

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
PIPERTON PLANNING COMMISSION
April 13, 2021, 6:00 P.M.**

The Piperton Planning Commission met on April 13, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., at City Hall, with Board members: Chairman John Henszey, Vice-Mayor Mike Binkley, Commissioner Bob Archer, and Commissioner Mimi Ragon. Mayor Henry Coats was absent. 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, John McCarty, and Bill Thoda 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: Chairman Henszey led in the opening Prayer and Commissioner Bob Archer 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 changes to the published Agenda with the addition of a new item #8) Shaw's Creek Discussion and a new item #9) Discussion of In-laws Suites, Commissioner Archer moved to approve the revised Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Mimi Ragon. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 4. Any changes to the Minutes of the Regular Session of March 09, 2021 and the Monument Committee Minutes of March 29, 2021; Motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Session of March 09, 2021 and the Monument Committee Minutes of March 29, 2021

Action taken: There were no changes to the Minutes of the Regular Session of March 09, 2021 and the Minutes of the Monument Committee of March 29, 2021, Vice-Mayor Mike Binkley moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Session of March 09, 2021 and the Minutes of March 29, 2021 as presented, seconded by Commissioner Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 5. Pyramex Safety Products Parking Expansion

City Planner Brett Morgan stated Pyramex has made a request to modify their final site plan for the 1st phase of development by adding 43 parking spaces, they are also making interior changes to add additional office space, the site plan submitted shows the location of the proposed new parking spaces and adjacent sidewalk, and this plan doesn't require any of the exterior lighting to be shifted or moved but there will be minor modification to the landscape plan that can be conditioned to be reviewed/approved by staff if the Planning Commission approves, so staff recommends approval of the amended Pyramex Site Plan adding 43 parking spaces and adjacent sidewalks subject to the following two conditions: 1) The amended Pyramex Site Plan shall conform to all previous Conditions of Approval not modified by this amendment and 2) Applicant shall provide a revised Landscape Plan for staff review and approval.

City Engineer Harvey Matheny inquired if the site plan will have to be re-recorded to which Mr. Morgan stated we will have to re-record the site plan.

Vice-Mayor Binkley inquired on the loss of trees or shrubberies to which Mr. Thoda (Pyramex's representative) stated we are trying to relocate two trees but if we can't then we will

replace with new ones and will extend the landscaping down with the new parking and also that same condition that exists along the truck court where we are extending that parking and will extend that landscaping screen.

Mr. Morgan stated they will also be extending the sidewalk as well.

Mr. Thoda stated they also checked the handicap requirement and we are okay for the new total.

Action taken: Vice-Mayor Binkley moved to approve the amended Pyramex Site Plan adding 43 parking spaces with the two conditions, seconded by Commissioner Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 6. Storm Water Design Standards

City Engineer Harvey Matheny stated this document was created to solidify and formalize the Design Standards that we currently for the most part are already requiring so the City contracted with Robert Reeves (local Engineer) to create this document, it primarily establishes our design criteria for different frequency storm events, it establishes our stormwater detention requirements, it establishes our standards for the type of pipe that will be required, the different type of inlets that we allow, grading and drainage standards etc.

Mr. Morgan stated in our last updated subdivision regulations we knew this document was coming so we added reference to it so the connection of this document to the subdivision regulations was approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Matheny stated there are two or three minor edits that I need to make, one of those edits is for this document to cross reference our standard construction specifications document so that everything is cross reference and they reference each other so that will be here, discussed page 14 for a couple of sections that were included but there is nothing there and they are reserved for the future, staff recommends adoption and this will go to the Board next week for their review and approval.

Vice-Mayor Binkley inquired if there was anything in this document or should there be regarding private landowners tapping into our storm drains or curb cuts or things like that?

Mr. Matheny stated there is not and that is a good point we have certainly allowed that and we have administratively approved that.

Vice-Mayor Binkley suggested adding that to it.

Mr. Matheny agreed that would be good to add in here, and I will make a note of it.

Vice-Mayor Binkley inquired if there are any studies in the past that you are aware of that says that our storms are stronger and we need to be designing for more stormwater at a faster pace.

Mr. Matheny stated obviously you hear a lot about that in the news and other places but I haven't seen any changes in design standards effectively that would be changing the stormwater frequency/intensity duration numbers that are established from historic data but I haven't see any changes to this point, we are requiring the minimum design standard to be the 25 year storm event.

Mr. Morgan stated just looking at it from the other side, we don't want to be overly burdensome on the cost of doing development if our standards are not just adequate but there good standards so we don't want to raise them and cause extra land to be used for detention if it is not really necessary yet but we don't want to be way outside the normal standards of this area.

Action taken: Commissioner Archer moved to approve the Storm Water Design Standards recommended tonight with the edits that were discussed as well as recommend it to the Board of Mayor and Commissioners, seconded by Vice-Mayor Binkley. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 7. Proposed changes to the Piperton Sign Ordinance

Mr. Morgan stated the Sign Ordinance, Article 8 provision governing signs needs to be updated and amended due to both Federal and State requirements emphasizing content neutrality and the political signs in the State that have changed, the proposed amendments all deal with one of

three things: content neutrality, State's Freedom of Speech Act and other minor textual corrections and clarifications, with that Mr. Morgan went over some of the amended text and stated there maybe a few more minor things that do not relate to content neutrality or the Freedom of Speech Act that we find between now and taking this next month to the Board that we might need to edit.

Action taken: Commissioner Archer moved to approve the proposed changes and recommend to the Board of Mayor and Commissioners, seconded by Commissioner Ragon. The Motion received all affirmative votes.

Agenda item 8. Shaw's Creek Discussion

Mr. Matheny stated that he received plans for the Shaw's Creek temporary construction road to review and when he opened up the drawing file the temporary construction road followed an alignment that did not match the approved master plan, the approved master plan shows the stub out basically paralleling the creek all the way up to Raleigh LaGrange and all these cul-de-sacs go off to the east from the road and basically they have flipped it and as you recall this temporary construction road in this future phase will become a permanent road when this phase develops so Brett and I talked about it and at minimum wanted to bring this to your attention but it is our opinion that before this road could become a permanent road that they would need to come back and amend the Master Plan because this is a significant change to the layout that is showing on the current Master Plan and the Engineer that works for the client is aware of that, they were anticipating having to come back and amend before this could become a permanent road so my position to them is if you want this to become your temporary construction road that is fine but know until the Master Plan gets amended officially you are doing at risk so I would like some of your thoughts about this becoming the permanent layout or if you saw any major problems with it, I will say the lot count has 1 additional lot in this layout than what is showing on the Master Plan and this is conceptual and can be cleaned up so the lot count did not go down and we will have to confirm that the common open space is the same or no less than what has been approved, other things have to be vented.

Mr. Morgan stated they also removed the lots that are were facing Raleigh LaGrange Road so I imagine they have more common open space, they can go up on the common open space but they can't reduce it.

Mr. Matheny stated he is curious what kind of buffer we have behind these rear lot lines over to the creek which is more than 80 feet so that is a pretty good buffer.

Commissioner Archer inquired what the reasoning is for flipping it.

Mr. Matheny stated when we were having those discussions they were talking about this road along this alignment was pretty costly because of the terrain is not very friendly along here due to a drainage path and other sufficient drainage path at another location so this takes the road up to a higher ground, there will be some water coming across under the road but it is not nearly as much as you would have down here so this is an easier construction path and goes all the way to Raleigh LaGrange, and from a traffic standpoint I like the greater separation between this proposed drive and the existing drive and in the currently approved location they are fairly close together, I did look at the distant from this road to the curve in Raleigh LaGrange and you have greater than 500 feet of visibility to the east before that curve occurs.

Chairman Henszey inquired about the access point for Mr. Simmons other than Raleigh LaGrange access that we have to deal with.

Mr. Matheny stated that is the only stubout that is currently shown on the Master Plan and still shown in the same location on this plan, discussion ensued on a bridge conversation and if that connection is still on the Master Plan it could still be connected to this as the cul-de-sac could go away and it could connect to that so if we wanted that crossing to take place than this plan could still work it would have to be modified slightly, there is nothing to vote on but we want to bring this before you for your input and to see if there are any red flags to this, we would rather they not build this as a temporary construction road at risk if we know on the front end we are strongly opposed to that being a permanent road in the future.

Chairman Henszey stated whatever we do we need to figure out how to get past the concrete so it don't get changed for the 4th or 5th time.

Mr. Matheny stated if they put the effort in to putting in a base and the culvert crossing and everything else for this road then I feel pretty certain they intend on that being a permit route.

Vice-Mayor Binkley inquired if we would inspect that as a permanent road.

Mr. Matheny stated we will certainly expect tree removal to make sure they don't leave root balls and things underground that shouldn't be there so we will inspect the construction of that temporary road (the base).

Commissioner Archer inquired if they will return with an amended Master Plan showing this?

Mr. Matheny stated before they can make it a permanent road they will have to amend the Master Plan.

Chairman Henszey inquired when they have to have the construction road on the development of that property to the west, they need to be using that construction road for that new development in the west correct?

Mr. Morgan stated correct.

Mr. Matheny stated the only thing they have approval for as we sit here tonight is grading and have had that approval for some time but the construction plans for that, for the drainage, the water and sewer are sitting on my desk, unsigned as they have not given us their letter of credit so therefore they haven't fully executed their contract and that is why we are holding their plans and we have not had a preconstruction meeting.

Chairman Henszey inquired at what stage do they have to be using the construction road instead of the main road.

Mr. Matheny stated they need to have that construction road ready before they start putting in that infrastructure so that needs to be the first order of business.

Chairman Henszey stated it looks like they are ready to put all the infrastructure in and they haven't even thought about the construction road.

Mr. Matheny stated this would be the first order of business.

Mr. Morgan stated Harvey, I would say in your preconstruction meeting deal with making sure the proper signage is put in at both entrances to say this is not your construction entrance, I realized looking at this that this road is significantly wider or so it appears than this, so I can help but think this parallel road is going to be the same width, is this something we need to look into?

Mr. Matheny stated he doesn't know what the proposed width of that road was, this stub road is narrower than this road.

Mr. Morgan stated he is sure they haven't fully developed it.

Mr. Matheny stated this part of it is fully developed because it is in phase 1.

Mr. Morgan stated it looks like to me they are reducing section of the road as well to which Mr. Matheny stated it does look like that, and Mr. Morgan stated so we will have to note that within the plans if they come back for amended Master Plan approval.

Commissioner Archer inquired what caused them to flip flop the plan.

Mr. Morgan stated it is easier to build it.

Mr. Matheny stated constructability and construction costs.

Agenda item 9. In-laws Suites Discussion

Mr. Morgan stated if possible he will have an Ordinance ready for the next Planning Commission meeting, and he proceed to go over the sample ordinance for a special exception to come before this Board and the BZA for the final site plan approval of that, this would allow in any residential area and given what those different uses allow it is important that we look at the sizes that we want to allow, right now anything over an 1 ½ acres we allow 40 % of the principal structure to be for accessory structures but do we want to count in-law suites in that for instance if someone came along and decided that they wanted an in-law suite but they already have a detached garage that

accounts for 30% of their accessory structure, do we want to essentially penalize them-these are things we need to look at.

Chairman Henszey inquired what is the difference between the in-law suites and simply adding on to the house.

Mr. Morgan stated if you add on to the house it becomes part of the principle structure and it is not an in-law suite and that needs to be addressed in this because we don't want to limit in-law suites to exterior structures necessarily and we would want to note as habitable living space it is required to be sprinkled.

Chairman Henszey stated there should be one set of meters for the property, 1 electric meter so this structure would have to be off the house meters and it is all designed to prevent renting the structure out.

Chief Bullock stated he would suggest that because of emergency situation where we have to address utilities that becomes a safety issue.

Discussion ensued regarding regulations.

Agenda item 10. Any other old/new business, questions or matters from the audience
There was none.

Agenda item 11. Adjournment

Action taken: Vice-Mayor Binkley moved for adjournment, seconded by Commissioner Archer. The Motion received all affirmative votes, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly Holloway, City Recorder

Approved: _____ date: _____