

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING

GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

September 12, 2022

Goodlettsville City Hall

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Chairman Tony Espinosa, Jeff Duncan, Grady McNeal, Jeff Parnell, Mayor Rusty Tinnin, Scott Trew, and Judy Wheeler

Absent: N/A

Also Present: Addam McCormick (Staff), Tim Ellis- City Manager, Russell Freeman-City Attorney, Sharon Reed (Staff) and Alex West (Staff)

Tony Espinosa called the meeting to order, and Wheeler offered prayer .

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

Item #2 Approval of August 1, 2022 Meeting Minutes: Approval of the August 1, 2022. Duncan abstained since he was absent at meeting. Motion passed.

Item #3 Espinosa opened the Public Forum on Planning Related Topics.

No one requested to speak at the meeting. Parnell made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by Wheeler. The motion passed unanimously. The Public Forum was closed.

AGENDA

Item #4 Neely Family Subdivision/CESO, Inc: Request final subdivision plat approval to combine multiple parcels and create a one-acre commercial lot on 26.53 acres at 1016A and B Louisville Hwy 31W. Properties referenced as Sumner County Tax Map 141 Parcels# 58.00, 58.02, 59.00. Properties are zoned CG, Commercial General, and IC, Industrial Commercial. (#11-22)

Item Representative: William Huffman, CESO, INC.

Staff Discussion:

- The subdivision plat is to combine the existing multiple properties into one property and include an out lot along the Hwy 31W frontage.
- The lot combination is for a proposed industrial warehouse development project.
- The development site plan was removed from the agenda due to a project redesign required due to a revised stream relocation design versus the initial piped stream design proposal.
- The revised project design will reduce the available building square footage on the property.
- The applicant has requested to proceed with the subdivision plat without the one acre out lot (#2) at this time.
- The exact dimension and depth of the out lot is currently being reviewed for a potential commercial development.
- The applicant will provide a revised plat for the final out lot dimension and depth.
- Staff would recommend approval.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Huffman stated the developer wishes to combine all into the 26.53 acres and there will not be a second lot at this time
- Duncan asked McCormick if lot#2 will be of size that can be handled by the administrative staff.
- McCormick responded yes, at that point it will be administrative staff level from one lot to two.
- Parnell discussed lot size at the administrative staff level and the need to combine for industrial development
- McCormick responded and discussed the surrounding properties and stream that goes through the Property

Motion: Motion by Parnell to approve the request and removing lot #2 from the initial proposal, seconded by Duncan. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #5 Kenjoh Outdoor Advertising, LLC: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 14-305 (2)(a) Interchange Sign Zone to change the sign square footage calculation regulation. The amendment request is for the proposed alteration of the permitted but not constructed pole sign at 705 Rivergate Parkway. **(Deferred at August 1st meeting)**

Item Representative: Jim Murphy, Bradley Law Firm

Staff Discussion:

- The applicant provided a revised Zoning Ordinance amendment proposal and documentation of the proposed signage, one-sided sign examples, and studies on the visual impact of interstate signs.
- Staff reviewed the existing signs along I-65 within the city limits after the last meeting.
- During the last meeting staff incorrectly discussed the design of the billboards along the interstate being two (2) sided signs.
- There are multiple one-sided signs especially between exits ninety-seven (97) and ninety-eight (98) due to the location of the signs in relation to the interstate including sign installation angles and the distance from the interstate.
- Staff has approved a sign permit for a ninety (90') feet sign with 220 square feet at 705 Rivergate Parkway behind the existing church building.
- The Planning Commission previously reviewed and denied a proposal for a 750 square feet sign.
- The applicant provided a proposed ordinance amendment to permit in the Interstate Sign District the option for a single faced sign combining the square footage of both sides of the sign face into a single faced sign.
- Example the base sign square footage permitted in the Interstate Sign District is 175 square feet with allowance for increased sign square footage depending on the distance the sign is from street providing access to the property including the proposed sign.
- The proposed ordinance would permit based on the base sign square of a two (2) sided 175 square feet sign to a single faced sign with 350 square feet.
- The maximum square footage permitted in the Interstate Sign District would be 227.5 square feet so with the amendment proposal a one-sided sign could be permitted at 455 square feet.
- The applicant's Zoning Ordinance proposal would permit within the Interstate Sign District a larger sign square footage then currently permitted but would still be less than a typical billboard square footage of 670 (+) square feet.

-The Zoning Ordinance defines the calculation of a pole sign display surface based on one side of a two (2) side sign with exception for signs faces back-to-back installed at an angle exceeding thirty (30) degrees.

-Staff read through the Zoning Ordinance section 14-303 (3) (d) When two (2) sign faces of the same shape and dimensions are mounted back-to-back on the same sign structure and are either parallel or form an angle not exceeding thirty (30) degrees, only one (1) of the sign faces shall be used to compute the display surface area. If the angle of the sign faces exceeds thirty (30) degrees, then both faces shall be used to compute the display surface area.

-The proposal would be a smaller square footage then the previously denied request. If the Planning Commission determines the proposed amendment would still permit new signs larger then desired within the Interstate Sign District, then staff would recommend denial of the Zoning Ordinance amendment request to the City Commission.

-The revised proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment includes the previous staff request requiring Planning Commission review and approval of the one side sign option.

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Murphy discussed added amended language to include sign limited to be viewable from an interstate highway due to previous concern about application of the amendment

-Murphy discussed the "Drafted" Amendment to Section 14-305(b)

-Espinosa discussed concerns from last month's meeting regarding highway work and driver safety

-Murphy responded they did submit the plans for TDOT's improvement, but this property is outside the scope of the area.

-Murphy discussed studies conducted in other communities to show the level of distraction for these type of signs

-Duncan discussed the original ordinance and the intent of the ordinance is clear to a specific size and adding the size from both sides does not seem to meet the intent of the original ordinance.

-Trew agrees with Duncan's statement and discussed the visibility of South bound traffic with the smaller size sign and drivers' safety

-Espinosa responded it is probably already an existing issue based on the number of signs, but that would have to be validated and not available for this meeting.

-Tinnin commented on the location of the sign traveling North bound you are looking at the back side of the sign

-McCormick responded the goal would be to angle the face of the sign and coming North bound you would see the back side of sign at an angle

-Espinosa agrees with Duncan's statement regarding the original ordinance.

-Freeman discussed the current ordinance, angle of signs, and size of two (2) sided signs.

-Murphy responded and discussed current ordinance language for back-to-back signs, angle of signs, and how you calculate the size of the face

-Murphy responded they are proposing the ability to take the back side and combine it into one (1) sign in a situation where you could have both back-to-back

-McCormick responded within the Interstate Sign District only

-Ellis questioned McCormick if we know specifically where the sign will be located and will the rear access to the building be blocked off by this sign

-McCormick responded yes, they have an approved sign permit for ninety (90) feet sign with 220 square feet at this location and does not think it will be blocked by this sign

-Murphy responded he did not know because he has not seen the site plan

-McCormick responded if this goes to the City Commission and they approve they will have to come back with a design plan for location, tonight is regarding the Ordinance and recommendation to the City Commission.

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

Item #6 ATMA KRUPA INC: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 14-307 (2)(e) to permit a non-conforming sign to remain on the property with a new sign installation. The owner request to maintain one of the non-conforming signs at 707 Rivergate Parkway either by amending Zoning Ordinance or subdividing the 1.8-acre property zoned CPUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development for a future site development. **(Deferred at August 1st meeting)**

Item Representative: No one to represent and discuss agenda item

Staff Discussion:

-Staff recommend deferring until additional request is made by the owner

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Espinosa discussed deferring with no one being at the meeting to represent an agenda item.
- McCormick responded the by-laws requested someone to be here but the Commission can make a special approval to approve or deny if no one to represent the agenda item
- Ellis discussed the Commission rules if they deny an agenda item and he would recommend deferring until they give notice, they are ready to come before the board.
- Duncan asked for clarification on how to get on the agenda for consideration
- McCormick responded through talking with them and emails they requested this review
- Duncan asked if they were notified that they would be on this agenda?
- McCormick responded he would recommend deferring and put on hold until he hears from them.
- Espinosa agrees with McCormick unless someone thinks there is an issue with deferring.

Motion: Motion by Trew to defer the request until planning staff is notified and a request made to be on the agenda, seconded by Parnell. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7 Community Development Staff: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance with the addition of sections 14-305 (1)(d)(vi) City Sign Zone and 14-305 (5)(c) Commercial Planning Unit Development Districts to permit the Planning Commission the ability to review the application of the permitted commercial center and planned unit development freestanding sign square footage when multiple freestanding signs are permitted

Item Representative: Staff

Staff Discussion:

- The proposed amendments would permit the Planning Commission flexibility in reviewing commercial center designs to allow a larger main entrance sign for developments permitted multiple signs due to property size and the number and dimension of roadway frontage.
- Staff requests Planning Commission discussion if the flexibility included in the amendment should also be applied to single site developments that due to property size and road frontage dimensions and multiple street frontages are permitted multiple signs.

- The Planning Commission in the review of development project site plans/master plans may permit the total pole and ground sign square footage permitted for a development project per the provisions of this ordinance to be alternatively applied to permit a shared development project sign to include increased sign area and height for ground signs and pole signs.
- The alternatively applied sign area and height is only permitted by equally eliminating or reducing the other pole and ground signs permitted by the provisions of this ordinance within a development project.
- The maximum sign area increase permitted to be applied to a single sign is sixty-six (66%) percent. The maximum sign height increase permitted to be applied to a single sign is thirty-three (33%) percent, but no pole sign shall exceed thirty (30') feet in height.
- This does not include the Interstate Sign District.
- The project site plan shall define the alternately applied sign square footage and a written agreement shall be recorded against the impacted properties.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- No discussion

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

-North Cartwright/East Cedar Mixed Use Development

The owner of the property at the corner of Cartwright Street and Cedar Street (adjacent to Starbucks) requested to discuss a mixed-use project on the property including retail, small boutique hotel, and residential rental units. Staff discussed with property owner that new hotels are required to include a minimum of ninety (90) rooms and that parking for the proposed project would need to include designated parking for hotel visitors and residents of the rental units. The property is within the Commercial Core Overlay district so the proposed uses would be permitted with the exception of the section of the proposed project with a boutique hotel with less than ninety (90) rooms. The discussion is to determine if the project is feasible and any Zoning Ordinance amendments that would be required with the project.

- Espinosa agreed parking would be a consideration
- Trew discussed the traffic on the road in front of Starbucks and turning left onto Long Hollow Pike
- Parnell discussed the size of the parcel and space for retail, hotel, residential and parking
- Duncan commented on a previous discussion similar for this property
- McCormick responded by the ordinance they could do a short-term rental component for up to five (5) units
- Ellis asked if the owner of Motel 6 would be interested in combining the two (2) parcels?
- McCormick responded he could discuss with them.
- Duncan commented as a community anything they can do to clean up the area, combine the two (2) parcels, would be a plus and as a board member interested to hear about it.
- McCormick responded he would talk with them in more detail and let them know the concerns discussed tonight.

-Comprehensive Land Use Plan Review

The current land use plan was adopted in 2006. The plan needs to be reviewed and updated. Staff will start including a discussion agenda item for reviewing sections of the plan.

-Reformatted Zoning Ordinance Review

The Zoning Ordinance is being reformatted to be more user friendly and incorporate charts into sections of the Zoning Ordinance. The flood zone ordinance is being relocated to an appendix since the ordinance section is prepared by the State Flood Plain Management office and will be easier to incorporate updated amendments. Staff will provide a draft of the reformatted Zoning Ordinance with the October meeting packet.

Copper Creek 2-1 Maintenance Bond

The maintenance bond expires September 20, 2022. The developer is working to finalize the storm water detention pond along Allen Road, but they have had issues with contractors and heavy rain. Per staff's discussion with the developer they want to extend the maintenance bond and staff agreed no them no more than ninety (90) days to finish the work.

Rivergate Retail Project

There is a possibility of a special called Planning Commission meeting to discuss a Rivergate retail project. Staff would contact each member with the date and time of the meeting.

Trew commented on the number of sign requests on the agenda and questioned if they are too rigid with the square footage of signs. Trew questions if they should look to update the size of signs.

McCormick responded and discussed the intent of the Interstate Sign District

Ellis commented this sign discussed earlier would not be permitted in Metro Nashville because it would be to close residential zoning district. Ellis agrees with the boards decision and agrees with the ordinance. Ellis discussed property the City owns that Metro wants to convert to digital billboards, but they are too close to residential zoning.

McCormick discussed the traffic growth on I-65 interstate area and that sign installers are attempting to get more advertising along the interstate.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Tony Espinosa, Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant