

CITY OF LAFOLLETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

207 SOUTH TENNESSEE AVENUE

LAFOLLETTE, TN 37766

PHONE: (423) 562-4961 FAX: (423) 563-0703

Chairman:

Joe Bolinger

Vice Chairman:

Eddie Wheeler, Jr.

Commission Members:

Mayor Michael Stanfield

Mark Hoskins

Dewayne Gibson

Codes Officer:

Jeff Duncan

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 2021 AT 4:30 PM**

- 1.) Call meeting to order.
- 2.) Approval of Minutes for:
 Planning Commission Meeting on July 22, 2021
- 3.) Comments from citizens.
- 4.) M-1 Industrial Site Plan Review located on Old Jacksboro Hwy. Map 103D-A Parcel 00.5.00 to propose metal building 50' x 60'.
- 5.) Existing Site Plan Review for 317 East Central Avenue Map 085K-D Parcel 007.00. Property is in a C-1 Central Business District.
- 6.) Adjournment

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS AGENDA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 2021 AT 4:30 PM**

- 1.) Call meeting to order.
- 2.) Approval of Minutes for July 22, 2021
- 3.) Comments from citizens
- 4.) Variance Request for East Hemlock St. Map 085N-D Parcel 057.00. Property is in a R-2 High Density Residential District.
- 5.) Adjournment.

FAIR HOUSING AGENDA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 2021 AT 4:30 PM

1.) Call meeting to order.

No business having been scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 2021, therefore, no minutes to approve.

2.) No business is scheduled.

3.) Adjournment

**CITY OF LAFOLLETTE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Thursday-August 26, 2021**

MEMBERS:

Chairman: Joe Bolinger

Vice-Chairman: Eddie Wheeler, Jr.

Commission Members:

Michael Stanfield

Mark Hoskins

Dewayne Gibson

Secretary: Eddie Wheeler, Jr.

Codes Officer: Jeff Duncan

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

LaFollette City Administrator: Stan Foust

LaFollette Staff Reporter: Donna Weaver

OTHERS PRESENT:

LaFollette City Administrator: Stan Foust

Scott Bowman

Dio Sanchez

Lindsay Hutson (WLAF)

Eva Herinkova (LaF P)

Mr. & Mrs. McCall

CITY OF LAFOLLETTE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING:

- 1.) Call meeting to order:** Mr. Bolinger announced it was time to start the meetings. He requested roll call for all three meetings. Which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes

Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Chairman Bolinger stated they did have a quorum and he appreciated everyone that was there.

- 2.) Approval of minutes for July 22, 2021:** Chairman Bolinger requested motions to approve the minutes for the July 22, 2021 meeting. Mr. Wheeler made the motion, Mr. Gibson made the second. Chairman Bolinger requested roll which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes

Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

- 3.) Comments from Citizens:** Chairman Bolinger asked if there were any one that wanted to make any comments. No one spoke. Chairman Bolinger stated to note there being none.

4.) M-1 Industrial Site Plan Review located on Old Jacksboro Hwy. Map 103D-A- Parcel 005.00 to propose a metal building 50' x 60'.

Mr. Bolinger read aloud item number four. Scott Bowman with IRTEC spoke up and introduced Dio Sanchez with A+ Garage Door Services. Mr. Bowman stated when they done a site plan with the engineers. It required a TDEC permit and that was included in with the packet that he had submitted previously with Dustin Woodson's previous Hydrohalic report. Mr. Bowman stated that the ditches were already in the rith raff, Retention Basins are installed by the design. The problem is right now during construction it was designed as a Sediment Basin also. Mr. Bowman stated that there was one little area beside the roadway that had some erosion on it to fix also. Mr. Bowman stated that was the package he had submitted and what he was asking was that Mr. Sanchez doesn't have to submit a whole new Hydraulic report that he was doing a whole lot less than exceeds the Hydrology on the original site. Mr. Hoskins spoke up saying that he had a question to ask. He asked Mr. Bowman if they could change the name that was on the Hydrology Report to reflect that legally. Mr. Bowman stated "yes". Mr. Hoskins stated that he was in agreement and asked if anyone else had an opinion on it. Mr. Duncan stated the only question he had pointing to the drawing was the water from this point to this point on the map. Mr. Bowman stated that no longer existed. Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. Sanchez if he was buying the property. Mr. Sanchez stated he had bought it already. Mr. Hoskins made the motion to approve. Mr. Gibson made the second. Chairman Bolinger requested roll which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes
Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes
Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Motion Carried

5.) Existing Site Plan Review for 317 East Central Avenue Map 085K-D Parcel 007.00. Property is in a C-1 Central Business District.

Mr. Duncan stated that the applicant Mr. & Mrs. Evans was not there at the meeting. Chairman Bolinger asked for a motion to table. Mr. Gibson made the motion to table, Mr. Hoskins made the second. Chairman Bolinger requested roll which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes
Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes
Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Motion Carried

6.) Adjournment: Chairman Bolinger asked Mr. Duncan if there was anything else to be brought before the Planning Commission. Mr. Duncan stated no. Mr. Gibson made the motion to adjourn,

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

1.) Call Meeting to order: Chairman Bolinger requested roll call which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes
Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes
Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

2.) Approval of Minutes for July 22, 2021: Chairman Bolinger asked for approval of the minutes for July 22, 2021. Mr. Wheeler made the Motion to accept. Mr. Hoskins made the second. Mr. Bolinger requested roll call which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes

Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes

Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Motion Carried

3.) Comments from Citizens: Note there was none.

4.) Variance Request for East Hemlock St. Map 085N-D Parcel 057.00. Property is in a R-2 High Density Residential District.

Mr. Duncan explained that Mr. McCall was asking for a variance for a 50 x 150 foot, he had placed a double wide trailer in the lot, under pinned everything. Mr. Duncan explained that the double wide was facing the adjacent lots. Mr. Hoskins asked what the codes said about this. Mr. Bolinger stated that it had to face the street. Mr. Stanfield stated that he did not think it had enough property for it to face the street. Mr. Hoskins stated it did not with including the set-backs. Mr. Bolinger asked Mr. McCall if he had gotten a permit to put the double wide in. Mr. McCall stated that he got all the permits, it had been state inspected and he had the utility and building permit from the clerk. Mr. Bolinger stated he would like to see a copy of it. Mr. McCall stated that he submitted a plot plan to Daniel Foster the former Codes Officer. He stated, Daniel had told him all he needed was block foundation. He stated he did not get any copies of codes or restrictions. Mr. McCall stated that he had paid Clayton Homes to set it as per the codes of the city. Mr. McCall stated it had been inspected by the state. Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. McCall if he had gotten a Certificate of Occupancy from the City of LaFollette. Mr. McCall stated that he did not. He stated that he did not know he was suppose to get one. Mr. Bolinger explained to Mr. McCall that the permit that he had was a county permit and he did not have a city permit. Mr. Foust stated that Mr. McCall had stated that he had submitted a plot plan and asked who had done the plot plan. Mr. McCall stated that he had done the plot plan. Mr. Foust stated that it would have had to have been done by a professional. Mr. McCall stated that Daniel Foster had not told him that. Mr. McCall said he had gotten with a Jeff Carter at Clayton's and they laid everything out as far as setbacks and everything. Mr. Hoskins asked if it was the buyer's responsibility for all the local fee's and permits. Mr. Foust stated that was true. Mr. Duncan stated he had talked with Clayton Homes and they had told him it varied on the loan/individual. Mr. Foust stated prior to this he had done that job for sixteen to eighteen years before and every time he had dealt with Clayton's they had left that up to the person that was actually purchasing the mobile home. Mr. Foust stated that was their due diligence to do all the surveys and things of that nature. Mr. McCall stated that he had paid them to set it and everything. Mr. Hoskins asked if this was a problem that occurred alot. Mr. Hoskins stated that the lot could not accomodate anything but a narrow house with a small porch on it. Mr. Foust stated what should have happened with that being a size 50' by 150' the mobile home should have been shortened to where it could face the street. Mr. Hoskins stated he couldn't have with the set-backs. Mr. Foust explained he could have if he the planning commission had granted a variance with it being a lot of record. Mr. Duncan stated eith five foot on each side. Mr. Foust stated "yes". Mr. Bolinger stated he had went by and looked at it and stated to Mr. McCall that had attached a porch on the front and back of the mobile home and he was right on the property line. Mr. McCall stated that the porches was not attached to the mobile home, that they could be removed. Mr. Hoskins asked

Mr. McCall "so you're saying it is not a permanent fixture? Mr. McCall stated "right". Mr. Hoskins asked if it was privacy reasons the reason for it to face the street. The planning commission members stated "no" Mr. Foust stated that it was part of codes and part of 911 as well. Mr. Hoskins stated that he was sorry Mr. McCall had went through the time and expense and the worry on it, and asked if there was any other remedy for it. Mr. Duncan stated that he knew of one other instance and he didn't know who asked or why they done it, but they had literally put a door in the side of the mobile home. Mr. Gibson stated that was what he was going to recommend. Mr. McCall stated that end was a utility room and a bedroom. He said he had it set up to where it would be off street parking and a walk way going to the front door. Mr. Bolinger asked Mr. McCall if someone had told him to go to the county to get a permit. Mr. McCall stated no he had gotten it over at the clerks office. He stated that the utility company had told him to go over to the clerks office. He stated he went to where you get titles and such. Mr. Foust stated that one of the problems they were going to face with this and they would face it down the road if they allowed this to happen. Mr. Foust stated that what this has created is especially if it is sold and it goes through a finance company that what was being created here was a non-conforming use property. If something happened to the mobile home it had to conform. If they allowed him to be a non-conforming a legal use and that would come up for example say the finance company had called and that is what brought this to a head for they called wanting to know if this was a legal or non-conforming use property in the city. Mr. Foust stated it was a non-conforming use property. Mr. Hoskins stated so nobody will touch it. Mr. Foust answered and stated no body would touch it and if something happened to that property, that if the board approved it with a door being put in the side of it or what ever, if something happened to it it could not it could not go back in there on that lot it has to conform from that point on. Mr. Hoskins asked what 911 had to say about it. It was stated they hadn't asked. Mr. Hoskins asked how did that effect the emergency responders if the door was not facing the road. Mr. Gibson stated that it looked to him is that that is what it would be all about. Mr. Hoskins stated he was just trying to figure out why they should not do this. Mr. Duncan stated as long as they had an addrees. Mr. Hoskins asked Michael Stanfield why they should not do this. Mr. Stanfield stated he had no problem with it. Mr. Hoskins stated he wanted to know what their thoughts were. Mr. Gibson stated the law was the law. Mr. Hoskins stated he agreed to that. Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. Bolinger what he thought about it. Mr. Bolinger stated it was non conforming, there was no permit gotten to put it in there to begin with, and even if you take the porches off its still non-conforming. Mr. Hoskins stated they didn't inspect it and asked who done the building inspection. Mr. Bolinger stated it was like the administrator said they would be creating something that would keep traveling down the road that the next person that comes along and does the same thing, or tries to do the same thing are you just gonna keep doing this. Mr. Bolinger stated that if you were going to do something you needed to go through and make sure you had all the right permits and stuff in order to do it and that was the clerks office there at the city and that is where he should have come to. Mr. McCall stated that he had talked to Daniel about. Mr. Bolinger stated that if he had of came there he probly wouldn't have gotten one because it was non conforming. Mr. Stanfield stated that Mr. McCall didn't know. Mr. Foust asked Mr. McCall if he had talked to Daniel before or after he had moved it on there. Mr. McCall stated that he had talked and gave Daniel a copy of his plot plan and asked what he needed to do. He stated that Daniel told him is he needed to do the set backs. Mr. MCall stated he asked Daniel if they did an on site inspection and he stated Daniel told him they didn't do that. Mr. Foust stated they had to inspect set backs that was part of the codes. Mr. Hoskins stated that with the information that was before them today and the general opinion of the planning commission he is going to make a motion that they cannot allow this to occur. Mr. Gibson made the second. Mr. Duncan stated he would like to make a statement. Mr. Bolinger said to go ahead. Mr. Duncan stated that if he did make a door on the side, put a porch there, would the planning commission accept it. Mr. Wheeler asked if the set backs would be in compliance if he put a porch on it. Mr. Duncan stated that they would. Mr. Duncan sated that he didn't take a tape measurer but he had

about 13' foot on one and 12' on the other. Mr. Hoskins asked if it was a one story building. Mr. Duncan stated yes. Mr. Wheeler stated a porch by the new door to make it look like the front of the house and not the side. Mr. Hoskins stated if it was a way to salvage the project he thinks it was an outstanding idea and he would remove his motion if they all agreed to it. Mr. Bolinger stated that they did have a second and he would have to remove his second. Mr. Gibson stated he would remove his second if he would get in compliance with the door. Mr. Stanfield asked Mr. McCall if he understood. Mr. McCall stated he did. Mr. Stanfield stated and a porch. Mr. Wheeler stated to Mr. McCall to make it the front of the house. Mr. Duncan asked if they could tell Mr. McCall what his other option would be. Mr. Wheeler stated to move it. Mr. Hoskins stated they did have a motion and a second and asked if they wanted to take it to vote and let it fall with vote or with draw the motions, or what does everyone else want to do. Mr. Stanfield to Mr. Hoskins if it was up to him he would just go ahead and pull it and just do it again. Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Gibson both stated they would withdraw their motions. Mr. Hoskins asked if everyone was in agreement with this. Mr. Hoskins asked the Chairman, Mr. Bolinger what he thought of it. Mr. Bolinger stated that once again they were kicking the can down the road. Mr. Stanfield stated that he made the motion to approve it as long as he put a door and porch on it. Mr. Wheeler stated to make it appear as the front of the house. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Stanfield what was the time frame to give Mr. McCall to do those things. Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Foust stated that Mr. McCall couldn't sell the property until the requirements were met. Mr. Gibson asked if they agreed to it would after all is done make it legal. They replied it would. Mr. Foust stated that would take of Mr. McCall problems and in the future of any owner. Mr. Bolinger asked if he was going to remove the porch that was on the front. Mr. McCall stated that he would rather not. Mr. Duncan asked if it would meet the set backs with the porches on there. It was stated no. Mr. Hoskins asked what their codes said about an addition to the main structure. Mr. Foust stated that if they were not attached it would still be considered an addition to the fact you still have to be five foot off the line and he was still to close. Mr. Duncan stated the back or what he considered the back was 8' and again this was just guessing. The front would be 2'. Mr. Hoskins asked if the trailer was not square with the property line. Mr. Duncan stated that it was close. Mr. McCall stated the front porch was five foot wide and the back porch was 10 foot. Mr. Duncan stated the back porch would have to come in another three feet. Mr. Hoskins stated the table was open for motion. Mr. Stanfield made the motion to approve it. Mr. Hoskins stated to meet all set backs and change the end of the trawler towards the road to the front of the building. Mr. Stanfield state yes towards the street. Mr. Gibson stated he would second it based upon Mr. McCall meeting the setbacks, and the front. Chairman Bolinger requested roll which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes
Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes
Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Motion Carried

Chairman Bolinger asked for a motion to adjourn: Mr. Stanfield made the motion, and Mr. Wheeler made the second.

FAIR HOUSING BOARD

Chairman Bolinger requested roll which was as follows:

Mr. Gibson----- Yes
Mr. Hoskins----- Yes

Mayor Stanfield----- Yes
Mr. Wheeler----- Yes

Chairman Bolinger stated with there being no minutes to approve, also no business is scheduled if he had a motion to adjourn. Mayor Stanfield made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Gibson made the second.

Meeting Adjourned