**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**
**GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD**

October 1, 2001 5:00 PM Massie Chambers

Present: John Cannon, Jim Galbreath, Grady McNeal, John Coombs, Scott Trew, Margaret Wall, Jim Hitt, Jim Driver, Gary Manning
Absent: Susan Williams
Also Present: Bill Terry, David Wilson, Jim Thomas, Charlie Lowe, Bennie Lane, Vicky Ignatz, Matt Dowdle, Kevin Estes, Brian Wray, John Murphy, Debbie Robinson, Pat Edison,

The meeting was called to order by John Cannon. Prayer was offered by Grady McNeal.

The minutes of the September 10, 2001 Planning and Zoning Board meeting stand approved as written.

**Item #1 (9.1 #13.01) Consider the request of Steve Brown, Barge Waggoner Sumner Cannon, for approval of the amended final plat for Twelve Stones Crossing, Phase 1, 2 and 3, Lots 18, 19, 20, Sumner County Tax Map 143M, Parcel 80.**

Staff reviewed. This plat amends the final plat of Twelve Stones Crossing, Phase 1, 2 and 3 by combining and resubdividing the existing three lots into two lots. The plat conforms to all zoning regulations.

Motion by Coombs for approval to amend the final plat of Twelve Stones Crossing, Phase I, 2 and 3, Lots 18, 19 and 20, Sumner County Tax Map 143M, Parcel 80. Motion seconded by Wall. Motion passed unanimously.

**Item #2 (9.1 #13-01) Consider the request of Kevin Estes, Dale and Associates, Inc., for approval of the preliminary master plan for Meadowcreek, HDRPUD, Davidson County Tax Map 25, Parcels 71, 96 and 11.**

Staff reviewed. Terry reported that there are two plans that are currently in effect on the property. One approved plan is a final master plan for a condominium development. This would provide 54 units on 6.4 acres of land with a mix of two story townhouses and one-story flats. The second plan is a preliminary master plan for the Morningside Assisted Living Center on 5.6 acres of land. This project was to be divided off from the property that would be developed as condominiums. The final master plan was never approved.

The current proposal, a rental apartment project, would completely scrap the approved plans and recombine the property into one apartment site. The preliminary master plan indicated 84 units on twelve acres. Staff reviewed the plan and submitted comments. Most of the comments were addressed; however, there are several issues to be considered. 1) One additional fire hydrant is needed to meet the 300-foot requirement for all buildings. 2) The mobility of the firefighting apparatus and other emergency vehicles is limited due to four dead-end driveways proposed for the site. Access to the rear of the buildings is not available. Staff requested that a looped driveway system be considered; however, the issue was only partially addressed by the engineer.

3) Architectural requirements need to be considered. The current proposal shows only building footprints depicting straight lines of a rectangular building that indicates flat front elevation with a flat roof. This plan changes substantially the type of architecture in the previously approved plan which included variable front elevations with 7/12 and 12/12 pitched roofs. The previous plan's exterior included brick on the first story units with vinyl exterior on the upper level units.
4) A general summary of the project has not been submitted.

Kevin Estes, Dale and Associates, stated the properties previously owned by Life Trust and Kirby Clifton has been purchased by Murphy Development, LLC. The complex will consist of two story buildings with 8-12 units per building with a pool, clubhouse and open space. The existing landscape canopy will be maintained along Dickerson Road and the perimeter of the property. He added that the driveway pattern was sufficient and that the fire truck would only have to back up to egress the parking area located on the southern most side of the complex.

Cannon stated that the main issue was adequate ingress/egress access of the Fire Department's emergency vehicles from the main road and throughout the driveway system. The road system is not properly constructed for fire access and requires the emergency personnel to haul hoses, back up trucks and provides no access to the rear of the buildings. Terry added that the Fire Chief is uncomfortable with the short distance from the main drive's entrance to the nearest parking area. Estes confirmed the radius to the entrance can be expanded, a 60 ft. curve radius can be attained, a cul-de-sac will be added to the south side of the plan and that the driveway plan will satisfy current code requirements.

Cannon offered that the design appeared to lack any architectural features. Estes stated that the building design was prototypical and standard for this type development. Terry presented photographs of an existing complex on Myatt Drive in Madison that is being developed by Murphy Development, LLC. Driver added his concern regarding the architectural design. The Board has worked hard to develop a modified architectural design for the previously approved plan for this site and would not want to deviate from the approved plan. Estes affirmed that his firm would work with the City to develop an acceptable architectural plan. Coombs echoed the comments of Driver and added that even though the previously approved architectural design plan never materialized, the building design needs some variation breaks due to the site's high elevation that makes it highly visible from the public street. The design should be compatible with the adjoining development of Rolling Meadows and should be representative of the City's current architectural concept due to its location at the southern entrance to the city. Coombs requested all exteriors be covered in brick materials and permit no vinyl siding. Also, all existing trees and fence row vegetation be removed and new materials be planted to comply with the landscape ordinance. He added that the entrance signage adds no value to the property and should be redesigned and landscaped appropriately.

Estes stated he was ill prepared to discuss building design at this step of the approval process and would work with the City to meet requirements. He requested direction from the City regarding the development's signage and entranceway and assured the Board that landscape ordinance requirements would be met. Estes stated he would set up a meeting with staff to discuss and clarify issues.

Trew questioned why the buildings appear to be crowded toward the front of the property and the majority of the open space is on the rear portion of the property. Estes confirmed the buildings are situated on the front portion of the property to avoid the drainage issue which the adjoining development of Rolling Meadows has experienced.

Estes requested the item be deferred until the next Planning Board meeting.

Motion by Driver to defer consideration of the preliminary master plan for Meadowcreek. Motion seconded by McNeal. Motion passed unanimously.

**Non-Agenda Item:**

Terry reported that the Goodlettsville Chamber of Commerce had originally appeared before the Board in December, 2000 requesting an amendment to the Sign Ordinance permitting permanent banner signs on public right-of-ways. The Board requested information regarding quantity, cost, street locations, utility company requirements, installation/maintenance, etc.

Debbie Robinson, Goodlettsville Chamber of Commerce, Executive Director, and Pat Edison, Beautification Committee Chairperson, presented information to the Board relating to the street banner program.

1) Option I - The proposed thoroughfares would contain a total of 60 banners with sponsorship attachment - Main Street (20 banners), Long Hollow Pike (12 banners) and Rivergate Parkway (25 banners). Banners would be placed prominently around the mall entrances and interstate exchanges. Option II - This plan would be to install 14 larger sized banners on all major thoroughfare intersections and traffic lights. It is recommended that at least two styles of banners be purchased initially to enable a variety throughout the year.
2) 60 – 30 x 80 banners, pole, hardware - $6,000
   14 - larger banners, pole, hardware - $2,900
3) NES requires that banners be attached a minimum of 12 ft. above sidewalk and no closer than 12 in. from any existing pole attachments. Banner arms shall have a cast aluminum breakaway coupling and an internal stainless steel safety cable. NES has waived all application and annual attachment fees.
4) NES requires a pole attachment contract and hold harmless agreement with the City.
5) Funding of project – Develop public private partnerships with area businesses; a $1,000 donation from the Chamber's Beautification Committee; additional funds donated by the City of Goodlettsville. Note: Sponsor identification programs are not advertising but an acknowledgement of a gift;
6) Maintenance and storage – All maintenance and storage of banners would be provided by the City

Robinson added advantages of the street banner program are name recognition for City, community identification for visitors to the area, establish a "warm, down home feeling" to the area, and provide an avenue to publicize special seasonal activities and events for the City.

McNeal questioned the life expectancy of the banners. Robinson stated that Nashville Tent and Awning, a banner vendor, estimated a ten year usage of the banner. Wall asked why the request was for two sets of banners. Robinson stated the banner program would replace the current Christmas decorations for the City and a second banner would be non-seasonal. Thomas asked if the maintenance costs had been projected. Robinson responded that this information was not available at this time.

Hitt voiced his concern that corporate identity sponsorship could offend citizens. He recommended that the Chamber of Commerce develop funding guidelines for sponsorship from the area businesses or submit a donation request for program funding to the City. Coombs agreed that without guidelines enabling review of banner sponsorship content, the program could be opening itself up for blanket advertising by one sponsor. Galbreath recommended a joint ownership of the banner between the City and the Chamber. Thomas suggested that the Chamber buy the banners and donate them to the City; thereby eliminating the Chamber from maintenance responsibilities.

Terry stated the issues before the Board are program funding, sponsorship signage which is a violation of the sign ordinance and responsibility of maintaining banners. The sign ordinance currently permits special event and civic type signage at one location. An amendment to the sign ordinance would need to be crafted to specifically address the banner issue. Thomas offered to get an estimate regarding maintenance of the banner program from the Public Works Dept.

Motion by Coombs to direct Bill Terry to review the current sign ordinance, craft language to address the banner program and sponsorship issues and provide the Board with this information in a timely manner. Motion seconded by Wall. Motion passed unanimously.

John Cannon, Chairperson

Vicky Ignatz

Vicky Ignatz, Recording Secretary