OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING
GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

January 4, 2021

Remote Zoom Format Meeting

5:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor Rusty Tinnin, Vice-Chairman Scott Trew, David Lynn, Jeff Duncan, Judy Wheeler, Jerry Garrett, Chairman Tony Espinosa, Jim Hitt, Jeff Parnell, and Bob Whitaker

All members discussed during roll call being at home alone or family only at their locations McNeal connected into the meeting after the roll call.

Absent:

Also Present: Addam McCormick, Russell Freeman, Mary Laine Hucks, Rhonda Carson, and Tim Ellis

Chairman Espinosa called the meeting to order and Garrett offered prayer.

Trew made a motion to approve the agenda, Wheeler seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0. Roll call vote completed

Staff discussed the remote format meeting based on the extension of the Governor's order and the increase in COVID cases in our area and discussed the public comment submitted prior to the meeting by Chad Ray, local business owners and owner of adjacent mobile home parks from the 619 N. Main project stating support of project and the subject property has sat idle for a long time and would be good to have a project in this area. Trew commented on the public comment since comment was made by an adjacent property owner.

Trew made the motion to close public forum, Lynn seconded the motion. Motion passed 11-0

Lynn made the motion to suspend the Planning Commission's By-Laws to permit the remote meeting format, Hitt seconded the motion. The motion passed 11-0. Roll call vote completed

Garrett made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2020 meeting, Hitt seconded the motion. Motion passed 10-0- Espinosa abstained due to absence at meeting. Roll call vote completed

Trew made the motion to nominate Espinosa for 2021 Chairman- Whitaker called for nominations to cease, Garrett second the motion. Motion passed 11-0- Roll call vote completed

Garrett made the motion to nominate Trew for 2021 Vice-Chairman-Whitaker called for nominations to cease, Hitt seconded the motion. Motion passed 11-0- Roll call vote completed.

AGENDA

Item#1 **619 North Main Street/Holladay Ventures/Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc:** Requests recommendation to the Goodlettsville City Commission to rezone 20.75 acres from CS, Commercial Services to HDRPUD, High Density Residential and Preliminary Master Plan approval for a mixed use development including 311 multi-family residential units and 7,500 square

feet of commercial. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 01812006900. (#012-20) Property Owner: Proctor Family Partnership

Staff Discussion:

-McCormick (Staff) discussed project including:
-Project discussion at November meeting included mixed use with commercial along N. Main Street
- Property location and acreage and slope issues
-Current zoning CS, Commercial Services
-Proposed zoning HDRPUD- High Density Residential Planned Unit Development
-Comprehensive Plan- Commercial Concentration and Industrial along back of property along rail road tracks
-Proposal includes the increased density of fifteen (15) units per acre over base of seven (7) units per acre due to mixed use development and location in relation to other commercial uses in the area
-As discussed with Vintage Northcreek project if a mixed use project of mixed use setting then could review a high density residential development in a commercial comprehensive plan designation

-Request includes reduced parking from the City's requirement of 1.5 space per one-bedroom unit and two (2) spaces per the two (2) and three (3) bedroom units- City requirement of 590 parking spaces for the residential units
-Request includes alternative Design Guideline requirement for building materials proposed
-The master plan process includes the permitted uses in the commercial space and commercial live work space

Staff discussed approval recommendations including stipulations:
-Traffic study to be completed with final master plan to determine any improvement needs on N. Main Street at proposed driveway access points and TDOT review and approval also required
-Final Master Plan to include service locations for commercial area loading zone and trash service and ensure parking in these areas supports commercial uses.
-Defined permitted uses in the ground flood commercial spaces to be revised to remove two family dwellings and essential services limited to on-site utility needs, and the personal and group care limited to day care facilities
-Building plans to comply with City's Design Guidelines regarding a minimum fifty (50%) percent brick and stone on all buildings and final master plan to include additional elevations defining materials
-Final master plan information to include document supporting reduced parking proposal for the two (2) and three (3) multi-family units or additional parking to meet the City's requirements.
-Final master plan information to include site signage design

-Evan Holladay- Project Developer - Holladay Ventures and Scotty M. Bernick, Project Design- Ragan Smith Associates, Inc

-City staff review of property back in August
-Mixed use component- topography difficulties of property hill top in the middle of the project
-Difficult for a large retail development without completely removing the elevation of the property
-Apartment design step down design due to elevations
-Design provide highest and best use of the property
-Commercial retail area provide 7,500 sq. ft. in south building and live work units in the north building
-Explained live work example with tailor that started in live work setting than grew business to full service commercial use- live work units the lease will require a business component
-Parking design and property contains thirty-five (35%) percent slopes and ninety (90') feet elevation changes
-Four (4) story design on front building due to elevations but only three (3) stories above grade
-Project amenities including pool, club house, dog park, primitive walking trails, and maintaining existing trees in center of development and along train track areas.
-Church Street improvements include building a section of street since currently only gravel but access to Church Street gated- emergency use only
-Commercial uses took out a lot of uses- selective uses only
-Long term ownership of development
-Connection adjacent to the north end of Main Street streetscape project
-Discussed Mr. Ray's comment about redevelopment potential of other properties in area with a project like this
-Espinosa discussed the Main Street project per question received
-Staff and Ellis discussed Shevel Drive to Dorris Drive and this project adjacent to northern edge of Main Street project across the street and up from Dorris Drive
-Holladay discussed parking proposed at 1.64 parking spaces per unit instead of city requirements due to experience with parking demands with their similar projects
-Brick proposed at fifty (50%) percent of the buildings along Main Street with remainder of buildings with hardi-board type siding and other buildings twenty (20%) percent brick and remainder of these building also with hardi-board type siding
-Main Street fronting building include full visibility from Main Street other buildings limited visibility

Espinosa called for a five (5) minute recess at 5:58 pm returned at 6:03 pm

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Trew discussed rear elevations and limited visibility
-Trew discussed building entrances along Main Street and if residents would use both driveway locations on Main Street
-Duncan discussed finishes and with higher elevations of project the back of buildings could be visible from larger areas and his comments are consistent with similar requests for hotels in the city

Duncan discussed multi-family and quality design important for community and don't like reduced brick percentages on back and sides and could review buffer designs
-Duncan discussed commercial uses and the live work units- what type of incentives are planned to get spaces occupied
-Holladay discussed their idea of getting spaces rented
-Wheeler discussed if the day care use proposed would allow both children and adult
-Staff discussed per zoning could be either but primarily they are child care uses
-Staff discussed that animal day care was discussed but could be issue with noise
-Hitt discussed the live work units and if would also be rented out as a residential unit
-Hitt discussed signage proposed in the commercial area and if the driveway access points enough for emergency traffic
-Hitt discussed if the proposal parking would be enough for 311 units
-Holladay discussed wall signage would be above doors of commercial spaces and ground type signage out by driveways on Main Street
-Holladay discussed the live work units would be a typical one-year lease with stipulation for business operation at the space and with their other projects their proposed parking ratio has worked
-Duncan discussed site plan and parking spaces and Holladay discussed 511 total parking spaces provided
-Tinnin discussed along back side of buildings there are not any sidewalks shown connecting to walking trail
-Parnell discussed visiting the site and it is a challenging property and generally in support of project concept
-Parnell discussed vehicular traffic through the site and without connection through the property access going to be difficult due to traffic blocking up on Main Street
-Parnell discussed review taking Church Street as a public street through the property
-Holladay discussed their intention for Church Street to be limited to emergency traffic with project since his experience with multiple access is a safety concern for residents
-Parnell discussed Church Street access is needed for businesses this would allow a secondary access when Main Street is blocked
-Parnell discussed the Church Street connection is important for traffic access in the area
-Parnell discussed understanding the hardship for public street connection and the loss of units
-Parnell discussed concern with the lower parking counts but could review this and building materials with Church Street extension
-Holladay discussed the traffic study can review the access and need for connection
-Parnell discussed a traffic study not going to eliminate his request for the Church Street extension and would like to know how much hillside going down and retaining walls
-Holladay discussed top of hill and trees to remain with walls due to site development costs
-Espinosa discussed traffic delays on N. Main Street will be need to be reviewed with traffic study
-Garrett discussed he is aware the property has been for sale since the 1960s and no one has moved forward with the property due to topography and thinks the residential proposal is the highest and best use of the property
-Garrett discussed concern that is harder to rent three (3) and four (4) story units

-Holladay discussed the front buildings are four (4) stories but back residential use would enter at second (2nd) story due to slopes and building design and they have not had any issues with renting the three (3) story units
-Garrett discussed traffic onto Church Street with project
-Whitaker discussed access and exiting a concern due to issues with N. Main Street including both north and south bound approaches in this area

-Whitaker discussed the project would be an asset to community and the project is a valuable project
-Tinnin discussed reviewing design to allow full access to Church Street into project versus a public street extension since would provide a connection to Long Hollow Pike
-Holladay discussed would review Church Street connection but has traffic concerns with outlet
-Ellis discussed if the TDOT railroad realignment bridge would impact the project design since TDOT has project under design stage at this time
-Ellis discussed the Church Street access design and if he heard correctly that it would be gravel
-Holladay discussed the Church Street area is now gravel and would be upgraded to city standards
-Wheeler discussed live work spaces and commercial leases
-Holladay discussed would be open to commercial only leases in this area and if commercial spaces are a success then could use live work spaces as commercial in the future also
-Espinosa discussed ability to find retail tenants for this location has disadvantages and City's concern is will they be able to rent spaces and if a few years a request is made for all to be residential
-Espinosa discussed live work makes sense the retail commercial space could be an issue
-Espinosa discussed railroad noise and rear buffer and sidewalk connection to walking trail
-Espinosa discussed questions received on-line and concern with cutting corners on parking requirements
-Holladay discussed the anticipated construction start date would be 2022-time frame
-Espinosa discussed moving forward how Commission feels about deferring request to review master plan revisions and rezoning review
-Staff discussed the rezoning and preliminary master plan are reviewed by City Commission at same time- Planning Commission discussed with recent project that Planned Unit Development zoning is tied to preliminary master plan
-Parnell discussed would like to know what Mr. Holladay would like to do at this point
-Holladay discussed moving forward with request and including changes on final master plan subject to traffic study regarding Church Street and that site access could be reviewed on the final master plan
-Espinosa discussed the risk associated with moving forward with plans with questions remaining
-Parnell discussed having a hard time approving plans without Church Street extension to Main Street and not as concerned about proposed building materials and reduced parking requirements
-Trew discussed agreement with Church Street access and parking and building materials due to open space and visibility
-Hitt discussed concern to proceed with rezoning with these questions with preliminary master plan
-Holladay discussed Church Street connection limited to residents only

-Trew discussed if access could still be gated with residents having access to use
-Parnell discussed that is better than shown but commercial use still a problem
-Tinnin asked if commercial users could have access to Church Street back gate
-Parnell discussed since commercial open to public then gate access would be an issue
-Commission discussed if Church Street would become a cut thru
-Duncan discussed parking and not a lot for commercial use
-Bernick discussed public road versus private road and different slope requirements- public street and slopes would require extensive site alteration to bring down existing grades
-Bernick discussed parking provided versus required should not be an issue with parking demands and that additional parking spaces could be added with more site excavation but trying to keep areas of existing trees
-Bernick discussed parking and drive aisles designed to be generally level and driveway coming in limiting slope up to connection to commercial area then increasing slope into residential areas
-Wheeler discussed the remaining questions and the Commission's need for specific answers before moving forward with approvals
-Holladay discussed deferral could impact the deadline of the property purchase contract
-Espinosa discussed hopefully the comments by Commissioners tonight would give Holladay the ability to discuss purchase contract
-Staff discussed based on emphasis by Planning Commission with a previous project Planned Unit Development zoning request for master plan to be aligned with rezoning request then deferral would be best.
-Duncan discussed appreciating Holladay for positive development proposal

Motion: Garrett made a motion to defer the request, Wheeler seconded the motion. Motion passed 9-0. Lynn and McNeal experiencing technical issues were not able to vote. Roll call vote completed

Item#2 **7-Eleven Store#1047011/Development Management Group, LLC:** Requests storm water and flood plain engineering plan approval for a 5,464 square feet building and fuel pumps on 3.80 acres at 843 Hwy 31W/Louisville Highway. Properties referenced as Sumner County Tax Map/Parcels 141/ 012.00, 013.00 and are zoned CS, Commercial Services, Interchange Overlay (#010-20). Property Owner: Richard Feldman. Site Plan approved at the November 2, 2020 Meeting.

Staff Discussion:

-Staff discussed site plan except for storm water design approved at November meeting
-Plans submitted include storm water design
-Property contains FEMA designated and regulated flood plains and flood way
-Project design includes storm water quality and quantity underground pipe facility
-Project design include off-site agreement regarding cut in the flood zone to offset fill the cut area is on the adjacent Harper Property including FEMA review and approval of map amendment
-Plan review comments from the City's Engineer consultant include requirements for flood zone items and questions about drainage design calculations and stream bank buffer

-Staff recommendation to approve subject to compliance with remaining engineer consultant's comments based on the City's Storm Water and Flood Zone Ordinance

Ken Knuckles and David Abby, Development Management Group, LLC and Mike McGuffin-Project Developer
-Knuckles discussed the remaining review comments and except for item#1 regarding flood zones the items are already underway or completed
-Property owner agreement already in place with adjacent property owner and their FEMA approvals are ongoing
-McCuffin discussed agreement with adjacent property owner and time constraint with their engineer receiving approval from FEMA

-Steve Casey, City's Engineer consultant with Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc

-Casey discussed that compensation flood plain not a simple cut and fill process which requires hydrologic analysis regarding stream bank cross sections and volumes and the FEMA review and approval process for adjacent property owner's engineer (Harper) is time consuming

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Parnell discussed process and outstanding issues regarding FEMA flood zones and asked Mr. Casey will it be difficult for them to achieve completion

-Casey discussed they would be able to complete engineering for the remaining comments including FEMA approval but will be time consuming and require engineering study

-Espinosa discussed the comments and that the remaining comments need to be acknowledged in any motion

Motion:

Garrett made a motion to approve with full compliance with remaining comments, Parnell seconded the motion. Motion passed 9-0. Lynn and McNeal experiencing technical issues were not able to vote. Roll call vote completed

Item#3 **Goodlettsville Hotel, LLC/ EcoGreen Construction Services**: Requests a revised Design Guidelines variance regarding exterior materials on the approved five (5) story -67,560 square feet hotel at 555 Rivergate Parkway. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02609009200 and is zoned CSL, Commercial Services Limited within the Interstate Sign District. (9.1#07-20) Property Owner: Vishal A Banker

Staff Discussion:

-Staff discussed the request and site plan approval and previous denied variance request to remove the brick from the back of the building due to the limited visibility of the building from Rivergate Parkway

-Staff discussed the request is to do 100% EIFS, Exterior Insulation and Finish System materials on the entire building and the brick areas shown on the approved site plan would be an EIFS brick design

-Staff discussed the request is based on the limited visibility of the building from Rivergate Parkway and cost associated with replacing brick material with EIFS

-Staff discussed options for review including either denying request based on site plan approval and previous denied variance request, review alternative design based on limited visibility of building and intention for similar appearance design, or if based on cost saving then any review would be subject to the City Commission reviewing and approving a defined time period for limiting enforcement of brick materials based on COVID pandemic impacts

-Scott Parisi, EcoGreen Construction Services

-Parisi discussed the proposed design is based on improved energy costs with consistent building insulation design system and differences in brick versus EIFS installations and cost savings

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Trew discussed if standing next to building would you know it is not brick
-Parisi discussed that the location of the building on the site you would not know from Rivergate Parkway but standing within ten (10') feet of building then yes would know
-Trew asked if material was paintable- since hotels rebrand by changing colors including the hotel at Long Hollow and Cartwright
-Parisi discussed the design is a finishing system dye with finish and can be enhanced with color
-Duncan discussed feels like bait and switch with site plan approval but the product is not bad but site plan was approved for a specific project design not wanting to change that approved design late in the process
-Hitt discussed why was request not made to begin with and stay with existing approval
-Parisi discussed the hospitality industry has been extremely hard hit with pandemic and ownership perspective the request is more than cost savings more energy efficient building design
-Tinnin discussed from an aesthetic standpoint the proposal is almost as good as brick
-Tinnin discussed understood the financial issues with COVID impacts and the proposal is not a quality issue
-Parnell discussed the proposal and similar project on Second Avenue in Nashville in that project the buildings looked like a brick building
-Parnell discussed precedent if the Commission approves the design and if we want to permit the material then put it in the Design Guidelines but don't know enough about the material
-Espinosa discussed concern with setting a precedent always a concern by this Commission
-Trew discussed the EIFS material is not an inferior product since the City's Design Guidelines already permit the material and preference for brick is purely aesthetics
-Garrett discussed not in favor of changing the building material requirements
-Whitaker discussed about the difference between drivet and EIFS and has experience with previous site developments with these materials and they are still quality looking buildings
-Parisi discussed similar design between materials big difference is the EIFS system with backing materials
-Ellis discussed the City developed Design Guidelines back in 2011-2012 and the City hired a consultant to assist in the guideline development by Planning Commission and City Commission
-Staff discussed per State Law communities can develop design related requirements and this not a building code type issue since building code permits both materials

-Staff discussed the approval process if reviewed based on costs that this is an issue beyond the Planning Commission's basis for alternative design

-Wheeler discussed grout lines and different installation options and if these altered the quality of the material installation
-Parisi discussed the different installation options does not impact installation quality
-Espinosa discussed the proposal and elevated high quality products make it and location of project then quality is key
-Duncan discussed the product is not an issue and look at material standards across the board and not against product since can be used for creative designs and can consider in future but concerned with precedent at this time
-Freeman discussed different products and cost reduction as basis is a bad precedent and concerned with Planning Commission not having the ability to waive the requirements
-Freeman discussed the Planning Commission could approve with stipulation with City Commission approving something temporarily reducing standards
-Staff discussed the Planning Commission's review options
-Trew discussed defer the request and reviewing an amendment to the Design Guidelines
-Ellis discussed the Design Guidelines were originally set up with public hearings so would need to follow the same process to amend the Design Guidelines so would take more than a few months
-Parisi discussed the Planning Commission should review the materials since the material - provides improved energy efficiency design
-Trew discussed visiting this issue soon including possibly an education item

Motion:

Garrett made a motion to deny the request, Duncan seconded the motion. Motion passed 8-1. Tinnin voting no. Lynn and McNeal experiencing technical issues were not able to vote. Roll call vote

Item#4 **PBG Builders, Inc: Request a Design Guidelines variance** regarding exterior materials with an existing building alteration at 406 Two Mile Pike. The 0.38-acre property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02605013800 and is zoned OP, Office/Professional.

Staff Discussion:

-Staff discussed the request including the existing building has wood siding material that includes condition issues and the request is an alteration to an existing building
-Staff talked with representatives originally about removing wood siding and replacing with hardi-board siding but after discussing their proposed design with an architect they came back with a more modern design including painting the existing concrete block similar to the Starbucks design on Cartwright Street
-Staff discussed the request includes a new metal roof and court yard design
-Staff discussed the Design Guidelines permit wood siding and concrete block when not visible
Tim Prow- Powell Building Group
-Prow discussed the proposed design based on modern type Starbucks design
-Prow discussed the design request is an aesthetic issue not a cost savings issue

-Prow discussed they reviewed hardi-board type siding and EIFS but concerned with durability issues with these materials at lower levels of the building adjacent to the ground
-Prow discussed the existing wood siding has sections that are rotted

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Trew discussed the proposal is a great improvement to the site
-Duncan discussed liking the design
-Prow discussed the design with window upgrades and garage type door on front courtyard area
-Prow discussed the fence height in the courtyard would be three (3') to four (4') feet in height
-Wheeler discussed the proposal and is in agreement
-Hitt discussed being a neighbor of the project and asked what the building would be used for
-Prow discussed it would be their office for at the time eight (8) staff members
-Prow discussed their lease at Dollar General building on Conference was ended so they have to relocate but they want to stay in Goodlettsville area
-Ellis discussed the long term lease has expired and it was an issue of a corporate footprint matter
-Parnell discussed the proposal was a huge improvement and would site plan be required by Planning Commission for site work
-Staff stated the courtyard area would not require a site plan and parking lot existing
-Parnell discussed the fence location in relation to the right-of-way
-Prow discussed their design also includes removing the pole sign and using the existing parking lot
-Garrett discussed being delighted that they are staying in Goodlettsville City limits and the proposal will be a tremendous improvement in the area

Motion:

Wheeler made a motion to approve the request, Garrett seconded the request. Motion passed 9-0. Lynn and McNeal experiencing technical issues were not able to vote. Roll call vote completed

Item #5 **Planning and Development Services Staff: Requests approval of the 2020 Planning Commission Annual Report**

Staff Notes:

-Staff discussed the report includes projects approved by the Planning Commission during the year and includes some items to work on during the upcoming year
-Wheeler discussed the report and thanked staff

Motion:

Whitaker made a motion to approve the request, Duncan seconded the request. Motion passed 9-0. Lynn and McNeal experiencing technical issues were not able to vote. Roll call vote completed

DISCUSSION ITEM

-Quik Trip-Interstate Sign Proposal

-McCormick discussed the proposal to increase the sign height of the interstate high rise signs
-Staff discussed the sign ordinance limits sign height to sixty (60') feet and that city amended the sign ordinance to increase the sign area based on location of sign in relation to street providing access
-Staff discussed the proposal to increase the sign height would need to follow a similar process
-Daniel Chambers- Quik Trip
-Chambers apologized for coming back a second time and not making this part of the original request
-Chambers discussed they are proposing to relocate sign further back on the property and increased height to 100 feet
-Chamber discussed the height increase is based upon trees blocking visibility and their desire to have clear visibility for drivers on I-65 approaching the exit
-Espinosa discussed the need for a visual to see the difference between sixty (60') feet and one hundred feet
-Duncan discussed the ordinance included in the meeting packet and discussed sign heights
-Staff discussed the ordinance was intended for sign area only
-Trew discussed the sixty (60') feet height and visibility
-Chambers discussed mature trees along interstate and they intend for really clear visibility of the fuel sign
-Chambers will have presentation materials with visuals to help see the proposed sign design including sign on the property
-Ellis asked if they float a balloon and use drone footage for signage visibility proposal
-Ellis discussed the recent ordinance was based on sight distance onto residential areas
-Parnell discussed height of other interstate sign heights in area and Staff and Commission discussed existing sign heights and locations
-Chamber discussed wanting to discuss the request first with the Planning Commission before making a formal request

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:22 pm. All in favor.

_____ _____

Chairman Tony Espinosa **Addam McCormick, Planning Director**