

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING
GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

November 2, 2020

City Hall Auditorium

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Vice-Mayor Rusty Tinnin, Scott Trew, David Lynn, Mayor Jeff Duncan, Grady McNeal, Judy Wheeler, Jerry Garrett, Chairman Tony Espinosa, Jim Hitt, and Jeff Parnell by speaker phone

Absent: Bob Whittaker

Also Present: Addam McCormick, Russell Freeman, Mary Laine Hucks, Tim Ellis, Zack Young, Rhonda Carson, Mike Bauer

Espinosa called the meeting to order and offered prayer.

Trew made a motion to approve the agenda, Hitt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2020 meeting, McNeal seconded the motion. Lynn, Trew, and Duncan abstained since were absent at meeting. Parnell voted to approve. Motion passed.

AGENDA

Item#1	Item#17-Eleven Store#1047011/Development Management Group, LLC: Requests site plan approval for a 5,464 sq. ft. building and twelve (12) 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
---------------	--

Item Representative: Ken Knuckles, Development Management Group

Staff Discussion:

- Previous site plan review regarding access still part of long term proposal
- Louisville Hwy 31W turn lane improvements
- Traffic study references twenty (20) fuel pumps but site plan shows twenty (22) pumps but only nineteen (19) available for use at one- request clarification to make sure does not alter Hwy 31W turn lane improvement designs
- Partial site plan approval requested- storm water items including storm water quality, flood plains, and off-site flood plain cut information needed
- Request storm water items to come back at later meeting for review but ok with going forward so applicant can request TDOT approvals
- Non-improved right-of-way back of property request to abandon- city formal process including review of recent court case will need to be considered but can proceed with site development at this time and this row abandonment can be reviewed in the future

- Building design includes adhered brick and stone and canopy red stripe on gas canopy request reduce width per Design Guidelines
- Partial site plan approval at this time storm water design reviewed by Planning Commission at additional meeting
- Knuckles discussed fuel pump issue with twelve (12) fuel islands and total accessible nineteen (19) fuel pumps including sixteen (16) cars and three (3) trucks and reason traffic study was set up
- Signage proposal includes a high rise sign considering requesting a height increase but no additional requests at this time
- Second access still proposed but understands with TDOT long process and site design could incorporate a future connection
- Second access benefit to site access, adjacent properties and city and how traffic study information can be amended to include review information for TDOT and they will continue to participate
- Currently reviewing off-site flood plain cut to offset on-site fill design and in discussion with adjacent property owner and will finalize storm water designs and bring back to the Planning Commission
- Traffic study proposal and Hwy 31W improvements including expanded acceleration lane to permit truck turn out of the site

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Trew discussed truck turns out of the site and will that be a difficult turn for semi-trucks
- Knuckles explained design based on sixty-seven (67') feet truck reviewed and included acceleration lane and lane expansion for improved truck turns out
- Duncan discussed off-site flood plain cuts and clarification if contingent upon property owner agreement
- Espinosa asked or additional comments from Planning Commissioners and Parnell no comment at this time
- Espinosa discussed and clarified the request and staff's recommendation for partial site plan approval including storm water design being brought back to Planning Commission for review and confirm fuel pump issue discussed with traffic study engineer

Motion:

Trew made the motion to approve the staff recommended partial site plan approval seconded by Garrett. Parnell voted to approve. The motion passed unanimously.

Item#2	Zoning Ordinance Amendment/ Khaled Abu Qudaira: Requests recommendation to the City Commission to the amend the Zoning Ordinance Sections 14-206 (5)(e)(i) and 14-206 (5)(e)(ii) Special Regulations Applying to Transient Habitation to reduce the minimum number of hotel and motel rooms in a new development to sixty-five (65) for a proposed development at 977 Louisville Highway/Long Drive.
---------------	---

Item Representative: Khaled Abu Qudaira and Abdelaziz Haroon

Staff Discussion:

- Request includes a proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment request to permit a sixty-five (65) room hotel or motel facility
 - Zoning Ordinance requests ninety (90) room minimum for hotels and 150 rooms for motels and difference between hotel and motel is access internal for hotel and external for motel
 - Request based on property limitations with flood ways and floodplains
 - Presentation on flood maps including 2021 maps with back area floodway on 2.23-acre property and use of floodways limited to parking areas only
 - Discussion on INT- Interchange overlay and limitation of uses to restaurants, hotels/motels, and fuel stations
 - Denial recommendation based on intent of zoning ordinance for larger scale hotel and motel developments and investment level
- Haroon explained request and his vision for the project and discussed with engineer and with flood zone only a sixty-five (65) room project including parking would work based on engineer recommendation
- Haroon discussed cost of property and reason for development request is for a family business
- Haroon discussed meetings with city staff and wants response from the city

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Espinosa thanked the representatives for their proposed investment in the city and the Zoning Ordinance regulations are in place for a reason
 - Duncan discussed the ordinance and the debate a few years ago to reduce the hotel count to ninety (90) rooms and level of investment and project that meets City's standards
 - Trew discussed desire to accommodate businesses but the Commission has recently reviewed variances with hotel developments and denied the requests so would not support this request
 - Tinnin asked about sewer service along the project and would it support a 150 room project.
 - Staff discussed would have to discuss sewer service issue with Sewer Department
- Haroon and Qudaira discussed the possibility of eighty (80) rooms and difference between eighty (80) and ninety (90) hotel rooms
- Duncan discussed the City's Ordinance based on project quality and investment and ninety (90) hotel rooms is the minimum level determined by city
- Duncan discussed based on property limitations that the particular site does not support the business proposal per City requirements
- Espinosa discussed debating room count not helpful with request and ordinance section exist for a reason
- Haroon and Qudaira discussed a phase in design to meet minimum room requirements
- Espinosa discussed that would not be an option

Motion:

Garrett made the motion to deny the request seconded by Hitt. Parnell voted to deny the request.

. The motion passed unanimously.

Item#3 **Mitch Barnes: Requests Subdivision Regulation Variance** to permit the subdivision of the 2.26-acre property into two (2) total lots provided access by a fifty (50') feet access easement to Hitt Lane. The property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02503000100 and is zoned R25, Low Density Residential Property Owner: Joseph Barnes. Subdivision Regulations Section 1-112.109

Item Representative: Mitch Barnes

Staff Discussion:

- Subdivision Regulations section discussion limiting one residential lot to gain access from access easement- request is to permit two (2) residential lots
- Variance request process and Board of Zoning Appeals review criteria- and variance review basically based on a property limitation
- Steep slopes on the property and length of driveway required over 1,000 ft.
- Staff recommendation denial based on same opportunity being available to other properties in similar situation and if City wants to permit this type of limited subdivision then an amendment can be prepared for two (2) and three (3) lot subdivision with access by shared easement.
- Emergency vehicle access would be key issue for number of lots permitted

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Duncan discussed access drive location
- Garrett asked about proposed building facing and visibility
- Barnes discussed houses would be toward easement and 700 feet to Moncrief visibility limitations including possible view of roofs only from Moncrief and no visibility from Hitt Lane
- Barnes discussed water and sewer service from Moncrief
- Staff discussed driveway construction
- Barnes discussed twelve foot (12') width gravel drive with concrete crossing and driveway currently being built off Hitt Lane
- Barnes submitted a survey of property easements
- Espinoza discussed the additional information needed including options
- Barnes discussed another easement is not possible since family will not permit another access easement and slope limitations for other options
- Duncan discussed the easement information submitted and question about second easement
- Garrett discussed considering voting favorably for request due to challenge to build in this area with slopes and special person would choose to live in area in this area
- Garrett made a motion to approve with stipulations in order
- Duncan seconded the request but additional discussion occurred about stipulations
- Staff discussed fire and emergency service will need to be accessible and staff could have Fire Department review driveway when completed and fire truck biggest concern over an ambulance due the vehicle size and mobility
- Staff discussed trash service to be picked up at Hitt Lane
- Freeman discussed possible property title issues with two (2) properties sharing an easement and could be an easement over an easement issue

- Barnes explained the location of the easement is on the adjacent property and runs length of his property
- Hitt discussed two (2) residents with one access easement any other examples
- Staff discussed not being aware of any local examples
- Tinnin discussed easement set up and shared access across lot

Motion:

Garrett made the motion to approve the request with stipulation referenced in meeting seconded by Duncan. Espinosa voted no and Parnell abstained. The motion passed 8-1

Item#4 **Grisham Home Builders:** Request approval for either two (2) detached single family dwelling units or one two (2) family detached dwelling unit on the 0.88-acre property on Long Hollow Pike. The property is located in area of 831 and 833 Long Hollow Pike. The property is referenced as Sumner County Tax Map/Parcel# 143 022.07 000 and is zoned LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development. Property Owner: Cody Watts

Item Representative: Steve Grisham

Staff Discussion:

- Property zoning LDRPUD density calculations
- Received a request for a duplex on the property and how it was being marketed
- Previously discussed with applicant only permitted for single family but after reviewing the acreage and Planned Unit development zoning density and permitted use the provisions could be reviewed for a two family duplex since zoning is 1.7 units per acre based on original acreage include in the subdivision would permit three (3) total residential units.
- Lot one contains a recently constructed single family dwelling
- Subdivision plat from 2008 only referenced buildable lots not if lots were only for a single family or if either lot was permitted for a two (2) family dwelling and typically plats reference intended use of lots
- Staff opinion is that intention was for single family due to surrounding uses at time but nothing to confirm that in relation to zoning ordinance provisions
- Grisham submitted house plan elevations for a single family dwelling and discussed proposal
- Tinnin discussed request and two (2) single family dwellings would be better than a duplex

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Garrett discussed was not on Planning Commission at that time but knowing people that were on it they would not have approved a duplex use in this area
- Staff discussed the applicant's request to construction two (2) detached single family dwellings instead of one-two (2) family duplex
- Espinosa discussed what is ideal for the property and what are they are being requested to approve
- Staff discussed the two (2) detached single family homes better fit in area and would be better rental value and more valuable

-Planning Commissioners requested clarification on what can be done with the property including subdivision

-Hitt discussed access to lot two (2) and staff discussed the shared drive currently installed would be access since it crosses creek area- subdivision would same issue with Item#3 since this lot does not contain any road frontage but access by a fifty (50') feet drainage easement

-Staff discussed the original project zoning or subdivision plat did not define the density and use of the property so could be reviewed different ways

-Trew discussed during 2007 and 2008 do not remember any duplex dwelling approvals in this area

-Hitt and Garrett discussed not in favor of duplex if either duplex or two (2) single family dwellings

-Duncan discussed lot three (3) shown on the subdivision plat is not a buildable lot and staff confirmed it is not a separate buildable lot goes with remaining property at top of hill

-Grisham wants to do two (2) single family dwellings and forget the duplex

-Espinosa discussed if he can request since he is not the owner

-Staff discussed planned unit development and approvals would follow property have not talked to owner

-Freeman discussed the due diligence process use of property and applicant not property owner being present and approval vote would be vesting use of property

-Tinnin discussed if approved can they later push for duplex and if approval would lock out single family dwelling approvals

-Staff discussed the zoning permits both a single family of duplex

-Freeman discussed if anything with planned unit development to determine

-Staff discussed no master plan at time of this property rezoning no formal plan in place for this property

-Grishman discussed request for two (2) single family dwellings and property owner's options if property does not sell

-Staff discussed house design submitted and square footage and garages and Commission can review sq. ft. and materials to meet provisions of Design Guidelines

- Grisham discussed 2,000 to 2,400 sq. ft. and with garage

-Duncan discussed a minimum 2,000 sq.ft. preliminary plan approval and final plan required to be reviewed by this board

-Tinnin discussed builder does nice projects

Motion:

Duncan made the motion to approve the request as a preliminary master plan approval for two (2) detached single family dwellings with minimum 2,000 sq.ft. living space and garage seconded by Wheeler. Parnell voted to approve The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Duncan discussed this could be his last Planning Commission meeting with new City Commissioners and Mayor starting in November
- Duncan thanked everyone for service on Planning Commission- thankless and hard job
- Espinosa thanked Duncan for his service on the Commissions

-619 N. Main Street- Mixed- Use Multi-Family Apartment Development

Item Representatives-Evan Holladay and Marshall Fenster, Holladay Ventures

- Staff discussed proposal for a mixed use multi-family project on twenty (20) acres on N. Main Street
- Staff discussed proposed zoning and rezoning required and comprehensive plan designation of the property is commercial along Main Street and industrial along back of properties adjacent to rail road tracks
- Staff discussed challenges with slopes on property for a commercial center project
- Holladay discussed the project and their development process:**
- Do not build developments to sale- ownership intention
- Need for quality work force housing opportunities and recent job created in area
- Mixed use project with commercial live work units along N. Main Street ground floor
- Meet with City officials to discuss property and proposal
- Topography is tough including ninety (90) feet elevation change and rock
- Stair step building design based on topography
- Emergency access on College Street- gated emergency only access
- Working with Ragan Smith for design that engages Main Street and continue the sidewalk streetscape project north to this project
- Intention to keep many existing trees as possible for outdoor enjoyment
- Amenities resort like with open areas and walking trail along back of property, swimming pool, fire pit, dog park, fitness center and garage areas available
- Exterior building designs including brick and hardi-board and glass on commercial spaces
- Trew discussed if first floor retail can be turned into residential
- Holladay discussed with live work design can be both
- Duncan discussed project and asked applicant what is different and what sets the development apart with other developments the City has seen with higher price point or designs for older elderly age groups
- Duncan discussed development not to be a resource drain on the city – quality development long term of city
- Holladay discussed ownership and management, resident groups develop ownership sense to property owners, live work design offers huge draw for residents and area including food and service
- Holladay discussed amenity design and connection to mature existing trees
- Espinosa discussed development of this area and no shortage of people this project could serve and the City's vision for the right way to develop this area
- Espinosa discussed the positives of the city and great community with quick access to Nashville

- Espinosa discussed the three (3) story live work design not just an apartment complex and marketing of project with Main Street area.
- Espinosa discussed the applicant's investment in the community but a project design including the story heights and demographics the project could go really well or poorly
- McNeal asked if it was a gated community
- Holladay responded yes a gate behind the public parking area for commercial section
- McNeal discussed noise abatement design with rail road tracks in area
- Wheeler asked if elevators in the three (3) story buildings
- Holladay responded noise abatement can be reviewed with building design issues and no elevators

-Louisville Hwy 31W/ Interchange Overlay Zoning Boundary

No representative available

- Request to remove property from INT overlay to convert existing non-conforming car wash and repair shop to an auto tow in lot and paint and body shop including altering existing car wash building including installation of bay doors
- Property is at northern edge of the Hwy 31W interchange overlay area
- Tinnin discussed concern with appearance of converting car wash into a vehicle repair shop

Public Forum on Planning Related Topics

No one requested to speak at the meeting the public forum was closed
Duncan made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by McNeal.

Scheduled Training session moved to December Agenda

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

Chairman Tony Espinosa

Addam McCormick, Planning Director