works but the fence doesn't work so the question is going to come up do we leave it at 825 or have the developer redo the fence in its entirety or not.

Mr. Morgan stated next month Piperton Hills will be coming to the Planning Commission with phase 1 of the development for site plan approval so this road alignment is a necessary part of that phase 1 so that is why we wanted to bring it to your attention for discussion and with that we will ask for a change in the Major Road Plan designation of Keough.

Mr. Matheny stated he has had some discussions with the developers of Crown Vista, I will make them aware that Piperton Hills will be on the agenda next month and if they want to make a formal request of some geometric change so they don't have to remove as much of their fence that certainly is their prerogative or they may come to the meeting and formally request it at the meeting.

Mayor Coats inquired the geometry won't be right though if we let the fence stay.

Mr. Matheny stated as the fence is now there is not a geometry that will work even if we allowed the geometry to go to 711 feet which is depicted on here it lines up very well with Keough Road but that would require some super elevation of the roadway as you go into that curve to meet roadway design standards.

Chairman Henszey stated which would then cost Piperton Hills more money and a possible safety hazard.

Mr. Matheny stated it does come with other ripple effects including a power pole.

Agenda item 8. Adjournment

Action taken: Commissioner Archer moved for adjournment, seconded by Commissioner Ragon. The Motion received all affirmative votes, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly Holloway, City Recorder

Approved: _____ date: _____