

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING

GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

July 12, 2021

Goodlettsville City Hall

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Chairman Tony Espinosa, Vice Chairman Scott Trew, Jeff Duncan, Jim Hitt, Jeff Parnell, Grady McNeal, David Lynn, Bob Whittaker

Absent: Mayor Rusty Tinnin, Judy Wheeler, Jerry Garrett

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

Espinosa called the meeting to order and Trew offered prayer.

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

Item #2 Approval of June 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes: Duncan made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2021 meeting, Parnell seconded the motion. Espinosa, McNeal, Lynn, and Whittaker abstained since all were absent at that meeting. Motion passed.

AGENDA

Item #3 Copper Creek 2-6, Meritage Homes: 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: Dan Crunk, Truland Consulting, Troy Tyson, 675 Fall Creek Circle

Staff Discussion:

- Cooper Creek Section Two (2) Phase Six (6) Fifty-five (55) residential lots completed
- All improvements are in only two (2) items remaining
- Sidewalk repair- section holding water at bottom forty (40') feet section of Fall Creek Circle Storm water finish grading repairs
- Per discussion with applicant- the sidewalk repair is proposed to be completed within next two (2) weeks and detention pond repairs are proposed to occur in the next few months. The detention pond serves sections of both phase 2-4 and 2-6.
- The sidewalk improvements on Fall Creek Circle to be completed prior to the July 22, 2021 City Commission meeting and the detention pond improvements to be completed by November 1, 2021.
- Once the sidewalk section is repaired, the new bond will be a one-year maintenance bond at \$ 48,000.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Crunk states they agree with the conditions.
- Tyson states there are cracks in sidewalk in other areas that need repairs
- Parnell asks McCormick if he would like to speak about Mr. Tyson concern

- McCormick states there are a couple of sections in other phases but he will walk and confirm
- Crunk states that they are on the punch list and are being taken care of
- Espinosa states the question by Parnell regarding the concerns of Mr. Tyson will be taken care of on the punch list

Motion: Motion by Trew to approve the request with stipulation, referenced in meeting seconded by Parnell . The motion passed unanimously.

Item #4 The Hill Place/L. Steven Bridges Land Surveying and Consulting: Requests recommendation to the City Commission for an amendment to the project master plan for two (2) additional residential units on 6.83 acres on Brick Church Pike. Properties referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcels 018160A1100CO-1600CO and are zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development. Property Owner- GMAC Properties, LLC/ O.I.C. The Hill Place (#7-21)

Item Representative: Mark Writesman

Staff Discussion:

- The current twenty-six (26) units on the property calculates to 3.8 units per acre. The proposal to include two (2) additional units will be 4.0 units per acre which is below the maximum density permitted.
- The proposal is to add additional residential units twenty-seven (27) and twenty-eight (28) on the property.
- Per discussion with applicant the units will be consistent with the existing brick construction and the drainage from the additional units and parking area will be graded to drain into an existing detention pond on the south-west corner of the property.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Writesman states the property is zoned for fifty (50) units currently have twenty-six (26) units requesting to build one (1) building with two (2) units

Motion: Motion by McNeal to approve, seconded by Hitt. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #5 Dry Creek Commons Phase Two/Wamble & Associates, PLLC: Requests final master plan approval for thirty-nine (39) residential townhouse units on 5.39 acres on Dry Creek Road. Property referenced as a portion of Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 03304007200 zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development and a small section of A, Agricultural zoning along I-65. Property Owner-Vastland/Eatherly/McClung/Development (#8-21)

Item Representative: Danny Wamble, Project Engineer

Staff Discussion:

- The phase includes an additional access point on Dry Creek Road which was approved with the original and revised preliminary master plans.
- The City requires 300 feet sight distance for new driveways on urban arterial routes.
- The townhouse building design will be consistent with the current buildings under construction in phase one.

- The City's engineering consultant plan review comments include requested additional drainage calculation information to support the ditch in phase one behind phase two (2) units- 213-223.-The project design includes a common storm water detention pond for both phases that was constructed with phase one.
- A section of the project including the area of the additional Dry Creek Road driveway in phase two (2) includes storm water by-passing the detention pond due to site grades. The engineer consultant comments include additional storm calculation information to support this by-pass design.
- The by-pass section also includes public storm drainage from Dry Creek Road.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- McCormick asks Wamble if he could explain the site distance calculation of 287 feet
- Wamble explains formula from the AASHTO manual used by engineer to calculate the intersection site distance. The study shows they are providing 307' ft. and 308' ft.
- Wamble states he has reviewed the engineer consultant comments and they will comply
- Wamble explains two main issues drainage was shown on the approved 2003 and 2016 concept plan pond design is built and in compliance with the City's requirements. The by-pass is small area they will provide calculations of capacity for the side ditch. Townhome units with roof draining towards the road they will put in a roof drain to catch the water and take back thru water quality unit.
- Parnell asked if we have received a letter from TVA verifying their review of the plan with the amenities in the easement?
- Wamble states no building improvements in the easement. If they ever decide to build improvements and it becomes a problem with TVA they will address with the HOA. They do not anticipate any problems.

Motion: Motion by Duncan to approve with the consultant's review comments being addressed, seconded by Whittaker. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #6 Villas at Highland Park/TTL/Sage Legacy, Developer: Request preliminary master plan approval for 133 townhouse units on 19.12 acres on Dickerson Road. The plan includes the addition of a 1.2-acre property on Dickerson Road zoned CPUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development that does not include any residential units. Planning Commission at the April 27, 2020 meeting recommend approval to the City Commission to rezone the 19.12 acres from A, Agricultural to HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development. Properties referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcels#02500006000, 0250021900, 0250021800, and 02500006200. Property Owners: Thomas and Tammy Cox and Robert and William Burton (#9- 21)

Item Representative: George Grundler, Sage Legacy LLC, and Barry Cleveland, TTL

Staff Discussion:

- The Planning Commission at the April 27, 2020 meeting approved the rezoning recommendation to the City Commission with a list of project design guidelines.
- The City Commission at the July 23, 2020 meeting approved the rezoning ordinance on first reading only with project guidelines.
- The City Commission's rezoning ordinance second reading and Planning Commission's Comprehensive Plan review were both deferred until the project master plan was submitted for review and approval.

- City Commission approved on first reading only a set of guidelines to regulate the project
- Staff discussed the City Commission guidelines
- Multi-family townhomes at a density of seven (7) units per acre for the entire 19.12-acre property including total 133 units
- Unit cluster design to preserve natural green space
- Fifty (50') feet conservation easement along a portion of the northern edge in order to preserve a natural boundary with the single-family properties to the north
- Townhomes will be limited to two-stories and the intent is the units to be for-sale properties and half of them to be limited to a one-story building design
- All of the Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines regulations regarding building materials and development requirements including but not limited to landscaping would apply
- Preliminary and Final Master Plan review and approvals required by Planning Commission including a traffic study
- The proposal includes the additional 1.2-acre property not included in the previous review. The project is zoned CPUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development
- The property includes a TVA utility easement that is currently non-improved. The applicant has stated their intention to request the easement being abandoned to allow units to be constructed as shown on the proposed plan
- The City's Fire Marshall's review comment included a loop street design around the project to accommodate emergency and sanitation services.
- The units are two (2) story units. The building architectural design will be required to be revised to reflect the fifty (50%) percent brick or stone on all exterior elevations.
- Staff would recommend the front section of the property zoning be revised to be designated for commercial development including rezoning the front CPUD. The applicant has not requested the commercial rezoning this is a staff suggestion.
- Recommend deferral to address the TVA easement, looped drive per City Fire Marshall request, the fifty (50%) percent brick or stone on all exterior elevations
- The project proposal includes two (2) story townhouse designs to include more square footage for the units versus a mixture of one-story designs. The previous project approval guidelines included a mixture of one and two (2) story units.
- Revised building design information including garage dimensions and elevations

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Cleveland discussed the five (5) items outstanding
- Cleveland states they are in the process of requesting a review for the TVA easement.
- Cleveland states the final design will show looped drive and additional lanes.
- Cleveland states they have applied for the City Sewer availability letter
- Cleveland states the sight distance information is in the process of scheduling on a survey. The results will be provided to McCormick when available.
- Cleveland states the revised building design information and garage dimensions is 21' ft. x 20.5' ft.
- Grundler states they will adjust the plan to meet the criteria in the comments.
- Cleveland states no problem with deferral for another meeting once all information is provided if approval cannot be based on conditions of meeting the requirements of the City for the five (5) items outstanding.
- Trew asked for explanation on the City's concern of one-story and two-story units
- McCormick states original guidelines and design toward age retention for the one-story units

- Trew states he is trying to imagine what that will look like and would it be a group of one-story units and a section of two-story units seems it would be disjointed
- Grundler agrees with that assessment. They feel for the citizens of Goodlettsville the two-story will be more cohesive, comprehensive aesthetic in the community and better marketing price point.
- Cleveland states due to some topography, sewer design, and the project moved over to right were all factors in why the one-story went to two-story to accommodate the site
- Trew asked if the garage will be 20' ft. wide
- Grundler states the minimum will be 20.5' ft. wide and the depth will be 21' ft.
- Trew states so that will be good for one (1) car
- Grundler states they view that as a two (2) car garage
- Trew states so the driveway will also be good for two (2) cars side by side and you do not see a problem with on the street parking
- Grundler states they do not envision a problem with that having a two (2) car garage and a driveway accommodating two (2) cars
- Trew asks with the length of the driveway if someone parks in it will it obstruct the sidewalk
- Cleveland states no the distance between the building and the sidewalk is 20' ft.
- Trew asked McCormick if there is something we can put in the covenant that will not allow parking to impede the sidewalks
- Espinosa states he thinks this is a bigger discussion around the challenges of parking across sidewalks
- McNeal asks McCormick to go over the fire truck information
- McCormick states the Fire Marshall requested to have a loop design go all around the project
- Espinosa states the City staff recommends deferral on Item #6 Villas at Highland Park/TTL/Sage Legacy, Developer.
- Parnell states he is representing the real estate portion of this deal and will be abstaining from voting. May be a benefit for the applicant to hear thoughts on two-story
- Ellis states in with the Cottages at Twelve-Stone project about 33% are one-story based on the developments roof line when you go down the road you cannot tell they are one-story or two-story
- Hitt discussed deferring this item until September giving TVA time to respond
- Cleveland states their preference would be move forward to August meeting
- McCormick requested confirmation will be for-sale units
- Cleveland stated yes, for-sale property
- McCormick states defer to August meeting and if applicant is not ready then they can request it move to September meeting
- Trew states no issues with two-story units throughout the complex he thinks it would look more consistent
- Espinosa asks the applicant for their thoughts cosmetically
- Cleveland states cosmetically enough buffer both ways you will not notice
- Duncan discussed the thought process for the one-story was for the older/diverse population to have a place to live and not worry about steps
- Cleveland states the Villas are larger and the master will be on the main level
- Espinosa opened the meeting for public comments
- Glen Garrett – Resident since 1995. Not opposed. Asked for TVA easement 25-30 years ago and was declined. No permanent structure within a TVA easement. Mr. Garrett states they are asking for maximum development of seven (7) units for the 19 acre property but if you look where they are

building the property maybe 12 acres, so it does not meet the intent. No mention of property in the back. It is 6 acres and good buildable sites who to say down the road they may want to build on the additional acres. One (1) car garage unit will have cars parking and blocking sidewalks. Traffic flow concern number of people per unit and traffic in and out per day with the lay out of the land. Not opposed to land being developed opinion is not the right development.

-Espinosa asked McCormick if he wanted to add or share comments with Garrett

-McCormick states master plan type project. The units per acre will be for the whole property. One car garage the board will need to consider. As this goes forward traffic study will be completed and traffic improvement on Dickerson Rd. reviewed by City and TDOT.

-Hitt discussed Garrett's concern if the project was approved the back property cannot be sold off

-McCormick states it will be the HOA's property common open space and will be on the deed

-Trew asked Garrett if the units to the North that are adjacent to his house will he have a problem with two-story height in that area

-Garrett states no problem with one or two-story. He feels the Board had a very good reason to define story heights

-Kerry Garrett resident discussed the difficulty of a trash truck or emergency vehicle turning around on this property. They have lived in Goodlettsville all their lives were born here and care about what the City looks like and just wants what is best. She states she hates to see all the green area all gone but that is progress and it will be developed. Just want it to be the right development and not a development where a trash truck can't easily turn around. We want people who serve us to be able to get in and out of neighborhoods easily and do their jobs.

-David Wilson – resident 510 Utley Drive. Wilson states he and his wife own 4.5 acres adjoining this property. Wilson states he realizes the Commissioners are responsible for doing what is best for the City as far as new development is concerned and that can create tough decisions. He has watched proposals for development of this property come before this Commission for twenty (20) years or more and obviously this is a difficult piece of property to develop due to restrictions. He knows you have to make a transition between the large single-family development to the North and commercial property to the South, but this seems to be a very drastic transition right next door to the single-family homes. His opinion is this is not the best development for this property. He urges the board to continue to look, analyze and critique this plan and if there is a decision made to develop you will feel this is the best development you can get there.

-Espinosa asked Cleveland and Grundler if they wanted to share any other thoughts on this item

-Cleveland appreciates the opportunity to hear the comments. The green space will be HOA property. Green space adds trails, paths, recreation for their citizens to have as an amenity in their development. The perimeter road not shown now but will be there will allow that circular activity around the neighborhood and a way out of the subdivision. It will be safe and meet TDOT standards because Dickerson Pike is a state road. Townhomes and Villas development for the lower half and commercial along Dickerson Pike and within the high-density zoning.

-Grundler states he has been a home builder/developer for quarter of a century, and they view the opportunity to work with the residents and the City of Goodlettsville to develop a really nice community and diverse community of homes.

-Espinosa states we have received a lot of great feedback. The emotion is shared by all of us because we all feel that way and this area is right in his front yard, so he understands. Talking about cosmetics we understand that the whole Town of Goodlettsville can't be a single-family ranch home, but we ask that

you take a look of how that will look on that street as a single level or double level and that will be a major consideration.

-Espinosa asked for any additional public comments and no additional comments were received.

-Trew made a motion to close the public comments, seconded by Duncan.

-Duncan states he wants to make a comment before a motion is made. Cooper Creek was a development that the overall land total allowed density to go in a highly focused area. In his opinion it has been very successful, sold very well and one of the nicest new neighborhoods. He is not sure that is the intent of the original verbiage that was put together in that first reading. He does not want to kill the project, but he gets the feeling it is being condensed down to get the easiest product and maybe not the best product.

-Duncan states he will give the motion to defer because he wants the project to be successful but do not want to approve with TVA easement on top of buildings.

-Espinosa thanks Duncan for the comments and motion

-Trew seconded the motion but also wants to say he agrees wholehearted with Mr. Duncan and his assessment

-Espinosa states a motion and seconded to defer item #6. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM#7 Planning and Development Services Staff: Requests an amendment of the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan to change an area designation from residential low density to high density residential for the requested rezoning and preliminary master for properties on Dickerson Road as referenced in Item#6. (Deferred at June 5,2020 Meeting)

Staff Discussion:

-McCormick states Item#7 goes with Item #6 so we will defer. It is a staff item and does not have to be voted on will list them together on the agenda . Comprehensive plan to support the zone change to high density classification to match the proposal.

-Espinosa asked for a motion to defer

-Duncan made the motion to defer, seconded by Hitt. The motion passed unanimously. Whittaker not present at time of vote.

ITEM#8 Long Hollow Pike Access Drive-Development Management Group, LLC: Requests approval for a revised limited access drive connection on Long Hollow Pike for the Publix/Caldwell Square Center. Property referenced as Sumner County Tax Map 143J, Group G Parcel 04.00. Property Zoning: CPUDL, Commercial Planned Unit Development Limited. Property Owner SRK and Sunset Investment Partners (# 06-19)

Item Representative: David Abbey, Development Management Group

Staff Discussion:

The Planning Commission denied the previous request for a limited right-in and right-out driveway onto Long Hollow Pike. The City Commission approved Resolution 19-881 on October 10, 2019 approving the Long Hollow Pike limited access design shown as the dotted red line on the attached drawing. The revised proposal is to shift the drive sixteen (16') feet to avoid moving the existing center pole sign. Staff requested a transportation engineering firm to review the proposal. The engineer recommended

additional signage and lane striping to discourage non designed access. Due to concern with revised location in relation to Ellen Drive, the entrance curb section was amended to increase the radius and center divider dimension to further discourage direct traffic access from Ellen Drive into entrance. The TDOT, Tennessee Department of Transportation will be required to review and permit all driveways on state routes including existing lane signage and striping. Per the applicant, TDOT staff has reviewed the proposed revision and the proposed design does not include any non-compliance issues.

Planning Commission Discussion:

-Abbey states the sixteen (16') ft. pertains to inside the site and getting back to where the existing previous approved plan was and in doing so the island in the middle is larger. Intent was to get as close back along Long Hollow Pk. as it was previously approved to limit the change. TDOT no issues with their requirements. Publix is against moving the sign.

-Hitt asked McCormick on the drawing it points to a sign that says Do Not Enter who is that directed towards

-Abbey states directed towards the North bound on Long Hollow Pike coming from the interstate area. Engineering consultant suggested this is where they put it.

-Espinosa asked McCormick if he has any concerns with the move

-McCormick states in talking with the consultant with where it was before is it making it any easier for someone to come across Long Hollow Pk.

-Parnell states he was not around when Publix was brought into the City, so he is not aware of the parking count for the entire commercial area do you know the answer to that

-McCormick states he thinks the in between was to be shared but the out lots would have their own also

-Parnell states if we do not have to meet a number of parking spaces, he rather not have the eight (8) parking spaces along the front of Long Hollow Pk.

-Abbey states the property line for the parcel to the right of the entry drive coming into the parking spaces already so all the first bay would be on the right-side parcel. The parcel will have their own parking, but the first bay will tie with the parcel to the right.

-Espinosa asked Abbey if TDOT sees no issues with this design change?

-Abbey states no and they worked with TDOT on this the first time as well.

-Duncan states for the record he pushed for this after it failed with the Planning Commission the first time. The Commission specifically asked about that Publix sign because we were going against one of our boards that we have full confidence in. The sign was going to be moved no issue we could leave where it is at. Now two years later it is back on the table. Dishearten considering the relationships he frayed because he pushed this forward, so it is irritating that now it won't work.

-Duncan states he will abstain from the vote.

-Hitt states he would like to speak to Duncan's comments. He was a member that was adamantly opposed to this. He thought it was one of the worst things he saw come down in a long time. His feelings were adamant then and adamant again and would like to see this request denied so the board of Commissioners can carry it forward like they did before. He thinks it was a terrible idea at the time and thinks it is still a terrible idea.

-Espinosa states he was one of those that voted for this back when others voted against it. He appreciates everyone's feedback thus far.

-Trew voted for this and the reason he voted for it was keeping traffic off Loretta was a big plus for him he thought this would do that. Would like to see traffic off Loretta as much as possible but moving this fifteen (15') ft. is not a good idea.

-Espinosa asked McCormick if the driver behind this is the sign?

-McCormick states that is his understanding.

-Bill Sealy owner of parcels states they are sorry for any disruption they have caused in the review/approval of this. The access without drive was terrible for the two (2) out parcels. The initial reason for coming in was to hopefully get the approval of right in and right out. Because of the right in and right out both users they have for the parcels would require that. They have a medical use and a restaurant use under contract. Publix is willing to let them tear down and re-build but obviously they rather not tear down a beautiful sign and move over ten (10') ft. We appreciate the consideration and happy to look at other things and suggestions that engineering might have to make it a better situation.

-Espinosa asked Sealy if the right in and right out was in the original plans?

-Sealy states no.

-Parnell states he appreciates the clarification, and it seems like right now there is an approved plan to put the right in and right out on the premises so really all we are talking about is moving it. From an economic and development standpoint I want to see parcels developed so I think I would have been on the pro side getting this done.

-Parnell asked if this is denied is the sign such a problem at this point it can't be built the way it has been approved?

-Sealy states they can do it and Publix is agreeable, just a matter of getting something as nice and working with it in place rather than moving

-Espinosa states the requests is approval for a revised limited access drive connection on Long Hollow Pk. Option now for a motion to approve as requested, to defer/deny, Duncan will abstain from vote.

-Trew made the motion to deny, seconded by Lynn.

-Voting to deny Lynn, Hitt, Trew, and McNeal.

-Voting no Espinosa and Parnell.

-Duncan abstained and Whittaker not present at time of vote.

-Motion denied.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Fence Ordinance: Staff will be presenting at an upcoming meeting an ordinance amendment to address fencing materials and fencing heights within the front yard of properties. Staff has been asked to review fence material requirements for fences installed in front yards of properties.

Temporary Uses: Staff will be presenting at an upcoming meeting an ordinance amendment to revise temporary use review and approval process regarding which uses require review and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals versus which uses can be reviewed and approval by both Planning and Codes Directors especially temporary uses that are allowed as a single day or two (2) week events.

Billboard: Staff will be presenting at an upcoming meeting a request for a billboard on I-65 south of exit 96.

-Espinosa opened up the public forum. No one requested to speak at the public forum.

-Parnell made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by McNeal.

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

Tony Espinosa, Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant