



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

For the Meeting on 23 February 2026

Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**
 - a) December 29, 2025
4. **Old Business – None**
5. **New Business**
 - a) Case Number 2025-163: Variance from setback regulations at 4402 Parkcrest Drive and 4400 Parkcrest Drive.
 - b) Case Number 2025-168: Rezoning of 5932 Highway 51 North from Office to C-3 zoning.
 - c) Case Number 2026-007: Conditional Use Permit for a Used Car Lot at 6641 Highway 51 North
 - d) Case Number 2026-005: Plat for DeSoto Commons A-8 Commercial Subdivision.
 - e) Case Number 2025-134: Site Plan for Hilltop RV Park Expansion at 5370 Goodman Road West.
 - f) Case Number 2026-017: Site Plan revision for 7040 Highway 51 North.
 - g) Case Number 2025-148: Text amendment to the city's location requirements, dimensional requirements, and design standards of monument signs.
 - h) Case Number 2026-008: Text amendment to establish a native tree species list.
6. **Other Business – None**
7. **Adjournment**

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

Planning Commissioners Present – Lakita Fox (Ward 1), Stan Carroll (Ward 2), Calvin Freeman (Ward 3), Morris Taylor (Ward 5), Kirby Carter (Ward 4), Mark Crawford (Ward 6), and Chad Engelke (At Large)

Planning Commissioners Absent – Janice Vidal (Mayor's Commissioner, Technical Problems)

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

Items 1 and 2. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All Planning Commissioners were present except Janice Vidal. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chad Engelke.

3. Approval of previous Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion – Fox: Approve the minutes from Planning Commission Meetings from December 29, 2025.

2nd – Freeman

Vote Passed, 6-0

4. Old Business – none

5. New Business

a) Case Number 2025-163: Variance from setback regulations at 4402 Parkcrest Drive and 4400 Parkcrest Drive.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2025-163 and called upon the Planning Director to present the staff report. Director Hockensmith reviewed the details of the request, beginning with an aerial view of the subject property, the surrounding parcels, and the zoning designations in the area. The subject property and all surrounding properties are in the Ravenwood G PUD. Lots 16 and 16 are located on the west side of Parkcrest Drive and have different dimensions than the other lots in the subdivision. The applicant is seeking a rear yard setback variance for Lot 15 and Lot 16 due to the angle formed by the 20-foot building line setback encroaching into the lots. The setback line forms an angle such that it prevents a structure from being built on Lot 15. Director Hockensmith reviewed the specific procedures for variance applications including the applicant's responses. The applicant described that due to the dimensions of the lot, which they did not create, it is almost impossible to build a house there without violating the setback requirement. They are not asking for special treatment, as any other builder in the same situation is not prohibited from applying for a similar variance. Planning Staff found that the criteria for a rear yard setback have been met by the applicant and that enforcing a 20-foot rear setback would cause the house on Lot 15 to deviate from the others on the street, negatively affecting the aesthetics of the development. Allowing a 17-foot setback would allow for the building to match the surrounding structures without bestowing any negative impacts. Director Hockensmith concluded the staff presentation by recommending approval of the variance to allow for the rear yard setback to be changed from 20 feet to 17 feet for Lot 15 and Lot 16.

Chairman Engelke opened the floor for discussion from the Planning Commissioners. No questions or comments were asked. Chairman Engelke opened the floor for public comments, and seeing no one present to speak on the case, closed the public forum.

Motion – Freeman: After review of Case Number 2025-163, the Planning Commission approves a variance to allow the rear setback for lot 15 and Lot 16 of Ravenwood Subdivision Section G to be reduced from 20 feet to 17 feet.

2nd – Fox

Vote Passes, 4-2

b) Case Number 2025-168: Rezoning of 5932 Highway 51 North from Office to C-3 zoning.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2025-168 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to present the staff report. Director Hockensmith reviewed the details of the request, beginning with an aerial view of the subject property, the surrounding parcels, and the zoning designations in the area. The subject property is in the O (Office) zone as well as the properties to the North and East. Properties to the South are in the A-R (Agricultural-Residential) zone. The request for this rezoning to C-3 (General Commercial) would be to allow the use of the land for a funeral home, which is not allowed in the O (Office) zone. Hockensmith reviewed the requirements that must be considered for a rezoning and read the applicant's responses to each of the criteria listed in the ordinance. Planning Staff comments focused on the future land use map from 2003 which is the current guide that the city has for development. The map shows this area to be commercial development, as the map does not include any land zoned as Office. This is an indication that the city intended to consolidate the two types of zones into commercial, as there is no important distinction between the two zone types. Additionally, Planning Staff believes that the Office zone is inappropriate for this location as there are commercial businesses in the parcels surrounding the intersection of Highway 51 and Nail Road. The change from Office to C-3 would allow for a broader list of uses that could be located on the property. However, the Planning Commission and Board of Aldermen can consider the public need for uses like this and decide accordingly.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the presentation and opened the floor for discussion from the Planning Commissioners. Commissioner Carter: Are there traffic concerns with this rezoning? Hockensmith: If a traffic study were to be needed, that would come as part of the site plan review process. Since the use proposed is a permitted use, they could not change anything on the site and not be subject to the site plan review process. If they were to change something on the site, then they would have to come back here for a site plan case. The rezoning request is only for the parcel where the funeral home will be located. Commissioner Carter: I'm concerned about increased traffic. Hockensmith: that is a concern for a site plan review case if it comes before us. The chair asked for the applicant to speak. Quincy Randle, the applicant, came forward to address the Planning Commission. Commissioner Carroll: what is the plan for handling the traffic and parking? Randle: Business will operate typically when surrounding businesses are closed, so parking will not be an issue. Commissioner Carter: I'm all for this. We need this in Horn Lake. So, you're saying that most of the funeral services will occur at churches rather than at this location? Randle: Yes. Commissioner Carroll: So, you're never having services there? Randle: I'm not saying that. Since it is a small building, there won't be that many people that would be able to attend services in the chapel on this site. Commissioner Carroll: So, you're saying you're going to increase traffic. Randle: I will not allow any large gatherings there. I will also have a showroom inside, but I will not be changing anything structural on the building or the site.

Chairman Engelke opened the floor for public comment, but seeing no one come forward for comment, the public forum was closed.

Motion – Carter: After review of Case Number 2025-168, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the request by Quincy Randle of “North MS Funeral Home” to rezone the parcel at 5932 Highway 51 North from O to C-3.

2nd – Fox

Vote Passes, 4-3

c) Case Number 2026-007: Conditional Use Permit for a Used Car Lot at 6641 Highway 51 North.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2026-007 and called upon the Planning Director to present the staff report. Director Hockensmith reviewed the details of the request, beginning with an aerial view of the subject property, the surrounding parcels, and the zoning designations in the area. The subject property and the property to the West are zoned M-1 (Light Industrial) and parcels to the North and South are in the C-3 zone. The entirety of this parcel is in the AE flood zone, specifically the “100-year” flood zone. The applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit for a used car lot on the property. In reviewing the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit, planning staff did not believe that the proposed use would conflict with any of the requirements listed. Director Hockensmith read the answers submitted by the applicant aloud. Planning Staff noted a few things related to the submitted site plan that need to be addressed. According to the site plan, the owner of the property is proposing to unofficially separate the parcel into two lots for a future attempt at subdividing, with the intent to later sell the lot with frontage on Highway 51. All parking requirements on the site plan appear to be met except for curbs and landscaping in the paved parking lot and islands. Planning Staff would like to see crape myrtles replaced with native tree species that conform with the upcoming native tree species ordinance. Additionally, Planning Staff request that a 5-foot sidewalk be paved along the property line from the southeast corner of the property to at least the driveway, if not across the entire frontage of Highway 51. Finally, all code violations on site must be addressed, including the barbed wire fencing that is not allowed in the M-1 zone. Director Hockensmith concluded the staff presentation by recommending approval of the request for a Conditional Use Permit with conditions addressing the above concerns with the site plan.

Chairman Engelke opened the floor for discussion from the Planning Commissioners. Commissioner Carroll: Andrew, is the sidewalk requested to be on both lots? Hockensmith: It’s possible to just approve the sidewalk for lot 2. If any new building is constructed on lot 1, the sidewalk will have to be built. Commissioner Carroll: If a new owner does not come in, then we don’t have a sidewalk on that property. Hockensmith: Yes. Commissioner Freeman: so, that lot 1 can still be used for semi-truck parking? Hockensmith: Yes, but he is required to submit a site plan with conditions from the minutes of that Conditional Use Meeting. Chairman Engelke asked

the applicant to come forward to answer questions from the Planning Commission. Chance Walker, representing the applicant, came forward. Walker: We have no problems with the conditions proposed by the Planning Department and are willing to pave the full sidewalk. The plan for lot 1 is to rezone it back to commercial for a restaurant eventually. He's going to refurbish the existing buildings and sell nice cars. This will bring life to the area. Chairman Engelke opened the floor for public comments, and seeing no one present to speak on the case, closed the public forum.

Motion – Fox: After review of Case Number 2026-007, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Conditional Use permit request for a used car lot, for owner Jorge Bailey, for a period of 3 years, and receives a certificate of occupancy, upon the conditions that:

- The owner paves a 5-foot sidewalk along the property line of both proposed lots along Highway 51 North.
- The landscaping plan is administratively reviewed and approved by the planning director before any planting occurs.
- All barbed wire, including pole extensions it is attached to, is removed.
- All unpermitted fencing is removed.
- Curbs are built around the parking lot for the two shops in the back.
- The parking islands shown on the plan created by striping are instead landscaped and curbed islands.

2nd – None was made

Motion – Carter: After review of Case Number 2026-007, the Planning Commission recommends denial of the Conditional Use permit request for a used car lot, for owner Jorge Bailey

2nd – Carroll

Vote Passes, 6-0

d) Case Number 2026-005: Plat for DeSoto Commons A-8 Commercial Subdivision.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2026-005 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to begin the staff presentation. Director Hockensmith detailed the site and the surrounding properties. The parcel is located at the NE corner of the intersection of Interstate Boulevard and Nail Road and is part of a larger tract of unplatted land with the same parcel number. This plat would allow for the identified site to stand as its own parcel. This parcel and all surrounding parcels are zoned PUD. Hockensmith showed the proposed plat in its entirety as well as a more detailed view for the Planning Commission to review. The proposed property lines would isolate the property in the southern 3 acres between Interstate Boulevard and the Core 5 development to the East. The proposed plat appears to conform to all regulations on lot design, block design, and

streets. However, further commentary on easements provided insight into the drainage on the parcel. The proposed plat shows elevation lines that outline a ditch on the East side of the parcel, but the plat does not explicitly mark the ditch as a protected area for drainage. As development is proposed for the site, drainage will be a major factor in the review process to insure that no surrounding parcels are negatively impacted.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Planning Commission. Seeing none, the applicant was asked to come forward to answer questions from the Planning Commission. The applicant was not present at the meeting. Chairman Engelke advised that in the past the Planning Commission has moved to table cases where the applicant is not present, but other motions could be entertained.

Motion – Freeman: After review of Case Number 2026-005, the Planning Commission recommends approval for the request for the plat for Desoto Commons “A-8” Commercial Subdivision.

2nd – Carroll

Vote Fails, 1-5

e) Case Number 2025-134: Site Plan for Hilltop RV Park Expansion at 5370 Goodman Road West.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2025-134 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to present the staff report. Director Hockensmith reviewed the details of the request, beginning with an aerial view of the subject property, the surrounding parcels, and the zoning designations in the area. The property is in the A-R zone as well as the two houses to the southeast, and the other surround properties are zoned PUD. The request for an expansion of the site plan for Hilltop RV Park would include 41 new RV parking pads, an office building and one pavilion structure. The proposed expanded section for new RV parking pads is shown to connect in two places to existing roads on the property between existing parking pads and the stream to the north. The proposed parking pads comply with the current stream buffer required by MDEQ. During the staff review process when the case was originally heard in November 2025, Horn Lake Fire Department noted that there is insufficient water access for the Fire Department in the event of a fire on the property. Subsequently, the applicant has made additions to their plans that make the site compliant with fire safety standards for the development. Staff noted that parking at the new pavilion structure needs to be adjusted to make each spot 20 feet deep which would allow for the 24-foot-wide driveway required for two-way traffic. Currently every RV must be parked on a concrete pad, but some are not. In the process of expanding the site, the developer must provide concrete pads for existing parking sites as well as new parking sites. Appropriate sewer infrastructure is needed with the expansion as well as soil stabilization along the hill where construction of the new pads will occur. In conclusion, Planning Staff believe that more

information is needed from the applicant about feasibility for accomplishing the requirements detailed in the staff report prior to the beginning of construction.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and asked if other RV parks have a limit on how long an RV can stay on a particular lot and if Hilltop RV Park has a time requirement. Hockensmith: I did not come across any regulation that mentions a time limit for this RV park, but the review for this case focused on the physical aspects of the project. Commissioner Fox: As we update cases, should we approve cases with conditions or have them met before we approve them? Hockensmith: The Planning Commission can require new drawings when they are corrected.

At this time, Chairman Engelke called upon the applicant to come forward to address the Planning Commission. Commissioner Fox: How will the lighting be at the entrance? Daniel Kilzi (owner): We can put lights out there.

Motion – Freeman: After review of Case Number 2025-134, the Planning Commission approves the request by Doug Baker of ETI Corporation for the site plan presented in this report, at 5370 Goodman Road West, on the condition that all requirements and requests in the staff report are met.

2nd – Fox

Vote Fails, 1-5

f) Case Number 2026-017: Site Plan revision for 7040 Highway 51 North

The Chairman announced Case Number 2026-017 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to begin the staff presentation. Director Hockensmith explained that the Horn Lake Board of Aldermen recently approved a Conditional Use Permit to sell used cars on a portion of the parcel. The applicant is asking for approval of revisions to the site plan approved in Case Number 2025-161 based on the requests of the tenant. Changes to the site plan include replacement of the mansard roof canopy, painting the walls of the building light gray color, and bollards placed inside each parking space facing the perimeter of the property. Hockensmith detailed the previously approved site plan and corrections to the site that need to be made to comply with that approval. The conditions for approval listed in the possible motion include specific actions needed to be taken for the site to comply with the approved site plan.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Planning Commission. There were no questions or comments from the Planning Commission.

Motion – Crawford: After review of Case Number 2026-017, the Planning Commission approves the revised site plan as well as building modification, which includes the mansard roof replacement and repainting of the building, but only on the following conditions:

- All bollards shall be installed on the inside of each parking space that faces outside of the lot and shall be of equidistant spacing within each parking space, and any additional bollards in front of landscaped areas (instead of within parking spaces) shall be administratively approved by the planning director.
- All parking spaces on the corner frontage are to be 10 feet by 20 feet.
- The two entrances into the parking lot shall be 30 feet wide.
- Any gate on site must first be approved administratively by the planning director before installation.
- All portions of the sidewalk, including around the gas pipes, shall be 5 feet wide, and this width shall not include any 6 inch curb.
- The sidewalk shall follow a straight line for the entirety of the corner property line, with no deviations in width throughout.
- The resulting island from the gas pipes shall be exactly the width of any removed spaces in order to ensure that all the leftover space matches the width of the other parking spaces.
- The base of the Welcome to Horn Lake sign shall not touch the curb (to accommodate for potential lighting) and shall not have any parking spaces available behind the sign, meaning that the sign shall be within a landscaped island that takes up the full widths of any necessary spaces.
- The existing multi-tenant sign shall be removed and a new one shall be installed north of the sidewalk in the landscaped area, but only after a sign permit is obtained from the planning department.
- A landscape plan is submitted to the planning department for administrative review and approval before any planting may occur.

2nd – Fox

Vote Passes, 6-0

g) Case Number 2025-148: Text amendment to the city’s location requirements, dimensional requirements, and design standards of monument signs.

The Chairman announced Case Number 2025-148 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to begin the staff presentation. Director Hockensmith explained the need for revision within the city’s sign ordinance and how it can enhance the overall appearance of the city if done correctly. Feedback from residents, developers, and city staff indicates that the overall appearance of the commercial corridors in the city have a cluttered and cheap look partially due to the way signs have been built. Hockensmith detailed Sections D and J of the city’s sign ordinance that can

be adjusted to improve the detached sign design standards and overall appearance of signs within the city. Staff recommend maintaining a height maximum of 8 feet due to the wide setbacks on Goodman Road and Highway 51. An 8-foot maximum height would allow for many signs to remain compliant on that front. However, requiring that the materials used for monument signs to be brick, stone, or similarly textured blocks for their bases (excluding cinderblocks) would improve appearance within the city. Staff recommend eliminating manual changeable copy signs, as they become unsightly over time. The Planning Commission should consider whether electronic changeable message signs will be allowed going forward for safety and aesthetic reasons. Hockensmith stated that many cities around the country have experienced improved overall appearance through strict sign regulations, such as Collierville, TN. The current sections of the sign ordinance were displayed and Hockensmith read the proposed changes that would strengthen monument sign design standards within the ordinance. Hockensmith concluded the staff presentation by advocating for these changes that would demand higher quality signage that would improve the image of the city.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Planning Commission. Chairman Engelke: So, you're not proposing getting rid of ECMS signs right now. What would happen to the ones that exist already? Hockensmith: We could bring it back for its own separate case and it would put them in a position to be removed upon renewal of the sign's Conditional Use permit case. The changes proposed would affect new signs and signs that are damaged enough to need repair. Commissioner Fox: Regarding letter (D) "simple and classic" should be more specific. Hockensmith: Letter (E) is what we actually use in our sign review process. Chairman Engelke opened the floor for public comments, and seeing no one present to speak on the case, closed the public forum.

Motion – Freeman: After review of Case Number 2025-148, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed text presented in the Staff Report for Case Number 2025-148.

2nd – Fox

Vote Passes, 6-0

h) Case Number 2026-008: Text amendment to establish a native tree species list

The Chairman announced Case Number 2026-008 to be heard and called upon the Planning Director to begin the staff presentation. Director Hockensmith began the staff presentation by explaining the importance of the natural environment and biodiversity within our community. The replacement of natural forest land with suburban development has led to the degradation of the environment that we inhabit. It is necessary that we mitigate this damage to our environment by ensuring that native species of flora are planted to replace what existed prior to development. The Planning Department has compiled a list of tree species native to the southeastern United

States based on recommendations from publications in Nature and other scientific publications. The proposed native tree species list would fall under Appendix A. Zoning. As Article III. Trees under Chapter 14. Environment. Director Hockensmith concluded the presentation by describing some of the trees on the list.

Chairman Engelke thanked the director for the staff presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Carter: If someone redoes their landscaping they would have to adhere to this list? Hockensmith: Yes, they would submit a landscaping plan that would go through the site plan review process. Chairman Engelke opened the floor for public comments, and seeing no one present to speak on the case, closed the public forum.

Motion – Carter: After review of Case Number 2026-008, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed text presented in the staff report for Case Number 2026-008.

2nd – Freeman

Vote Passes, 6-0

6. Other Business – Commissioner Freeman mentioned that lighting should be considered for the site plan of the expanded RV park should it come before the Planning Commission again.

7. Adjournment

Chair – Called for a motion to adjourn

Motion – Fox: adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

2nd – Freeman

Vote Passed, 6-0