

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING

GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

May 2, 2022

Goodlettsville City Hall

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Vice Chairman Scott Trew, Jeff Duncan, Grady McNeal, Jeff Parnell, Judy Wheeler

Absent: Chairman Tony Espinosa, Mayor Rusty Tinnin

Also Present: Addam McCormick (Staff), City Manager Tim Ellis, Russell Freeman, Mary Laine Hucks and Sharon Reed

Scott Trew called the meeting to order, and McNeal offered prayer.

Item #1 Approval of Agenda: Parnell made a motion to approve the agenda, McNeal seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Item #2 Approval of April 4, 2022 Meeting Minutes: Parnell made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2022 meeting, Duncan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Trew opened the Public Forum on Planning Related Topics

Jeremy Mansfield – 109 Copper Creek Drive – Regarding the Allen Farms Investment LLC request for rezoning.

Citizens have concerns about infrastructure, traffic and the request to double the density of the property.

Discussed the storm water drainage run off issues.

Discussed the increase of homes in the Cooper Creek area and flooding issues with more homes in the area.

Mansfield stated as a Sumner County Commission representative for the area on behalf of the constituents and neighbors on Allen Road he requests they vote no for the re-zoning.

Trew asked for any additional comments and no additional comments were received.

Wheeler made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by Parnell. The motion passed.

The Public Forum was closed.

AGENDA

Item #3 City of Goodlettsville Parks and Recreation Department: Request preliminary site plan approval for a grant application submittal for Rachel's Garden Playground facility in Peay Park on Memorial Drive. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02500005801.

Item Representative: N/A

Staff Discussion:

-The project plan is currently at the preliminary design stage.

-The requested action by the Planning Commission is for a City grant application submittal. If the grant application is approved, then final plans will be prepared and submitted for the Planning Commission to review.

-The playground location will be located between the community center and splash pad at Peay Park.

-The Fire Department has worked on multiple fundraising events for the playground facility that will provide accessible facilities.

Planning Commission Discussion: N/A

Motion: Motion by Duncan to approve the request, seconded by Wheeler . The motion passed unanimously.

Item #4 Parkview Preserve Phase One - Insight Properties LLC: Requests recommendation to the City Commission for acceptance of public improvements with a one-year maintenance bond. Planning staff to define final improvement completion status.

Item Representative: N/A

Staff Discussion:

-Project Status:

-One hundred (100%) percent lot completion.

-Remaining Improvements including asphalt surface installation and pavement markings, limited sections of sidewalk damage repair, replacing dead sections of trees and plantings, and reworking access drive

-Staff would recommend approval subject to all the remaining improvements being completed, inspected, and approved by City staff and the City Commission accepting French Street as public street with two (2) \$ 60,000 maintenance bonds one for public improvements and one for private improvements.

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Parnell questioned the landscaping around the electric substation area

-McCormick responded the landscaping in this area includes some dead plants and will be completed per Phase II of master plan.

Motion: Motion by Duncan to approve the request, seconded by McNeal. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #5 Vintage Northcreek Phase Two/Ragan Smith/Jason Philips-Vintage Northcreek LLC: Request final master plan approval for seventy-six (76) apartment units on 2.1 acres. Property is zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development and is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 01914001900. Property Owner: Vintage Northcreek Phase II (#13-21)

Item Representative: Matt Lackey, PE – Ragan-Smith Ass. Inc.

Staff Discussion:

-The project is the second phase of the Vintage Northcreek Apartment project.

- Per the preliminary master plan the project density for the entire project was based on multiple property tracts.
- The first phase of the project is completed.
- The front commercial area is under separate ownership and will be developed and reviewed by the Planning Commission with a future separate plan.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Duncan discussed the access to phase II and the size of commercial lot seven
- Lackey responded roughly one acre and Ragan-Smith is not representing the owner of the commercial lot seven (7) but that they have worked with design representative for the lot seven (7) owner and the access layout is based on their design
- Parnell asked Lackey to talk thru the flood zone, drainage system, and what they are doing with storm Water
- Lackey responded and discussed the updated FEMA flood maps, letter map amendments, and bioretention plan

Motion: Motion by Wheeler to approve the request, seconded by Duncan. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #6 Stone Bridge Lots/Holladay Ventures: Request final master plan revision approval for revised traffic study and site grading design for 310 multi-family apartment units and 6,000 sq. ft. of commercial space on 19.22 acres at 619 N. Main Street/ Hwy 41/SR-11. Property is zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development and referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 01812006900. Property Owner: Proctor Family Partnership (#012-20)

Item Representative: John Gore, PE - Barge Cauthen

Staff Discussion:

- The proposed revised grading plan is due to the amount of grading and site work necessary for the site development.
- The proposal includes adding fill along the back section of the site and adjacent to the CSX railroad line.
- The current master plan includes the area as a natural landscaping area with a walking trail. The fill to be used will be from the cut excavation of other areas of the site.
- The proposal includes a roughly thirty (30') feet retaining wall along the back of the site.
- Additional information on wall design, walking trail location, and landscaping will need to be reviewed.
- If the revision is approved, staff will submit to City's Consultant engineer to review the revised grading design proposal.
- The revised traffic study reflects the approved commercial square footage and use and the number of apartment units.
- The City has requested TDOT to review a traffic signal at the main drive access due to the Planning Commission's concerns about delay at the main access drive due to traffic along N. Main Street and the warranted but not proposed right turn lane per the limitations referenced in the traffic study.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Gore discussed the March, 2022 updated traffic study and the grading and landscaping concept on the back of the property.

- Gore discussed a retaining wall on the North side of property, walking trail and landscaping screen.
- McCormick discussed a revised landscape plan will be needed since the original area now proposed as wall area was for noise buffering of the railroad to the residential units.
- Parnell questioned the thirty-foot (30') CSX right-of-way
- Gore responded the intention is to leave the thirty-foot (30') CSX easement undisturbed.
- Duncan discussed the rear buffer and originally approved reduced brick percentages and exterior materials on the back units based on limited visibility but now the area is visible and should the original reduced brick percentages be the same
- Trew questioned what will be on top of the retaining walls
- Gore responded the intention is chain link fence for safety respective
- McCormick responded for safety the fence will not be part of the wall and the wall will be a step back retaining wall and need some type of guard rail.
- Trew questioned the status of project
- Gore responded working through permitting for grading, building plans and codes.
- McNeal questioned the construction of the retaining wall
- Gore responded a Mechanically Stabilized Earth wall setback type system
- Duncan discussed the design of the detention ponds
- Gore responded and discussed the four basins, detention ponds, and CSX area and pre and post designs including not increased run-off on CSX right-of-way
- Parnell discussed concerns with the rear elevations, slopes and grading issues on the South side of the property on an area in addition to proposed alterations and discussed if opening up original approvals if this area should also be reviewed due to concerns with slopes adjacent to units in this area also
- Trew stated the concerns of the board: materials on the back buildings, retaining wall, drainage issues, and traffic concerns.

Motion: Motion by Parnell to defer the request, seconded by McNeal. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7 Kenjoh Outdoor Advertising: Requests approval for a pole sign within the Rivergate Parkway Interstate Sign Zone District on CSX Rail right-of-way on the south-west side of the I-65/Rivergate Parkway interchange.

Item Representative: John Kirirah – Kenjoh Outdoor Advertising

Staff Discussion:

- The proposal is for a high-rise sign at one hundred feet in height and 227 square feet in area per the Interstate Sign District section of the Zoning Ordinance on a section of the CSX right-of-way adjacent to I-65 based on the recently amended ordinance to permit increases in height and area based on the streetscape appearance of the sign
- Staff discussed the proposed signage location within the CSX right-of-way including proximity to I-65 and Moss Trail area and unique for signage proposal within right-of-way
- Staff discussed the City's Interstate Sign District including a district at all three (3) interchanges
- The proposal includes the request for expanded sign height and square footage per the provisions of the Sign Ordinance.
- Staff read through the sign ordinance sections
- The City's Sign Ordinance permits increased high-rise sign heights and sign area square footages based on the location of the proposed sign in relation to the streetscape of the roadway providing access to

the property including the sign and the requirement for the proposed sign to be behind the primary building on the property.

- The proposed sign location will be visible behind a section of homes along a section of Moss Trail that back up to the interstate and the proposed sign area.

- Staff would recommend denial of the proposed signage and increased sign height and sign area square footage based on the provisions of the Interstate Sign District including signage to be associated with a primary development building and the proposed sign location and property setting does not meet the Sign Ordinance section regarding streetscape appearance and visibility of the sign from residential areas.

- Staff discussed the city does not regulate the content on the sign the city can regulate the height and location and size of sign but not if the sign owner leases out the content

- Staff discussed the interpretation of the ordinance is the interstate sign district pole signs would be related to a development of primary use on the property

- The City has signs within the instate sign district associated with hotels and restaurants along the sign districts and has permitted two (2) high-rise signs within the Interstate Sign District across I-65 from this area including a sign behind the church facility at 705 Rivergate Parkway which is the same applicant requesting this item and behind the existing commercial center at 707 Rivergate Parkway but these both are associated with a project and development on the property

- Staff discussed the proposal on CSX right of way is not associated with a site development and building and includes tracks for the railroad

- Staff would recommend denial of the proposed signage and increased sign height and sign area square since not associated with a streetscape and the sign would be visible from the homes along Moss Trail

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Kirirah discussed this is a unique case and they have recently developed a partnership with CSX Transportation including a sign installed in another location and their intention for a sign in this location and they have a deal with CSX for a sign in this location

- Kirirah discussed they have changed signage proposal to drop sign area and height per ordinance based on staff's comments and had hoped the sign was not visible from the homes and has not been back there to review but would be willing to not have anything on back of sign adjacent to homes and north bound facing section of sign they would drop that sign face.

- Staff confirmed the discussed sign location and sign face direction discussed with presentation map

- Kirirah questioned if a parcel is vacant can you not have a sign? Would this disqualify the property?

- McCormick responded and referenced the Interstate Sign Ordinance Section about signage in relation to a building and staff's interpretation is that this section of the sign ordinance would not apply to a vacant property. The sign ordinance does not clearly say that but interpretation is that is implied to be associated with a project.

- Staff confirmed the email received about the applicant revising the request and the one face proposal discussed at the meeting tonight and visibility of sign and electronic message board along the referenced section of Moss Trail and the proposed sign is still smaller than a typical billboard type sign

- Staff discussed the proposal not being associated with a building on a site recent approval including sign district extension area for AWG on Cartwright Street and sign associated with a sign on a site

- Staff discussed the request is an interpretation item and this request is not limited by the Zoning Map amendment included on agenda

- Trew discussed the request of reduced height and size of sign more in line with the ordinance

- McCormick responded with his interpretation of the Sign Ordinance the sign is still supposed to be associated with a project and a smaller sign and one static sign face area would be less visible to homes on Moss Trail
- McCormick discussed the recent amendments for increased height and area are based on the distance the signage is from the streetscape and signage is relation to interstate associated with interstate advertisement and that the property being requested is on right-of-way for moving vehicles, but the property is within the interstate sign district and is the reason why applicant made request
- Duncan discussed his concerns of a sign on property not associated with commercial property and request being outside the purpose of the Sign Ordinance and what the sign ordinance is set up for and allows the city to do
- Trew discussed being in agreement with Duncan's comments
- Parnell asked City attorney Freeman for his thoughts
- Freeman discussed the intent of the ordinance section is for a sign associated with a project primary building or improved property and the proposal is outside the intent of the ordinance section
- Freeman discussed access to site would only be along railroad and has not reviewed any license agreement since nothing was include with meeting packet information but questioned access to the site
- Parnell discussed the Commission's role is to protect citizens living in the area and that he doesn't like this sign in this area but also not wanting to place citizens in legal jeopardy either and discussed the City's Attorney's comments and if the matter should be deferred
- Freeman discussed denying the request would be on solid ground based on the language of the Sign Ordinance on CSX right of way and this in an interpretation issue based on plain language of ordinance and intent for primary building being associated with signage and discussed not reviewing any license agreement and discussed access of the property in question and accessing the right-of-way
- Staff discussed the CSX letter was only placed in meeting packet information to Commission to show CSX had approved it
- Kirirah discussed the signage would require coordination with CSX and CSX is being compensated for use of signage on the property and would work on access with CSX
- Trew discussed the Planning Commission wanting to be fair and doing what is best for the City and residents of Goodlettsville discussing Parnell's question and more concerned about what is best for Goodlettsville

Motion: Motion by Duncan to deny the request, seconded by Wheeler. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #8 Allen Farms/Allen Farms Investment LLC, Property Owner: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the project master plan to change sixty-four (64) of the seventy-one (71) lots from one family dwellings to two (2) family dwellings. Properties included in the requested amendment area are zoned LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and are referenced as Sumner County Tax Map 139 Parcels 61.00 and 62.01 and Tax Map 143 Parcel# 033. (#22-18)

Item Representative: Dean Patel

Staff Discussion:

- The request is to amend a section of the project master plan to permit two (2) family dwelling units on sixty-four (64) of the total seventy-one (71) existing approved lots for one family dwelling units.
- The Allen Farms project master plan was previously approved for seventy-one (71) one family dwelling residential lots.

- The project area includes 86.11 areas zoned LDPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and five (5) acre zoned R25, Low Density Residential which includes seven (7) single family lots.
- The LDRPUD zoning does permit one and two (2) family dwellings, but the approved project master plan is limited to seventy-one (71) one family dwelling lots.
- The R25 zoning section only permits one family dwellings which is the reason the requested master plan amendment is for sixty (64) instead of the total seventy-one (71) lots to be changed from one to two (2) family dwellings.
- The LDRPUD zoning permits a maximum density of 1.7 units per acre which would be 146 total lots on the 86.11-acre section of the project area zoned LDRPUD.
- The applicant is requesting the home construction to be like the Vineyard at Twelve Stones project on Willis Branch including two (2) unit attached units.
- The typical lot width and lot square footage per the Allen Farms Master Plan including 15,000-18,000 sq. ft. lots with one hundred feet (100') lot widths are similar to the two (2) unit shared lot widths and lot square footage in the Vineyard project.
- The project traffic study was based on eighty-five (85) one family units and the project utility design was based on the seventy-one (71) family dwelling lots.
- The traffic study and utilities approvals would both be required to be revised and reviewed to reflect the proposed amendment to determine any off-site roadway or utility upgrades for the proposed increased density.
- The project density and the project defined use are per the current Allen Farms Master Plan and any changes to increase the density and type of units will require a master plan amendment reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Commission.
- The Planning Commission can deny the amendment recommendation to the City Commission based on the intention to maintain the existing master plan or defer to allow the owner to submit revised master plan information for the proposed density increase or approve the requested recommendation with stipulations.
- The owner discussed with staff additional possible amendments including unit types and densities that would require another revised project master plan and property rezoning expanding the development area of the project within the current open space areas per the project master plan.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Patel discussed the master plan of seventy-one (71) one family dwelling lots, the challenging slopes, local builders wanting to build smaller, utility lines, sewer, and development cost.
- Trew asked Patel what type, size and quality of home was approved for the seventy-one (71) lots?
- Patel responded 3,200 to 3,800 sq. ft. single family homes reducing the homes to 2,200 to 2,800 . ft. per side two family dwellings.
- Duncan discussed gravity sewer, run-off detention calculations, road-way volume and additional density approval.
- Trew asked if this would increase the number of cars?
- Patel responded possibly increase thirty (30%) to forty (40%) percent in vehicles
- Parnell discussed the site and issues with the number of lots for this site
- Patel responded and discussed the grading of the site and finding the right builders
- Trew discussed a decision and if any change would go back to the City Commission and would another public comment opportunity be provided
- McCormick responded yes this is a change to the original master plan and discussed the role of the Planning Commission to provide a recommendation to the City Commission

- Ellis discussed the City Commission's review process and public hearing process at second reading
- Trew discussed the opportunities for the public to discuss their concerns before the City Commission
- Duncan asked for clarification on the approved Master Plan
- Trew discussed possible lower percentage of units changing to single family and the Commission discussion percentage ranges up to twenty (25%) percent
- McCormick discussed the Planning Commission options, project density, and zoning.
- Duncan discussed the grading plan and a concept plan
- Parnell asked for clarification on deny/deferral of a request
- McCormick responded this is a master plan amendment and clarified that the Planning Commission could deny or defer this request or approve with stipulations for certain items be completed before City Commission review
- Parnell discussed concerns with the sixty-four (64) two (2) unit lots
- Patel responded he will go back and discuss with the builders and if it makes sense, he will bring back to the Planning Commission or go forward with the approved seventy-one (71) single family dwellings.

Motion: Motion by Duncan to defer the request, seconded by Parnell. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #9 Zoning Map Amendment-Planning Staff: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Interstate Sign District maps to limit district boundaries to defined properties for site development not including right-of-way.

Staff Discussion:

- The proposed revised Interstate Sign District and Mall Area maps remove all sections of right-of-way from the maps.
- Staff's interpretation of the Sign Ordinance section associated with the Interstate Sign District map is that the right-of-way areas were only included to graphically include a connected overlay district area at each interchange.
- If the proposed maps are approved, staff will prepare an updated GIS formatted map.
- Staff's interpretation of the Interstate Sign District section of the Sign Ordinance is for the signage permitted in the ordinance section to be associated (accessory use) with property developments (primary use) with the properties defined in the Interstate Sign districts.
- The proposed revised Interstate Sign District maps include the October 2021 approved map area extensions in the Rivergate area and along S. Cartwright Street

Planning Commission Discussion: N/A

Motion: Motion by Wheeler to approve the request, seconded by McNeal. The motion passed unanimously.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

Scott Trew, Vice-Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant