

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING
GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

October 6, 2025

Goodlettsville City Hall

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Chairman Scott Trew, Billy Barnfield, Commissioner Cisco Gilmore, Grady McNeal, Jeff Parnell, Mayor Rusty Tinnin, and Judy Wheeler.

Absent: N/A

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

Trew called the meeting to order and offered prayer.

Item #1 Approval of Agenda and Item #3 Public Forum: Trew proposed to the board he would like to introduce separately each agenda item and open and close the Public Forum comments with each agenda item.

Mayor Tinnin made a motion to approve the agenda and public forum platform, Barnfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #2 Approval of September 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes: Barnfield made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2025 meeting, Parnell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA

Trew opened the Public Forum for Item #4.

No one requested to speak.

Item #4 Dry Creek Commons Phase Two (2) Performance Bond Extension. Property Owner: Vastland Eatherley McClung Development, LLC.

Item Representative: Addam McCormick, Staff

Staff Discussion:

- The developer requests to reduce the current bond \$170,500 amount for the 2025-2026 time period due to the remaining cost improvements estimate of \$ 90,000.
- Project Status: Townhouse construction twenty-three (23) of thirty-nine (39) units completed- fifty-nine (59%) percent project construction.
- Master Deed Recording Date: February 22, 2022
- Current Project Bond: \$ 170, 500 - performance bond - October 11, 2025 expiration.
- Remaining Project Improvements: Final asphalt paving/stripping, Landscaping, and Sidewalk sections with remaining unit construction.

- Improvement Cost Estimate: \$ 90,000 estimate.
- Motion Option-Approval for one-year bond extension at current amount of \$ 170,500.
- Motion Option-Approval for one-year bond reduction/extension at \$ 125,000. (Staff Recommendation)
- Motion Option-Approval for one-year bond extension at amount determined by Planning Commission based on information provided during meeting.

Planning Commission Discussion: N/A

Motion: Motion by Mayor Tinnin to approve for one-year bond reduction/extension at \$ 125,000, seconded by Parnell. The motion passed unanimously.

Trew opened the Public Forum for Item #5.

Glen Garrett – 107 Roanoke Dr.

Garrett commented on the redesign and addition of a dormer to the one-story units and thinks aesthetically it looks better. Garrett asked the board to stick with the numbers that have already been approved for the one (1) and two (2) story homes.

Dawn Milanovich – 103 Roanoke Dr.

Milanovich has concerns for parking space if additional bedrooms are added to the units. Milanovich discussed concerns for encroachment of the easement causing her property to have a swamp along her property line and commented on a landscape plan to rectify the encroachment of the easement.

Item #5 Pine Ridge /Hidden Valley Homes: Requests recommendation to the City Commission to amend the one and two (2) story townhouse unit ratio master plan requirement. Project includes 117 townhouse units and commercial outparcel frontage on 20.32 acres on South Dickerson Road/SR 11. Properties are referenced as Davidson County Tax Map 025 Parcels 060, 062, 0218, and 0219 and are zoned HDPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit and CPUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development. Property Owner: ALSL, GP. (8-23) (Deferred at September 8th, 2025 Meeting)

Item Representative: George Grundler, Hidden Valley Homes

Staff Discussion:

- The request was deferred at the September 8, 2025 meeting.
- The project preliminary master plan approved by the Planning Commission at the April 27, 2020 and November 1, 2021 meetings included requirements for a mixture on one (1) and two (2) level townhouse units with the intention for the housing to be possible for older residents.
- The City Commission at the December 9, 2021 meeting approved the project rezoning and preliminary master plan ordinance including a maximum sixty (60%) percent two (2) story units and forty (40%) percent one (1) story units.
- The current project final master plan includes 117 units with forty-seven (47) one (1) story units and seventy (70) two (2) story units.
- The applicant's request is to permit options for the units to be either one (1) or two (2) story units.
- The Planning Commission review is based on the level of proposed buildings alterations proposed and if the proposal would negatively impact the original project and building design approval.
- Motion Option-Recommend to the City Commission to approve the request to permit all units to be either one (1) or two (2) story units per the applicant's request. (Staff Recommendation-due to limited change to existing architectural building designs)

- Motion Option-Recommend to the City Commission to deny the request and maintain the requirement for limitations on the number of one (1) and two (2) story units.
- Motion Option-Defer request to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Grundler discussed the site side elevation, exterior architecture, and increasing the square footage of the homes by adding a second level.
- Grundler discussed the revised plans have no impact on the overall height of the homes.
- Grundler stated the additional impact they had from an architectural standpoint is increase the architectural aesthetic of the windows and full brick elevation.
- Grundler stated they are far below the total allowable parking computation.
- Grundler discussed the opportunity to remove or mitigate the forty (40%) one (1) level units to have the ability to build a better, more marketable and more usable home.
- Commissioner Gilmore questioned Grundler on the original plans what materials did it show on the sides of the unit's brick or siding?
- Grundler responded below the top plate was shown with brick above that area is siding and now they want to take the brick all the way up to the peak of the gable.
- Commissioner Gilmore questioned Grundler if this is not approved would you be willing to keep the sides with brick or would you keep it siding?
- Grundler responded they want to be able to deliver a home with more square footage and did not know the answer to this question until they have received an answer to the request before them.
- Commissioner Gilmore clarified the reason for the request is to add square footage.
- Grundler responded it is to have the flexibility to add square footage because the market for the one (1) level home is less desirable.
- Trew commented he appreciated them addressing the concerns for landscaping in the back and the encroachment issue.
- Parnell being involved in the acquisition and sale of the land discussed the history and original intent of the property when it was sold and not opposed to twenty-five (25%), and commented if adding more bedrooms they will need more parking.
- Parnell commented the City needs the project and needs some one (1) story units.
- Wheeler commented the aesthetics of the revision are much improved from the front, back and sides.

Motion: Motion by Wheeler to recommend to the City Commission to approve the request to permit all units to be either one (1) or two (2) story units per the applicant's request and check for adequate parking, and the space between the existing homes and the new development, seconded by Mayor Tinnin. The vote to approve was three (3), Wheeler, Mayor Tinnin, and Trew, and the no vote was four (4), Barnfield, McNeal, Commissioner Gilmore, and Parnell. The motion failed.

Trew opened the Public Forum for Item #6.

David Elkins – 509 Alta Loma Road

Elkins stated his concern is the zoning change from low density to high density and if they allow high density over into the low-density neighborhood they will have more developers trying to buy somebody out and the next thing will be a bunch of tall skinny houses in the quiet neighborhood. Elkins discussed concerns for the steep property, driveways, and water drainage.

Eric Scott – 519 Alta Loma Road

Scott discussed a natural spring that runs underneath their property and empties out on the proposed drive into the area. Scott’s concern is with the safety of the area in the winter time and how people will get out when it snows. Scott does not think this is the right move for this property.

Tim Boyd – 221 Nathan Drive

Boyd stated that he is one of the original homes in Dry Creek and backs up to the proposed property. Boyd stated that since the property has grown up the drainage hasn’t been bad but if they clear out again, and put asphalt and homes back there the drainage will be ridiculous. Boyd stated over the years they have dumped loads of dirt and does not think the land can be stabilized in that short period of time and do not need additional homes.

Eric Meacham – 127 Draper Drive

Meacham discussed the neighborhood where the original homes were built in the 70’s and they do not want to be surrounded by what East Nashville has become. Meacham discussed the preserved ecosystem and wildlife on the property and hopes they will leave it low density.

Item #6 Dry Creek Cottages Dry Creek Road, Dale and Associates: Requests recommendation to the Goodlettsville City Commission to revise the project master plan to include and rezone an adjacent 1.49 acre property referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel#03304003300- 0 Draper Drive from R-25, Low Density Residential to HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development to alter the existing master plan from fourteen (14) detached one family dwelling units and a two (2) family detached dwelling unit to sixteen (16) one family detached dwelling units. The existing project is located on the 2.34-acre property referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcels# 033040C90000CO0 to 033040C01400CO at 0-120 Old Ryman Way/Dry Creek Road and are zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development. Property Owners: Meridian Capital Group, LLC and O.I.C. Dry Creek Cottages. (9.1 07-04/9.1# 15-17) (Deferred at July 7th 2025 Meeting)

Item Representative: No Representative

Staff Discussion:

- The developer had a conflict come up and requested a deferral.
- Staff informed the developer they have already notified residents of the meeting and the board can decide if they want to move forward with the request or defer.
- The request was deferred at the July 7, 2025 Planning Commission meeting.
- The proposal includes rezoning an adjacent 1.49-acre property and including a revised master plan for both properties for a total of sixteen (16) detached residential units.
- The existing master plan for the front 2.34-acre property includes fourteen (14) one family detached unit and a two (2) unit attached unit for a total of sixteen (16) units.
- The proposed rezoning and revised master plan does not include any additional units or project density.
- The adjacent 1.49-acre property is zoned R-25, Low Density Residential.
- The properties are designated on the City’s Comprehensive Land Use plan as the boundary between high density residential and low-density residential conservation areas.
- The 1.49-acre property does not contain any roadway frontage.
- The previous Dry Creek Cottages property owner purchased the 1.49-acre property in 2020.
- The existing project master plan includes a retaining wall up to twenty (20 ft) in height along the west property boundary.

- The revised project design intention is to reduce the scale of the retaining walls on the property and to incorporate more valuable residences for sale.
- The properties include a non-improved TVA easement on the properties that limits the full use of the properties.
- The project design includes private development improvements.
- The revised proposal is to maintain the existing number of residential units but spread the units over both the 2.34-acre and 1.49-acre properties.
- The rezoning proposal is for four (4) units on 1.49 acres at 2.68 units per acre.
- The current high-density moratorium is for three (3) or more units per acre.
- The revised plan includes a drive crossing the drainage area between the properties.
- Currently the approved plans and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) site permit does not include the drive crossing.
- If the rezoning and preliminary master plan are approved, then revised engineering plans would be required including also a revised TDEC permit and review of any regulated storm water buffer.
- The drainage culvert under the drive crossing the drainage area would be required to be sized to permit a 100-year design frequency storm water flow through the drainage culvert and include buffers at a minimum two (2X) times the width of the drainage area.
- The Tennessee Department of Environment (TDEC) and Conservation National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit was issued May 2019 and is valid until September 2026.
- The property does not include any defined flood hazards per the area Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).
- Staff Stipulation-Prior to review by the Goodlettsville City Commission, revised building plans including a one car garage meeting the Zoning Ordinance minimum one car garage dimensions of twelve (12') x twenty-two (22') feet and exterior building materials including a minimum fifty (50%) percent brick and/or stone on all building sides.
- Staff Stipulation-If the request is approved, the revised final master plan review by the Planning Commission will include a revised storm water quality and quantity design and storm water buffer as determined with the TDEC review of the drainage area proposed drive crossing.
- Motion Option-Recommend to the City Commission to approve the 1.49-acre property rezoning and revised preliminary master plan including staff stipulations based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the proposal is in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
- Motion Option-Recommend to the City Commission to deny the request based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the rezoning of the 1.49-acre property and revised master plan are not in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
- Motion Option-Defer the request (Applicant's Request) to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission. (Staff Recommendation)

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Trew, recommend they discuss the request as if the developer was there.
- Parnell discussed the site plans calculations showing elevations for one (1) car and two (2) car garage.
- McCormick responded the garage does not meet the minimum requirement for parking and revised plan includes multiple parking spaces- that was an issue discussed by developer.
- City Manager Ellis commented he would like the board to consider this is the third time the residents

have come in to express their concern and there's no one here to present the request.

-Barnfield asked what was originally approved a two (2) car or one (1) car garage?

-McCormick responded he would have to go back and look that he did not think they were garages originally.

-McCormick discussed the revised project design intention is to reduce the scale of the retaining walls on

the property and to incorporate bigger units.

-Trew questioned if it is denied it goes back to the original plans, correct?

-McCormick responded yes and if a City Commissioner agrees, they can take it to the City Commission without the recommendation from the Planning Commission.

-Trew commented he did not like the idea of changing to high density.

-McCormick responded the reason for high density it is consistent with the zoning out front and spread the 16 units out for larger homes.

Motion: Motion by Commissioner Gilmore to deny the request, seconded by Barnfield. The motion passed unanimously.

Trew opened the Public Forum for Item #7 and #8.

Kay Lamberson – 108 S. Wynridge Way

Lamberson discussed ethics regarding the proposal. Lamberson commented it is legal for the City of Goodlettsville to annex into Sumner County but she would like for them to think about is it ethically right.

Marcus Rowe – 4330 Long Hollow Pike

Rowe discussed the annexation process and stated the County Planning Commission would like to be part of the annexation conversation. Rowe read the first paragraph of the annexation resolution and therefore, it should be under the guidelines of County development. Rowe has concerns for traffic and damage to homes from blasting in the area.

Sarah Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge

Childress commented she is in opposition of this development. Childress stated it has been nine months and having circled around to the same point of contention with the same prospective view of brick and siding. Childress stated she is here because she cares about the community and wants to see it thrive and because she will dearly miss the peace and tranquility of green space when it's gone. Childress discussed as a biologist, she knows what happens when ecosystems are paved over. Childress asked that they consider if they are serving the needs of the community, whether the construction will enrich Goodlettsville in any way but monetarily.

Connie Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge

Childress stated they made Goodlettsville their home over 30 years because of the small town feel and open spaces. Childress discussed continual new development for the community and gaining more traffic, more congestion, more noise, more asphalt, more concrete, more houses, more environmental damage, and more wildlife habitat destruction. Childress discussed what they lose, privacy, peace, quiet, open spaces, wildlife and small-town feel. Childress stated that for some of them seeing sunrise is more important than seeing vinyl siding and brick walls.

James Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge

Childress discussed the timing of the meeting occurring during the fall break and many community members have expressed concerns and not able to attend due to vacations. Childress discussed the results of the citizens City survey. Childress discussed the loss of small-town community, overdevelopment, and natural habitat destruction. Childress discussed the traffic issues and developments proposals for low density and then petitioning for higher density. Childress stated they are downstream from the proposed development that would create a significant loss of rainfall absorption. Childress stated the concerns brought up before have not been addressed and ask they seriously consider all the issues before rubber stamping this and other projects impacting this community.

Justin Wilson – 608 Fall Creek Cr.

Wilson discussed the City survey results showing the citizens do not want more subdivisions, more condos, or single-family homes. Wilson stated once this occurs there's no taking it back and he does not think the annexation should be done. Wilson ended his comments with the vision statement of Goodlettsville and asked is this neighborhood actually enhancing the quality of life for Goodlettsville itself or is it something else?

Wallace Ralph – 4403 Long Hollow Pike

Ralph stated this is the third time he has stood before this body in opposition to this project. Ralph stated he is sympathetic to some of the other speakers concerns specifically the environmental concerns, overcrowding of the schools, and traffic. Ralph stated he has no issue with the seller's right to sell the property and he does not oppose growth. Ralph discussed the original project plans to build 112 units on 45 acres, next submitted for 91 units, not approved and now down to 69 units a reduction in density. Ralph stated as a County resident looking inside to the City he sees nothing but a loss because if they approve this project he can look out his front door and see Goodlettsville City Services delivered where he has none.

Jeremy Billingsley – 121 N Maple Ridge Ln.

Billingsley stated they moved from Hendersonville to Goodlettsville because of the small-town feel. Billingsley discussed the traffic issues now coming from Gallatin, Hendersonville, and Portland down Long Hollow Pike.

Steve Peak – 4404 Long Hollow Pike

Peak stated he and his wife have more to lose because they have 2,000 feet adjoining this property. Peak stated he is not against Phillips builders and thinks they will build a good house. Peak has an issue with the density of the project. Peak stated if they cannot build with 45 houses, then it should not be built.

Chris Reid – 119 N Maple Ridge Ln.

Reid discussed participating and investing their time in City surveys and planning sessions because they care deeply about the City of Goodlettsville's future. Reid discussed concerns for infrastructure, school capacity, and waste water systems. Reid discussed the housing market and is advocating for strategic thoughtful planning rather than annexation.

Cory Spano – 117 N Maple Ridge Ln.

Spano stated this is the third time he has been here and on behalf of many community members who are not able to be here it's abundantly clear they are firmly in opposition of the annexation and development. Spano commented the Commission should focus on the City core and the development of commercial growth in areas for revitalization and not focus on annexing rural areas for development. Spano asked that they deny this and allow the will of the people to be made.

Item #7 Ironwood Residential Development, Phillips Builders/Development Management Group, LLC:

Requests recommendation to the Goodlettsville City Commission to annex and rezone the 45.02-acre properties at 4408 Long Hollow Pike from Sumner County RR, Rural Residential to LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit and preliminary master plan approval for sixty-nine (69) one family detached dwelling unit lots. The properties are referenced as Sumner County Tax Map 140 Parcels 124 and 124.01. Property Owner: William B Ralph JR Trustee (15-24)

Item #8 Ironwood Residential Development, Phillips Builders/Development Management Group, LLC:

Request recommendation to the Goodlettsville City Commission to approve the plan of services for the proposed annexation of 45.02 acres at 4408 Long Hollow Pike and a 1,770 feet section of Long Hollow Pike right of way. The properties are referenced as Sumner County Tax Map 140 Parcels 124 and 124.01. Property Owner: William B Ralph JR Trustee.

Staff Discussion:

- The proposal is a requested annexation.
- The properties are located within the City of Goodlettsville Sumner County Urban Growth Boundary and are contiguous to the City limits.
- The City will also be reviewing an extension of the City limits 1,770 feet along the Long Hollow Pike right of way to include the property frontage.
- The plan of service process is required by state law to define the extension of City services to the property and the proposed timing.
- If the annexation request is approved, City services for the existing residence on the property including police, fire, trash, planning and code services, and park and recreation resident services and rates would be effective at the approval date of the annexation.
- Since the proposed annexation is for a proposed development, the developer with an approved project is required to extend utility services (water, sewer, electric) and complete required Long Hollow Pike improvements required per the TDOT, Tennessee Department of Transportation requirements.
- The Planning Commission at the September 9, 2024 meeting deferred the proposal for 112 one family detached dwelling (house) lots (2.4 units per acre) to the January 2025 meeting.
- The Planning Commission at the January 6, 2025 meeting recommended denial of the revised project master plan including 91 lots (2.02 units per acre).
- The original proposal was a MDRPUD, Medium Density Residential Planned Unit Development rezoning request.
- The revised proposal is a LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development rezoning request with sixty-nine (69) one family detached dwelling lots (1.53 units per acre).
- The annexation process also requires a property rezoning to designate the property a Goodlettsville zoning district.
- The City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates the area as Residential Development Low Density.
- The proposal is for 1.53 units per acre which is consistent with the Low-Density designation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan within the one to two (2) units per acre range.

- The plan defines low medium density at three (3) to four (4) units per acre.
- The Comprehensive Plan also defines reviewing project design including lot sizes based on adjacent lot areas.
- The revised master plan proposal includes larger lots at ninety (90') and one hundred (100') feet lot widths per the previous Planning Commission project review discussions.
- The previous proposal included lot sizes initially ranging from fifty-five (55') / seventy-three (73') feet and the January 2025 revised proposal included eighty-five (85') / ninety (90') feet lot widths.
- The adjacent Wynridge Development is zoned LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and the Copper Creek Development is zoned both LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and MDRPUD, Medium Density Residential Planned Unit Development.
- Per the City's Zoning Ordinance, the revised proposal including sixty-nine (69) lots is less than the City's defined requirement for a traffic study with residential projects exceeding seventy-five (75+) lots.
- The Long Hollow Pike improvements shown on the preliminary master plan proposal are based on a discussion with TDOT staff at the time of the initial 112 lot development proposal.
- Staff anticipates TDOT to maintain the Long Hollow Pike turn lane improvements requirements previously discussed with the revised proposal of sixty-nine (69) lots.
- Staff received a water service utility commitment letter from the White House Utility District (WHUD) including required water main improvements required by the project developer.
- The City's Sewer Department is currently reviewing the proposal regarding main extension and connection requirements to be completed by the project developer.
- The revised project design does not include a roadway connection to the N. Maple Ridge Lane public road right of way.
- The roadway connection is not shown on the revised project proposal due to the comments the developer received about concerns with the roadway connection.
- The City's adopted Fire Code requires a second point of access for the proposed number of lots.
- City staff requests for emergency services reasons that a gated connection limited access drive with a minimum twelve (12') feet width be installed within a dedicated twenty (20') feet access easement.
- Annexation/Plan of Services:
 - Staff Stipulation-City of Goodlettsville Sewer service letter to be obtained prior to the City Commission final review of rezoning and preliminary master plan.
 - Staff Stipulation-Limited emergency gated connection to N. Maple Ridge Lane public road right of way for emergency services as defined above.
- Motion Option-Recommend to the Goodlettsville City Commission approval of the LRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development rezoning and revised preliminary master plan including the staff stipulations based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the proposal is in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. (Staff Recommendation)
- Motion Option-Recommend to the Goodlettsville City Commission denial of the LDRPUD, Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development rezoning and revised preliminary master plan based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the proposal is not in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- Motion Option-Defer the request to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission.
- Trew restated what the board would be voting on the annexation, rezone and plan of services.

Item Representative: David Abby, Development Management Group and Jason Phillips, Phillips Builders

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Abby stated with sixty-nine (69) units this is roughly one and half unit per acre.
- Abby discussed the lot sizes being in range with Wynridge.
- Abby discussed the exterior boundaries with a thirty-five (35) foot undisturbed buffer.
- Abby discussed the back amenity area, and open space.
- Abby discussed the secondary access emergency connection- pervious type connection similar to what they have done for other projects.
- Abby discussed the parallel road to Long Hollow Pk frontage road and houses not backing up to Long Hollow Pike.
- Abby discussed the concerns for drainage and design will be required
- Abby discussed the left turn in off Long Hollow Pk.
- Trew asked McCormick where the emergency access/gate road would be.
- McCormick responded at the end of North Maple where the road is built to the property line.
- City Manager Ellis discussed the emergency access requirement under the International Fire Code.
- Parnell discussed the two cul-de-sacs going off the North side on the plans.
- Parnell discussed citizen comments and concerns from the last meeting were plans not matching Wynridge, density higher, lots smaller and houses not as nice.
- Parnell discussed the new plans addressing the concerns and feels like the requests that have been made have been met.
- Parnell discussed the process for annexing property.
- McCormick clarified the motion options as the board can choose to do one (1) motion if they want to include both agenda items or vote on them separately.
- Trew confirmed if this is approved it will go to the City Commission, and if it is denied it can still go to the City Commission.
- McCormick explained the process if it is denied by the Planning Commission.
- Trew asked for a motion to recommend, deny, or defer for annexation and rezoning of this property to low density.

Motion: Motion by Barnfield to deny the request, seconded by McNeal.

- Commissioner Gilmore commented he agrees with Parnell the neighborhood that is proposed is definitely equivalent as far as homes with Wynridge. Commissioner Gilmore discussed the lot size in the comprehensive plan coming up and the urban growth plan. Commissioner Gilmore shared his concerns with Mr. Phillips and what the people of the City wanted and he is a voice for the citizens.
- Commissioner Gilmore commented he did not know the vision for annexations in the future and one day we will probably see this area developed but at this time he did not think they're ready for that.
- Phillips discussed the price point of the proposed homes and believes they are the right applicant and the homes will increase property values in neighboring communities.

The vote to deny was three (3), Barnfield, McNeal, Commissioner Gilmore, and the no vote was four (4), Trew, Mayor Tinnin, Parnell and Wheeler. The motion failed.

- Wheeler discussed a different motion since Sumner County Schools are on Fall break and a number of people are not present that would have been to speak.

Motion: Motion by Wheeler to defer for one (1) month. Motion failed due to no second.

Motion: Motion by Parnell to approve the request for annexation and rezoning as long as the right-of-way is provided to the North property lines of the project, seconded by Commissioner Gilmore.

- Parnell commented land that is encompassed in the City limits is used to the highest and best use possible for that land because that adds value and grows economically.
- Parnell commented this area should be a residential area and discussed lot sizes, infrastructure, roads and the cost to maintain subdivisions with an acre lot vs smaller lots.
- Parnell commented economically it is beneficial for them to do everything they can to make sure every piece of property in the City limits of Goodlettsville is used to its highest and best use and what is being proposed is exactly that and reasonable.

The vote to approve was three (3), Trew, Mayor Tinnin, and Parnell, and the no vote was four (4), Barnfield, Commissioner Gilmore, McNeal, and Wheeler. The motion failed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

-Long Hollow Pike/Willis Branch Road- Horse Stables/Events- Conceptual Proposal-

Staff received a request for the 27.4-acre properties at the corner of Long Hollow Pike and Willis Branch Road. The properties are zoned R-40, Low Density Residential. The request is to use the property (in addition to existing homes) for a commercial horse stable and special events. The request would require a Zoning Ordinance amendment to permit the requested uses in a residential zoning district.

Mayor Tinnin stated the representative had an emergency and ask if they could defer the conservation until next month.

Jim Hitt – 723 Long Hollow Pike

Hitt stated he did not think this is a good idea for this piece of property and he stated the reasons for that in the letter he sent to all of them.

Long Hollow Pike/Willis Branch Road-Horse Stables/Event deferred for one month.

-Comprehensive Plan Amendment- Survey Results-

Sean Pfalzer presented a summary of the Comprehensive Plan, Community Engagement survey comments.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm.

Scott Trew, Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant