BRISTOL TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL REGIONAL
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 15, 2019

Members Present:
Kelly Graham, Chairman
Mark Webb, Vice-Chairman
Joel Staton, Secretary
Mark Byington, Vice-Secretary
Scott Gaynor
Kevin Buck
Jack Young
Margaret Feierabend
Tekai Shu

Staff/Others Present:
Danielle Kiser
Cherith Young
Ross Peters
Heather Moore
Steve Blankenship
Steven Mott
Brittany Fleenor

Members Not Present

Mr. Kelly Graham called the Bristol Tennessee Municipal Regional Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, April 15, 2019. Mr. Joel Staton performed roll call, and a quorum was declared present.

Mr. Graham introduced the new Planning Commission member, Tekai Shu, who is the social media and business development manager at Strongwell. He attended college at Emory & Henry where he earned a degree in Political Science, and he resides here in the area with his wife and daughter. Mr. Shu fills the open seat designated for a resident of the Urban Growth Boundary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
There being no corrections or additions to the March 18, 2019 minutes, Mr. Mark Webb made a motion to approve all minutes as presented; Mr. Kevin Buck seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

UNSCHEDULED COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:
None

OLD BUSINESS:
None
NEW BUSINESS:
A. Proposed Street Renaming – Pine Circle Drive to Andover Drive
Mr. David Metzger presented information on the proposed street renaming. He stated that he was approached by staff members of Bristol, VA a few weeks ago because they are going through their next generation 911 process. They will be renaming streets to establish certain standards set forth by the state. On the far western side of Bristol, there is an intersection where three of the four legs have the same name, Pine Circle Drive. From a 911 standpoint, that can create some issues. Bristol, VA is interested in renaming their section of the street Andover Drive, which is the name of the road that goes the rest of the way to Island Road, to comply with their next-gen standards. They contacted Mr. Metzger to see how Bristol, TN would feel about renaming our very short part of the road Andover Drive as well. The only piece of property on the TN side that boarders Pine Circle Drive is an undeveloped parcel, but that street name and address will not change because it has a Grove Park Drive address. Renaming the street will allow TN to line up with VA, so that we don’t have a street with a different name that is 45 ft. long. Staff proposed renaming the section of the road Andover Drive to become effective August 1, 2019. This will line up with the time frame that VA has for street name changes and address changes.

Mayor Margaret Feierabend made a motion to approve the street renaming; Dr. Mark Webb seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

B. Site Plan (SP2019-124) – Pinnacle Parcel E
Mr. Buck and Mr. Graham stated that they would be abstaining from the vote due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Blankenship presented information on the site plan. The Planned Business District requires the submission of a preliminary concept plan for approval by the Planning Commission prior to the submission of a full site plan meeting the requirements of Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance. The developers are proposing to build an 82,000 square foot shopping center located at 529 Pinnacle Parkway, situated in a PBD (Planned Business District) Zone. The access point will be off Pinnacle Parkway. Internal to the development, there are no required setbacks within the Planned Business District. A landscaping plan has not been provided, and will need to be submitted and meet Chapter 11 or 11A of the Zoning Ordinance. All proposed parking lot lighting will have to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. A photometric plan will have to be submitted to staff for approval. Signage, when submitted, must meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. A screened in refuse collection area is shown on the site plan at the rear of the buildings. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the conceptual site plan for Pinnacle Parcel E noting conformance to the intent of the Planned Business District.

Mr. Mark Byington made a motion to approve the site plan; Mr. Scott Gaynor seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.
C. Site Plan (SP2019-125) – Valero Fas Mart, 1287 Highway 11W
Mr. Steve Blankenship presented information on the site plan. The Planned Business District requires the submission of a preliminary concept plan for approval by the Planning Commission prior to the submission of a full site plan meeting the requirements of Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance. The developer would like to add an additional 880 square feet to the Fas Mart building located at 1287 Highway 11W, situated in a PBD (Planned Business District) Zone. No additional access points are required for this project. The setback requirements for this development shall be the same as the B-3 District. The setbacks are fifteen feet for the front yard and twenty feet for the rear yard. No side yard setbacks are required since the development is not adjacent to a residential lot or district. A landscaping plan has not been provided, and will need to be submitted and meet Chapter 11 or 11A of the Zoning Ordinance. All proposed parking lot lighting will have to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. A photometric plan will have to be submitted to staff for approval. Signage, when submitted, must meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. A screened in refuse collection area is shown on the site plan at the rear of the building. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the conceptual site plan for the Fas Mart Addition to the building, noting conformance to the intent of the Planned Business District.

Mr. Kelly Graham asked, if this is not part of the Pinnacle, why was it brought before the Planning Commission? Mr. Blankenship replied, because it is in the Planned Business District, and any site plan within that zone must come before the Planning Commission.

Dr. Mark Webb made a motion to approve the site plan; Mr. Kevin Buck seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

D. Subdivision Plat (SUB 19-11) – Replat Properties of: Crockett, Hayes, Owen, Reid, Poore, & Slaughter
Mr. Steven Mott presented information on the subdivision replat. The property owners, Joan Z. Crockett; James A. Hayes & Karen Hayes; Naomi E. Owen, Stuart R. Reid & Alva S. Reid; Brian A. Poore & Donna F. Poore; Judy Ault Slaughter, are seeking approval to re-subdivide 6 lots into 5 lots located at 114, 116, & 118 Montvue Rd; 1733 & 1735 Holston Dr. The property is approximately 2.545 acres and is situated in the R-1A Zone. Currently, the land is vacant and has City of Bristol water and sanitary sewer service. The lot size and density meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The plat format meets the requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations, pending signatures. The proposed five lot subdivision plat already contains access onto Holston Drive and Montvue Road. The dissolution of the landlocked parcel eliminated the issue of a lot without ingress or egress. No changes in current access is foreseen and/or needed. The preliminary and final plat meets all the requirements of the Bristol, Tennessee Subdivision Regulations. Staff recommends that the Bristol Tennessee Municipal Regional Planning Commission grant preliminary and final approval of the Replat Properties of: Crockett, Hayes, Owen, Reid, Poore, & Slaughter subject to receiving all required signatures on the plat.

Mayor Margaret Feierabend asked if the City, or the owners, initiated this request. Mrs. Cherith Young responded that the owner, Joan Z. Crockett, made the request.
Mayor Margaret Feierabend made a motion to approve the replat; Mr. Mark Byington seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS:

A. Signage Standards Discussion
Mr. Mark Byington made a motion to hold a work session to go over every aspect of the signs; Margaret Feierabend seconded the motion. The Commission asked for staff’s recommendation. Mrs. Cherith Young stated that she believes a work session on signage would be a good idea. Discussion ensued about the scheduling of the work session. Mrs. Young suggested covering as much as possible in one meeting and then, if there are more things to discuss, hold another work session to complete the signage discussion. The Commission agreed. Dr. Mark Webb wondered if staff had enough information from the Commission to be able to hold a meeting without going over the same things they’ve already discussed and agreed upon. Mrs. Cherith Young stated that staff has tracked the discussion with a chart, so that when a vote is required the Commission may refer back to the chart to see how and when decisions were made. Mr. Kelly Graham asked staff what their goal would be for the current meeting. Mrs. Young stated that staff would like to go over the last element on electronic message boards. At the last meeting it appeared that a maximum percentage was agreeable. A decision should be made on what that maximum number will be, so the discussion on electronic message boards will be complete.

Mr. Tekai Shu asked how the Commission arrived at the signage discussion. Mrs. Young stated that one of the goals from the City Council is to update the sign codes to make them clearer. A Supreme Court case came out a few years ago that is impacting the way communities regulate signage, so part of the goal is to look at our Sign Ordinance and see where it can be improved. Staff and the Commission have been working on this for four or five months, topic by topic, and have started with electronic message boards because there was a request from the community to look into where they are allowed.

Mr. Graham stated that the Commission would discuss percentage; everything else can be discussed in a work session. Mayor Feierabend stated that she would like to set a few work sessions and if the Commission doesn’t need them they may cancel them.

Mr. Byington made a motion to withdraw his previous motion to hold a work session to discuss all aspects of signage. Two, or three, work sessions will be scheduled, and if they are not needed they may be canceled; Mayor Feierabend seconded the motion to withdraw.

Mrs. Young showed the Commission examples of three businesses for the percentage discussion. These photographs showed examples of signs in Bristol where 33%, 26%, and 28% were electronic message boards. Mrs. Young stated that Bristol, VA has no maximum percentage, Sullivan County has a 50% maximum, and Johnson City has a maximum square footage of 32 square feet, or 25%, whichever is largest.
Mayor Feierabend stated that she likes 36% because the majority of signs in the City won’t be grandfathered in, they actually meet the requirement, and it’s not too much. Mr. Shu, stated that there is one existing sign in Bristol that is 60% and wondered if they would have to redesign their sign. Mayor Feierabend stated that they would be grandfathered in. Mr. Buck stated that if the sign broke down it could be replaced in kind.

Mr. Gaynor stated that he believes there should not be a limit on percentage because many of these signs are designed primarily with cost in mind. Electronic sign cost will be coming down, and a percentage limit will pose an issue in the future when people only want to use electronic message signs because it is cheaper. Mayor Feierabend stated that she is in favor of 36%, and that may be reevaluated in five or six years. Dr. Webb stated that he agrees, Bristol should stay tasteful with no more than 50% for electronic messaging. Mr. Byington stated that he believes a ratio of 60% static and 40% electronic would be agreeable.

Mayor Feierabend wondered if the Ordinance could be brought to Council in parts or as a whole. Mrs. Danielle Kiser stated that the Ordinance may be brought before City Council in parts. The Commission was in agreement about piecing the Ordinance because it takes a while to work through the entire thing. Discussion continued about percentage of static signs and electronic signs.

Mayor Feierabend made a motion that 60% of an electronic sign must be static and 40% may be changeable; Mr. Byington seconded the motion; the motion carried with only one opposing vote from Mr. Gaynor.

Mr. Jack Young stated that he believes this is a good place to start to see how things will progress. Mrs. Young stated that Staff will bring this information back in recommendation form that will be ready to go to City Council if it passes at the next meeting. A work session will be scheduled to discuss everything else.

B. Driveway Widths/Access Standards Project Update
C. Design Standards Project Update
D. Tiny House Project Update

Mrs. Young stated that she would talk about all three items together. Staff has been working hard to bring these items to a close, and the goal is to bring back these items at the May meeting. She then showed the Commission a concept of a document of menu items that will encourage good development. She also stated that staff will reach out to the shop class at Sullivan Central who has built some tiny homes.

Discussion ensued on the length and discussion topics of the work session. It was most agreeable to have a three hour, stand-alone meeting. Staff will email the Commission three different dates and times for them to agree upon.

Mrs. Young stated that a CLG training event will be held at the end of the month. In January, City Council approved staff to apply for a grant to prepare Historic District guidelines for the City’s historic zoning purposes. This will be a one day training event for all the people involved with historic zoning.
With no other business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.
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