

**City of Hernando, Mississippi**

**Office of Planning**

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**SEPTEMBER 14, 2021, MINUTES**

The Planning Commission met in a regular session on September 14, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall Board Room, 475 W Commerce Street. The following Commissioners were present: Commissioner Ashworth, Commissioner Thorn, Commissioner Clark, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner Carter, Commissioner Hawkins, Commissioner Skeen, and Commissioner Brumbelow. The following staff members were also present Kristen Duggan, BJ Page, and Steven Pittman

Commissioner Carter called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and Commissioner Thorn gave the invocation followed by roll being called.

Commissioner Carter asked if everyone had reviewed the August 10, 2021, minutes. Commissioner Brumbelow made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Commissioner Skeen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Carter then asked for a motion for the August 24, 2021, Special Call meeting. Commissioner Hawkins made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Commissioner Skeen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Carter announced the following item:

**Item 1: PL-1546 – Request to Rezone a 4.85-acre parcel of land from its current zoning in the “R-12,” Single Family Residential District (Medium Density) to the “C-2” Highway Commercial District. The subject property, consisting of parts of Parcel Numbers 308101000 0000800, 308101000 0001900 and 308101000 0002000 is located on the southeast corner of U.S. Highway 51 and Green T Road in Section 1, Township 3 South, Range 8 West. Bob Ginn with Land Development Resources, L.L. C, representing Cal Wilkins of Crossroads Desota, LLC, Owner of the property.**

Commissioner Clark recused himself and left the board room.

Mr. BJ Page presented the application to the commission.

Mr. George Ready came forward to represent the application. He stated that the property was originally a Planned Commercial District and there was never any activity on it. In 2017 the property was rezoned to R-12 at the recommendation of Mr. Briley. Mr. Ready feels that there should have been a PUD amendment instead of R-12

There were findings in 2006 to justify that the property should be commercial. He added that he feels that it complies with the Future Land Use Plan and there is enough evidence of change in the neighborhood to constitute this zoning. Commercial surrounds this property to the north and across the street. He also added the Interstate 69 and AWG are also changes in the area.

Commissioner Thorn asked if this is just a request for 4.85-acres. Mr. Ready stated that it was. The rest will remain residential. Commissioner Carter then asked if this 4.85 acres was divided out in the original rezoning, Mr. Page stated that it was not. This property was not included as part of the Crossroads Development, but the zoning remained R-12. Mr. Page added that he agrees with Mr. Ready that the better way would have been a PUD amendment. Mr. Ready stated that he wanted to make note that Mr. Page agreed that this was mistaken advice by the Planning Department, and this should not be held against Mr. Wilkins.

Commissioner Jordan stated that the 2020 plan update labels this as Urban Land which shows commercial along residential.

Commissioner Thorn asked if the buffer would affect the commercial or residential land. Mr. Ready stated that it would be on the commercial side.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against the application. There was no one.

Commissioner Jordan made a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** to the Board of Aldermen of a rezoning requested by Mr. Bob Ginn with Land Development Resources, L.L.C., representing Cal Wilkins of Crossroads DeSota, L.L.C., the owner of the property, of a 4.85-acre parcel of land located on the Southeast Corner of U.S. Highway 51 and Green “T” Road in Section 1, Township 3 South, Range 8 West from its current zoning in the “R-12,” Single-Family Residential District (Medium Density) to the “C-2,” Highway Commercial District, based upon the following findings:

1. How the proposed amendment would conform to the General Development Plan.

The subject property is zoned “R-12” which is a single-family residential district that is less conducive to higher traffic and commercialization caused by construction of I-269 and the New McIngvale interchange/access, as well as increased traffic on U.S. Highway 51.

1. Why the existing zoning district classification of the property in question is inappropriate or improper.

Within 1.5 miles of this property there already exist approximately 2300 homes with another 200 to follow. There are very few retail services in this area. A preliminary plat for Crossroads North Subdivision with 71 additional lots has already been approved for 30 of the 35 acres in this parcel. What remains is at the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Hwy 51 and Green T. Because of the unprecedented residential activity, commercial interests, and MDOT projects, this intersection has become a vital link for commercial services that will be needed in this area.

1. That major economic, physical, or social changes, if any, have occurred in the vicinity of the property in question that were not anticipated by the General Development Plan and have substantially altered the basic character of the area, which make the proposed amendment to the Zoning District Map appropriate.

The property was zoned commercial in 2007. The economy crashed, and 10 years of marketing yielded no prospects. The residential market rebounded to a degree in 2017. The decision was made to rezone at least part of the property to R-12. We were told that because the entire 70 acres was in a commercial PD, we would need to rezone the entire parcel to rescind the PD, which we did. The southern portion was developed into residential lots and sold to a builder between 2017 and 2020. That left 35 undeveloped acres at the intersection of Hwy 51 and Green T.

As plans were being made to develop this section, the area was undergoing drastic changes. I-269 was completed and an exit was installed at McIngvale Road. The LeBlonde property has been developed into warehouses creating many jobs and much more traffic. MDOT has several major projects in the works: Improvements to the Hwy 51/Green “T” intersection to include widening and a traffic signal/red light; improvements to the Pleasant Hill intersection with widening and a round-about; another exit at Star Landing Road; the closing and improvement of the I-55 Hernando exit for an extended period which will divert a lot of traffic through the Hwy 51/Green T intersection to get to the McIngvale Exit; additional lanes added to I-55 between Southaven and Hernando.

Within 1.5 miles of this property there already exist approximately 2300 homes with another 200 to follow. There are very few retail services in this area. With all of this activity, and in anticipation of what’s to come, commercial developers are making offers in this area. Having our corner zoned C-2 will help meet the growing demand for those needed commercial services.

Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Clark came back to the board room.

Chairman Carter announced the following item:

**Item 2: PL-1547 – Request for a Zoning Ordinance Parking Variance to allow construction of a new self-storage facility, providing seven (7) fixed parking spaces, rather than the required 35 parking spaces for a variance of 28 spaces on the subject property identified as 3331 US Highway 51 South Parcel No. 308624000 0001302, a 5.70-acre tract located on the northwest corner of US Highway 51 South and the entrance road to the City’s Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West. - Ben Smith of IPD Engineering LLC on behalf of Jim Burrow pf Hernando Self Storage 2, owner of the property.**

Mr. Page presented the application to the commission. He explained that storage buildings are low traffic and other cities in Desoto County require substantially less parking for this type of business. They require one space per 50 units which would be 7 spaces for this property.

Mr. Ben Smith came forward to represent the application. He explained that many other cities have less requirements and he feels that the ordinance is out of date. It is unnecessary to have 35 parking spaces.

Commissioner Thorn stated that based on the size of the development he feels that seven spaces seems low and asked if the applicant was willing to compromise. Commissioner Carter agreed. Commissioner Thorn then suggested adding two additional spaces to total nine spaces.

Commissioner Brumbelow asked about U-Haul rental. Mr. Jim Burrows stated that there would be no U-Haul rentals at this location.

Mr. Page added that a mini storage is a conditional use and unless approved in the original conditional use approval they would not be allowed to rent the U-Hauls.

Commissioner Carter stated that in the past the Planning Commission has agreed that the parking requirements need to be updated and the commission has done a good job of meeting in the middle.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against the application. There was no one.

Commissioner Thorn A motion to **approve** a Zoning Variance for Jim Burrow of Hernando Self-Storage 2, owner of the property, to allow construction of a new self-storage facility, providing nine (9) fixed parking spaces, rather than the required 35 parking spaces for a variance of 26 parking spaces, which will be added to the existing 3 spots on the west side, on the subject property identified as 3331 U.S. Highway 51 South (Parcel #3086-2400.0-00013.02), a 5.70-acre tract located on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 51 and the entrance road to the City’s Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, based upon the following findings:

1. *That the special conditions and circumstances that exist are peculiar to the land, structures, or buildings involved, and are not generally applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.* The very nature of the use (self-storage) is a special condition or circumstance peculiar to the buildings involved in this request. Most modern Zoning Ordinances recognize not only the low traffic demand usage of self-storage facilities, but also, as the applicant pointed out, the fact that all of the paved area of the site provides a parking area, yielding a much less stringent parking requirement. A poll of the cities of Horn Lake, Southaven, and Olive Branch reveals that all three cities require only one parking space for every 50 storage units. Based upon the 350 storage units proposed in this application, using these other communities’ provisions, only 7 parking spaces would be required, with which the applicant’s site plan does comply.
2. *That the literal enforcement of the provisions of these standards would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties within the same district under the terms of this Ordinance.* Because of the special conditions involved by the specific use of the property (self-storage facility), the strict enforcement of the requirements of the Ordinance would adversely affect the applicant by requiring a level of compliance that does not reflect the actual parking demand required by the project; thereby depriving the applicant of rights enjoyed by other commercial properties in the same district who are allowed to meet parking requirements more reflective of the actual parking demand of those uses.
3. *That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant and are not based upon economic considerations.* The nature of self-storage facilities, and the reduced demands for parking that accompany them, are true wherever these types of facilities are constructed, and as such do not stem from any actions by the applicant.
4. *That granting the variance requested would not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is otherwise denied by this Ordinance to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.* Approval of the variance would not confer on the applicant any special privilege otherwise denied by this Ordinance to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district. The nature of self-storage facilities and the reduced needs for parking that accompany them, are true wherever these types of facilities are constructed. Approval of the variance would allow the applicant to utilize a level of compliance more reflective of the actual parking demand required by the project, bringing the project more in line with other commercial properties in the same district who are allowed to meet parking requirements more reflective of the actual parking demand of those uses.

Commissioner Skeen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Carter announced the following item:

**Item 3: PL-1548 –** **Request a Design Review Variance to allow construction of a new self-storage facility without extending the roof parapet wall along the front elevation of some of the proposed buildings. The proposed self-storage facility will be located on a 5.70-acre parcel on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 51 and the entrance road to the City’s Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, more specifically known as 3331 U.S. Highway 51 South. The subject property is currently zoned “C-4,” Planned Commercial District**.- **Ben Smith of IPD Engineering LLC on behalf of Jim Burrow pf Hernando Self Storage 2, owner of the property.**

Mr. Page presented the application to the commission.

Mr. Ben Smith came forward to represent the application. He explained that the large building in the middle will have a parapet along all 4 sides of the building. The request is only for the rear side of the RV storage. There will be no units on top of these buildings that would require concealment and the request is only for the rear side that faces into the lot.

Commissioner Jordan asked if the slope was from the front to the back and Mr. Burrows said yes. He also stated that this was done on purpose so that you would not see this from the outside of the lot.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Jason Bradley, 3245 Highway 51, came forward. He stated that he is a neighbor and would rather see the elimination of the parapet to be on the interior of the lot so that it is not visible or no variance at all.

Commissioner Skeen A motion to **approve** a Design Review Variance to allow the elimination of a roof parapet wall along the front elevations of proposed buildings B, C, D, E, and F, as identified on the submitted site plan for Hernando Self-Storage 2 to be located at 3331 U.S. Highway 51 South, a 5.70-acre tract on northwest corner of U.S. Highway 51 and the entrance road to Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, based upon the following findings:

1. *That the special conditions and circumstances that exist are peculiar to the land, structures, or buildings involved, and are not generally applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.* The perimeter buildings in this development have pitched roofs to the interior. These roofs are standing seam metal roofs which means that the parapet wall will block free fall of the rainwater to the ground. Materials and colors are consistent throughout the building design, with continuity of the parapet being the only variable.
2. *That the literal enforcement of the provisions of these standards would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties within the same district and would not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is otherwise denied to other properties in the same district.* This variance, if approved, would not confer to the applicant any privilege that would be denied to any other applicant. Variances are considered on a case-by-case basis. The proposed elimination of the parapet along the front elevation of this facility does not detract visually from the adjacent properties or detract value to the area.

1. *That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant and are not based upon economic considerations.* False parapet walls are prohibited by ordinance. So the parapet wall cannot be placed on top of the metal roof. The metal roof is designed to extend beyond what would be the parapet wall.
2. *That the proposed modification upholds the intent and spirit of the Ordinance by providing an equal or better standard of protection and aesthetic value than the strict requirement of the Ordinance from which the variance is sought.* The absence of a parapet wall will expose only the painted standing seam roof. There is no equipment to be placed on the roofs. The Ordinance states enameled standing seam metal roofs are appropriate if it matches the architectural style of the building, which it will on this project. Metal roofs are very popular and pleasing to the eye.

Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: Commissioner Clark “Yay,” Commissioner Thorn “Yay,” Commissioner Jordan “Nay,” Commissioner Brumbelow “Yay,” Commissioner Hawkins “Yay,” Commissioner Ashworth “Yay,” and Commissioner Skeen “Yay,”

Chairman Carter announced the following item:

**Item 4: PL-1549 –** **Request a Zoning Ordinance Buffer Yard Variance to allow construction of a new self-storage facility with a ten (10) foot wide buffer yard along its western property line bordering the City’s Renasant Park rather than the required thirty (30) foot wide buffer yard, a variance of twenty (20) feet, as well as to propose an alternative landscape plan for that buffer yard and the buffer yard along the northern property line. The proposed self-storage facility will be located on a 5.70-acre parcel on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 51 and the entrance road to the City’s Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, more specifically known as 3331 U.S. Highway 51 South. The subject property is currently zoned “C-4,” Planned Commercial District**.- **Ben Smith of IPD Engineering LLC on behalf of Jim Burrow pf Hernando Self Storage 2, owner of the property.**

Mr. Page presented the application to the commission. He explained that this variance request has two parts. The first is the width of the buffer yard on one side and the second is the landscape deficiency. He explained that an opaque barrier, i.e., a masonry wall of 6 feet tall or an earth berm of 6 feet tall is required. They are proposing that the wall be the edge of the building since there is no separation and a masonry wall will be constructed between the building to make it continuous.

Commissioner Thorn asked if the landscaping is a separate issue and Mr. Page stated that it was not because it is all a requirement of the buffer yard. He then explained that the plans shows that they are deficient 8 evergreens on the north side and 10 deciduous trees. On the Western side they are deficient 8 evergreens and 9 deciduous trees.

Mr. ben Smith stated that they can work with the required material and will meet all ordinance requirements for the landscaping. He went on to state the city changed the zoning of the park and had they not changed it to R-10 the required buffer yard would only be 10 feet.

Commissioner Jordan stated that he feels the commission owes it to the citizens to protect the park and make sure that the utmost buffer yard is requires.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Jarrett Marshaw came forward and said he is against the request and feels that the citizens deserve a barrier between this building and the park.

Mr. Jason Brady came forward and is against this as well. He feels that the ordinance requirements should be met.

Commissioner Clark made a motion to **deny** a Zoning Variance for Jim Burrow of Hernando Self-Storage 2, owner of the property, to allow construction of a new self-storage facility, providing a ten (10) foot wide buffer yard along the western property line of the subject site, rather than the required thirty (30) foot wide buffer yard, a variance of twenty (20) feet, and an alternative landscape plan. The subject property is identified as 3331 U.S. Highway 51 South (Parcel #3086-2400.0-00013.02), a 5.70-acre tract located on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 51 and the entrance road to the City’s Renasant Park, in Section 24, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, based upon the following findings:

A. *That the special conditions and circumstances that exist are peculiar to the land, structures, or buildings involved, and are not generally applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.* The need for the variance is directly related to the design choices of the applicant concerning the number of storage units proposed and the resulting number of buildings involved as well as the proposed location of those buildings on the property, all of which, impact the amount of property available for provision of the buffer yard. The use of large trees may be prohibited due to the close proximity of the DCRUA sanitary sewer easement on the north; however, many developments use the same type of large trees in interior parking lot landscape islands, which are typically only 5’ wide. Therefore, a 10’ wide buffer yard area should be more than sufficient for the use of large deciduous trees. Finally, the criteria requires that the special conditions and circumstances **not be generally applicable** to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same district. The argument being put forward by the applicant could be made by any other business choosing to locate on commercially zoned property adjacent to a less intensely zoned district.

B. *That the literal enforcement of the provisions of these standards would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties within the same district.* Denial of the variance would not deprive the applicant of any rights commonly enjoyed by other properties within the same district. The width and landscaping requirements of the Buffer Yard regulations contained in City’s Zoning Ordinance are determined by the adjoining zoning district. In short, any “C-4” zoned properties anywhere in the City adjacent to a property zoned in the “R-10” district would have to meet the same “Type 30” Buffer Yard requirements that the applicant is required to meet.

C. *That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant and are not based upon economic considerations*. The need for the variance is directly related to the design choices of the applicant concerning the number of storage units proposed and the resulting number of buildings involved as well as the proposed location of those buildings on the property, all of which, impact the amount of property available for provision of the buffer yard. Additionally, although the use of large trees may be prohibited due to the close proximity of the DCRUA sanitary sewer easement on the north, the same case cannot be made on the west because of the narrowness of the buffer yard. Many developments use the same large trees in interior parking lot landscape islands, which are typically only 5’ wide. Therefore, a 10’ wide buffer yard area should be more than sufficient for the use of large deciduous trees. Therefore, the choice of plant materials is resultant from the applicant’s decisions.

1. *That granting the variance requested would not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is otherwise denied by this Ordinance to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.* Approval of the variance would confer on the applicant a special privilege in that he would be permitted to waive requirements of the City’s Zoning Ordinance buffer yard regulations that future developments will be required to meet; thereby permitting a larger use of the subject property, with less transitional landscaping, than would otherwise be allowed on any other “C-4” zoned properties adjoining similarly zoned residential properties.

Commissioner Brumbelow seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Carter announced the following item:

**Item 5: Request a Final Plat Approval for the 4th Revision** **of Lot 8 of Juanita Acres Subdivision. Lot 8 consists of 3.23 acres** **located on the east side of Hall Road, south of Pleasant Hill Road, and is more specifically known as 1246 Hall Road in Section 30, Township 2 South, Range 7 West., revising the Plat to vacate a 25’ wide right-of-way along the southern boundary line of the lot, previously vacated by the Board of Alderman on March 5. 2019. The property consists of 3.32 acres and is currently zoned “AR” Agricultural Residential District – Ban Smith IPD LLC on behalf of Matthew Baker, owner of the property.**

Mr. Page presented that application. To the commission. he explained that this was an easement that was previously vacated by the city. He added that the plat title needs to be changed to reflect the correct revisions.

Mr. Ben Smith came forward and stated that when an easement is vacated half goes to each adjoining property owner.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application. There was no one.

Commissioner Jordan made a Motion to grant Final Plat approval to the “1st Revision to Lot 8 of the 4th Revision of Juanita Acres Subdivision,” 3.23 acres located on the east side of Hall Road, south of Pleasant Hill Road, and is more specifically known as 1246 Hall Road in Section 30, Township 2 South, Range 7 West, based upon a finding that the submitted plat generally conforms to the requirements of the City’s codes and ordinances, subject to the following conditions:

Revise the plat as follows:

1. Revise the title of the plat to read “1st Revision to Lot 8 of the 4th Revision of Juanita Acres Subdivision.”
2. Revise the utility easements along the front rear and south side property lines to reflect the new south property line.
3. Reflect the Section corner tie-in.

Commissioner Thorn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Carter announced the following item:

**Item 6: Request a Final Plat Approval for Montclair Phase 6 consisting of 36 single-family residential lots and 1 common open space lot, located from West Oak Grove Road south on Scott Road, then northeast on Tates Way to Claire Circle South, then east on Claire Circle South to its terminus, situated in Section 23, Township 3 South, Range 8 West. - Greg Smith of Mendrop Engineering Resources on behalf of Butch Davis of Montclair LLC, owner of the property.**

Mr. Page presented the application to the commission.

Mr. Greg Smith cam forward to represent the application. He stated that they agree with all changes mentioned by Mr. Page.

Commissioner Carter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against the application. There was no one.

Commissioner Skeen made a Motion to grant Final Plat approval for Montclair Subdivision, Phase 6, consisting of 36 single-family residential lots and 1 common open space lot, located at the eastern terminus of Claire Circle South, situated in Section 23, Township 3 South, Range 8 West, based upon a finding that the submitted final plat generally conforms to the approved preliminary plan for the planned unit development, and generally meets the requirements of the City’s codes and ordinances, subject to the following conditions:

1. Revise the final plat to address the following:
2. Revise the Owner’s and Mortgagee’s Certificates to state “…and dedicate the right-of-way for the roads and utility easements as shown on the plat of the Subdivision to the City of Hernando for the public use forever.” Eliminate the following wording, “…and reserve for the public utilities the utility easements as shown on the plat.”
3. Revise Note #1 on the face of the plat to reflect the correct setback requirements for Lots 243 – 247.
4. Revise the plat to reflect the correct front yard building line for Lots 243 - 247.
5. Revise the plat to reflect the Section corner tie-in.
6. Revise the title of the plat to incorporate the number of lots and the Zoning District identification.
7. Revise the plat to eliminate the City Certification located in the upper left-hand corner of Sheet 1 since it is a duplication of the same certificate located on the right-hand side of Sheet 1.
8. Any buffer areas, retention basins, landscape areas, open areas, street medians, entrance signs, and any other common elements, proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowners Association in Phase 6, **or any of the previous phases**, shall be deeded over to the Homeowners Association. A copy of the finalized incorporation papers and all deeds transferring common elements to the Homeowners Association shall be submitted to the staff for inclusion in the file. All common elements required in all previous sections of the development must be completed and dedicated to the Homeowners Association prior to the issuance of any building permits in Phase 6.
9. The Homeowners Association covenants shall be submitted to and approved by Planning Staff prior to recording of the plat for Phase 6. The submitted covenants shall match the covenants that were recorded with Phases 1 – 5 of Montclair Subdivision. If amendments are requested by the developer, if the proposed changes are more restrictive than what is currently required by the previous phases of Montclair Subdivision, then those changes may be approved by the Planning staff. If the proposed changes are less restrictive than what is currently required by the previous phases of Montclair Subdivision, then those changes must be approved by the Planning Commission.
10. Improvements are to be the responsibility of the developer and not the responsibility of the City of Hernando.
11. All landscaping in all common open space areas, natural areas, buffer areas, streetscape areas, medians, islands, and the entrance signage areas and such other associated improvements shall be installed/constructed prior to the issuance of any building permit within that respective phase of the development. Street trees may be bonded insuring their installation prior to the final inspection and occupancy of the residence upon each lot.
12. Following Plat Approval, the Developer shall submit two (2) complete sets of construction plans for review and approval to the Office of Planning. Grading, drainage, and engineering construction plans to be approved by the City Engineer and Public Works Director.
13. The developer shall install drainage pipe, erosion control material, sewer mains and service, water mains, fire hydrants, and service, gas mains and service, curb and gutter for all streets, and gravel or soil cement base for the streets and one (1) layer of blacktop, 1½" thick, before the plat of the subdivision is recorded. A performance guarantee must be filed for the remainder of the improvements in an amount set by the City Engineer. This includes another 1½" of blacktop making a total of three inches (3") of blacktop surface and sidewalks. Prior to recording the final plat, all public improvements shall be installed, completed, and accepted by the City of Hernando.
14. Prior to the beginning of utility and improvement construction, the Developer shall enter into a Development Contract with the City of Hernando for the installation of all required Public Improvements. This is in accordance with Article VI Required Minimum Improvements, §B. Procedures for Posting or Release of Bonds of the City of Hernando’s Land Subdivision Ordinance.
15. Sidewalks shall be installed on both sides of all streets.
16. Streetlights shall be installed at the developer’s expense. Streetlight plans shall be submitted to the Office of Planning for City Engineer and Planning Director approval.
17. All utilities and services (electric, telephone, cable, etc.) are to be installed underground. The water service lines shall be installed with tracing wire at the top.
18. Prior to recording the final plat, the Developer shall submit for approval a schedule of Lot Numbers and associated street addresses to the Office of Planning. Corner lots shall include potential addresses for both streets.
19. Prior to submitting the plat for recording, the applicant shall coordinate with the Post Office the centralized delivery location of the mailboxes.

Commissioner Hawkins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Carter announced the following item:

**Item 7: Proposed Amendment to the Text of the City of Hernando Subdivision Regulations, and the City of Hernando Design Standards Ordinance concerning the provisions of cluster mailboxes.**

Mr. Page presented the information to the commission.

Commissioner Clark asked if the developer would be required to submit design plans to make the design of the builds. He then stated that the developer is not always the builder and may not know the design. Mr. Page stated that pattern books would be submitted to state the designs.

Commissioner Thorn asked how to handle situations where previous phases do not have CBU’s Mr. Page said he would consult the city attorney, but he feels previous phases are vested in when the original approval was granted. He then added that these plans would be required during the preliminary design phase.

Commissioner Carter announced the following item:

**Item 8: Review of Updated Comprehensive Plan**

Mr. Page stated that a digital copy of the plan would be emailed out so that the review was easier.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.