

Agenda for the Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Old Business –**
 - a) Case Number 2025-038: Site Plan Approval Request for Commercial Buildings at Parcel Number 108736020 0000600.
4. **New Business – None**
5. **Other Business –** Discussion of possible Planning Commission Meeting on June 9th, 2025
6. **Adjournment.**

-- Start of the Items/Cases Portion of the Minutes –

Planning Commissioners present – Chad Engelke (Chair), Kirby Carter, Calvin Freeman, Jimmy Stokes and Janice Vidal. Absent – Clara Kirkley, Jessie Ware and Chigger White

City Staff – Andrew Hockensmith, Planning Director; Billy Simco, Assistant Planning Director; Jonathan Ryan, IT Systems Engineer II

Attendees – Rhodes Thompson

Items 1 and 2. The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Secretary called roll with all Planning Commissioners present except Commissioners Kirkley, Ware and White. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Chair and recited by those in attendance.

3. Old Business.

- a.** Case Number 2025-038: Site Plan Approval Request for Commercial Buildings at Parcel Number 108736020 0000600.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2025-038 to be heard and called upon the Planning staff to begin the presentation for the case. Director Hockensmith presented the details of the case but noted that the applicant was not present at the meeting. The case is a request for site plan approval by Susan Stout Architect, LLC, to build two commercial buildings on the parcel at the northwest corner of Interstate Boulevard and Expressway Drive. This project will be in the M-1 zone, which is classified as light industrial in the zoning ordinance. The lots to the north, west and south are C-4 commercial zones. The lots to the east and southeast are PBP, which is classified as planned business park in the zoning ordinance. The proposed land use on the lot is consistent with the zoning and uses in the surrounding area. The two proposed buildings will face Interstate Boulevard with one situated behind the other due to the elevations on the lot. The development is planned to be built in two phases, with the building closer to Interstate Boulevard being built first. The second phase will require approval by the Planning Commission prior to construction in the future.

The site will have one entrance/exit on each Interstate Boulevard and Expressway Drive and sidewalks along both road frontages as well as one multi-tenant sign on the landscaped corner of the intersection. Two handicap spaces are required in addition to the parking provided on the site plan. The front of the building, facing Interstate Boulevard, will be comprised of glass and fiber cement panels. The panels will be the color “bark” on top and “gray” on the bottom of the building. The sides of the building, facing Expressway Drive and the back of the lot, will be comprised of metal paneling and feature four garage doors and five regular doors. The metal paneling does not conform to the requirement in the ordinance that states, “all exterior sides shall be surfaced equivalent to the front of the building.” However, the Planning Commission may determine that this is in some way equivalent to the front. Additionally, the side facing Expressway Drive does not meet the 20% glass requirement and will have an inconsistent material type from the front to the back. Director Hockensmith concluded the staff presentation by saying that there is a need for more small-to-medium-sized retail/office/restaurant spaces that are not attached to gas stations.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Vidal: Is there more information available about the building material type? Have you talked to the builder about it? Director

Hockensmith: Yes, this seems to be a common building material now. The buildings along Nail Road and the new Chipotle building were constructed using fiber cement paneling. Vidal: You mentioned the South face of the building and its material types. Hockensmith: Yes, the Planning Commission can determine whether this style of exterior is a new type of style itself or whether the front and the other sides constitute two different exterior types. Vidal: They are two different styles, and one style is better to have for the whole building. Seeing no further questions for the director, Chairman Engelke invited the applicant, Rhodes Thompson, to come forward. Thompson distributed a rendering of the building with the different building materials. Engelke: I believe that this is a new architecture style, and it is cost effective and looks good. Commissioner Carter: Mr. Thompson mentioned trying to attract a medical office tenant or similar, and I believe that would be good for the city. Thompson: This architectural style is desirable for medical companies and their suppliers. The site's proximity to the hospital makes it very desirable to those types of businesses. Commissioner Stokes: Do you have any pre-leases signed? Thompson: No, but people are asking for space like this right now, so it will not be difficult to fill the space. Discussion ensued about the drainage on site and that Neel-Schaffer, city engineer, will make sure that the plans are sufficient to handle the drainage on site.

Motion – Carter: After review of Case Number 2025-038, the Planning Commission approves the request for the site plan, as presented in this report, by applicant Susan Stout Architect, LLC, on Parcel Number 108736020 0000600, approximately 1.73 acres, on the condition that the city engineer approves the drainage plans and that the developer follows any advised changes to those plans, and on the condition that the developer comes back to the planning commission for approval on any building in the “Phase 2” area shown on the plan.

2nd - Vidal

Vote Passed, 4-0

4. New Business – None

5. Other Business – Discussion of possible Planning Commission Meeting on June 9th, 2025

Due to the absence of a quorum at the May 19th Planning Commission meeting, the cases that were not heard have been scheduled for consideration on June 9th to meet the deadline for the summer fireworks season.

6. Adjournment.

Chair – Called for a motion to adjourn.

Motion – Stokes: Adjourn the meeting at 6:28 p.m. **2nd – Carter.** Vote: Motion passed, 4-0