

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING
GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

June 1, 2026
5:00 p.m.

Goodlettsville City Hall
Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Chairman Scott Trew, Billy Barnfield, Terry Coats, Commissioner Cisco Gilmore, Jeff Parnell, and Mayor Rusty Tinnin.

Absent: Judy Wheeler

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

Trew called the meeting to order, and Commissioner Gilmore offered prayer.

Item #1 Approval of Agenda: Mayor Rusty Tinnin made a motion to approve the agenda, Barnfield seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Item #2 Approval of May 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes: Mayor Rusty Tinnin made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2026 meeting, Commissioner Gilmore seconded the motion. The motion passed.

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

Andy Thorpe - 131 N Wynridge Way

Thorpe stated it is troubling that we have leadership that has a conflict of interest and they express it in these meetings in public. Thorpe stated that he expects better than the minimum and look towards what is the best and provide the best for the citizens. Thorpe discussed roads with a 10% slope being really steep and a poor decision. Thorpe discussed the buffer zone in the stream. Thorpe stated that the Commission is looking to cut corners and provide the benefit for the developers, but not for the citizens. Thorpe stated that he is fed up with it and wants better. Thorpe is opposed to the Ironwood development.

James Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge Lane

James Childress stated that his property abuts where they are going to put a retention pond and removing trees. Childress discussed where they are drawing the property lines and that was not where the property lines were when he moved into the house. Childress discussed the retention pond and worried about erosion and the slope there. Childress expressed concern that the trees along the fence line may fall on his house when they cut them down. Childress asked that they keep some of the trees so he would not have to look at what they are doing over there. Childress is opposed to the Ironwood development.

Andrea Stillwell – 116 Forest Oaks Dr.

Stillwell is opposed to the Ironwood development. Stillwell stated as neighbors they have continued to come before not only this body but the City Commissioners with concerns about the environmental impact, traffic impact, and safety impact. Stillwell stated the plans they share with them do not alleviate those concerns. Stillwell asks that they think twice about the

consideration of the plans and the impact it's going to have on those directly impacted as well as those that live in the community. Stillwell asked they consider denying or deferring the plans so they can continue to have questions answered about what the final plans will be and how the developer will be held accountable on those plans.

Connie Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge Lane

Connie Childress discussed wanting to save the line of trees the developer marked for removal. Childress stated the trees provide privacy, and worth saving for the habitat. Childress stated that no one on either commission has stood up and said can we save it and that's what she is asking them to do.

Sarah Childress – 127 N Maple Ridge Lane

Sarah Childress would like to ask the representative for the Ironwood Development to please take care to preserve wildlife as much as possible when building this neighborhood. Childress discussed a landmark study that found a net loss of over 3 billion birds in North America alone. Childress stated that the land is small, but it hosts dozens of bird species, dozens of mammals, and many, many amphibians and reptiles. Childress believes they are worth protecting to preserve the beauty and biodiversity of the land they live on.

Michael Kelly – 100 S Maple Ridge Lane

Kelly stated that they are not listening to the people. Kelly asked that they hear and think about what they are saying to them. Kelly wants to know how a 10% grade in the Ironwood Development makes sense. Kelly stated they are making choices based on real estate they are involved in and know about. Kelly stated all we ask if for people to pay attention, listen to who puts you in the seats and listen to us.

Trew asked for additional comments and no additional comments were received. Barnfield made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by Coats. The motion passed.

The Public Forum was closed.

AGENDA

Item #4 Community Development Staff: Requests recommendation to the Goodlettsville City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance Sections 14-201(3), 14-208 (1)(b) to define provisions for fence regulations.

Item Representative: Sean Pfalzer, Staff

Staff Discussion:

- This item was deferred at the May 4, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.
- The City's Board of Zoning and Sign Appeals recently reviewed an administrative appeal regarding the fence section of the Zoning Ordinance.
- The appeal was based on the ordinance section limiting solid fences over four (4') feet in the front yard of the property and the percentage of open portions of the fence that would be required to not be considered a solid type of fence.
- A Board of Zoning and Signs Appeals member provided a Zoning Ordinance amendment suggestion to address the open and solid fence ordinance text.

- New revisions from the City Attorney have been incorporated since the May Planning Commission meeting to further clarify definitions of open style and solid style fences and front height requirements for residential districts.
- Staff presented Zoning Ordinance Amendments Sections: Fence Regulations 14-201(3) Definitions and 14-208(1)(b) Fences and Walls.
- Motion Option 1: Recommend approval to the City Commission for the amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to include provisions for fence regulations as presented by staff or with ordinance revisions determined by the Planning Commission. (Staff Recommendation)
- Motion Option 2: Recommend denial to the City Commission to not include provisions for fence regulations section in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Motion Option 3: Defer request to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- City Attorney Freeman discussed adding definitions for the front of the principal building and the face façade or it's designed street address.
- City Attorney Freeman referenced corner lots that may access their street right-of-way off of one street, but the front of the house may face another, if we're considering not allowing four (4') feet above the front façade, that needs to be defined.
- Trew commented eight (8') feet in a residential area seems pretty extreme.
- City Attorney Freeman responded obviously that eight (8') feet in height poses some issues for our first responders if they have to access over the fence with any equipment and or bodies.
- Trew commented this will be a recommendation to the City Commission so, if we do approve this, they would have the ability to change anything in the ordinance.

Motion: Motion by Barnfield to approve with an amendment to change residential from eight (8') feet in height to six (6') feet in height and add the definition of the front of the principal building to be that side of the house facing the street right-of-way which is the 911 address.

- Mayor Tinnin clarified that no eight (8') feet fence at all even in the backyards of residential districts.
- Barnfield responded that's my motion.
- Mayor Tinnin stated I assume the yards that have eight (8') feet fencing would be grandfathered in.
- City Attorney Freeman responded absolutely.
- Commissioner Gilmore asked will we have an understandable definition of the front of the principal building?
- City Attorney Freeman responded defining the front of the house, the height of the fence and from the front façade to the back of the property it's clarified that way as well.

Motion: Motion by Barnfield to approve with an amendment to change residential from eight (8') feet in height to six (6') feet in height and add the definition of the front of the principal building to be that side of the house facing the street right-of-way which is the 911 address., seconded by Commissioner Gilmore. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #5 Ironwood Residential Development, Phillips Builders/Development Management Group, LLC: Requests final master plan approval for sixty-six (66) 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 Representative: David Abby, Development Management Group and Jason Phillips, Phillips Builders

Staff Discussion:

- At the October 6, 2025 meeting, the Planning Commission denied recommendation to the City Commission to annex and rezone the 45.02-acre properties at 4408 Long Hollow Pk.
- At the November 2025 meeting, the City Commission approved on first reading resolutions to approve the plan of services for the proposed annexation of 45.02 acres at 4408 Long Hollow Pk. and a 1,770 feet section of Long Hollow Pk.
- At the December 2025 meeting, the City Commission adopted resolutions to approve the plan of services for the proposed annexation of 45.02 acres at 4408 Long Hollow Pk and a 1,770 feet section of Long Hollow Pk. right of way and roadway.
- At the May 4, 2026 the Planning Commission deferred approval of the Final Master Plan for sixty-six (66) single family dwelling unit lots at 4408 Long Hollow Pike.
- The final master plan meets setback requirements, and exceeds rear setback requirements for lots that abut the Wynridge subdivision and the west side of the property.
- Primary access is from Long Hollow Pk/SR 174 with a proposed turn lane.
- The project design provides gated limited-access emergency drive that connects to Wynridge.
- The project design provides 29% open space, exceeding the 10% requirement.
- The plan identifies tree preservation/removal, street-yard plantings along Long Hollow Pk. and Type 1 buffer plantings using existing trees and supplemental shrubs.
- Outstanding Road Design Issues: Correcting the road plan/profiles for consistency, addressing accessibility items, and cul-de-sac grading tie-ins for emergency vehicles.
- Outstanding Environment, Stream, and Erosion Control Issues: Clarify stream crossing and erosion control measures, any temporary stream crossing, riprap/outlet protection, and erosion protection at Road F.
- Outstanding Drainage and Stormwater Issues: Need to provide full details for the major drainage structures/box culverts, resolve drainage and stormwater design gaps, including detention pond outlet structure details and placement of water quality treatment units.
- Outstanding Utilities Issues: Need details for the sewage pump station, sanitary sewer force main, utility easements across lots including lot 35, sewer profiles, and existing sewer connection detail.
- Staff Stipulation-Complete City's Engineer Consultant plan review comments prior to any project land disturbance permit issuance.
- Staff Stipulation- Obtain TDEC approvals for necessary permits.
- Staff Stipulation- Obtain TDOT approval for the proposed turn lane improvements at Long Hollow Pike.
- Motion Option 1: Approve the final master plan with the defined staff stipulations. (Staff Recommendation)

- Motion Option 2: Deny the final master plan and define the needed plan amendments based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the final master plan does not meet the City's Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance.
- Motion Option 3: Defer the request for the applicant to provide additional requested information as determined by the Planning Commission during the meeting discussion.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Abby discussed the trees along one lot, stating they have already looked at some of the grading and have made some adjustments trying to save some more trees.
- Trew asked if they made a decision regarding the trees near the Maple Ridge cul-de-sac about sixty (60') feet tall will they stay or fall?
- Abby responded they are trying to only remove the trees for the emergency drive connection that go into the cul-de-sac.
- Trew asked if the detention pond near the Maple Ridge cul-de-sac there by necessity?
- Abby responded it is there by necessity and there are several lots going to drain to that location.
- Abby commented they are still completing those designs, but any overflow will be directed toward the stream that's there and not directed anywhere toward theirs.
- Trew asked if the detention pond will be wet always or dry most of the time?
- Abby responded it's going to be dry and considered a dry detention pond.
- Trew asked who will be responsible for maintaining the grass all around the detention pond?
- Abby responded that it would be a part of the HOA as part of the common space.
- Mayor Tinnin stated that citizens are concerned about the 10% grade, can he help them with clarification or a better understanding of what we need to know about that?
- Abby stated they have done what they can to get it down, but there's a lot of topography on the site.
- Commissioner Gilmore asked for clarification on the maximum 10% grade.
- Pfalzer responded the 10% maximum is in the road design specifications for subdivisions but not sure of the history of how long that has been in place.
- Pfalzer responded you would request a variance if you're going to be above that maximum.
- Commissioner Gilmore asked when the deadline for the plans was to be turned into the City for approval?
- Pfalzer responded that the deadline for the submission of these plans was Thursday May 21st and we didn't receive them until Tuesday May 26th.
- Commissioner Gilmore asked if the OHM Engineer that reviewed the plans has any reservations regarding what has been turned in on the plans.
- James Robert from OHM Engineering responded for the purposes of tonight's approval, master plan, the majority of the items have been resolved so we're comfortable with approval of the master plan.
- James Robert from OHM Engineering commented that for engineering, construction grading purposes, there's a lot of smaller detailed items in the plans to be resolved.
- Commissioner Gilmore commented deadlines are in place for the purpose of staff and engineering to have time to review and approve and going forward I do not want future projects not being turned in on time.
- Barnfield asked if they have plans for the access gate and what that will look like?

- Abby responded that they are trying to get an exact design on it, but it will be a Knox box lock.

Motion: Motion by Commissioner Gilmore to defer the request for applicant to provide additional information. Motion failed due to no second.

Motion: Motion by Barnfield to approve the request with stipulations and giving staff the ability to work out minor details, seconded by Parnell. The motion passed five (5) yes votes and one (1) Commissioner Gilmore no vote.

Item #6 Dean Patel: Requests recommendation to the City Commission to rezone the 4.73-acre properties at 622 Rivergate Pkwy, 611 Wade Circle, 645 Wade Circle, 647 Wade Circle referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcels# 02613004300, 02610001300, 02614000400, and 02614000300 from CSL, Commercial Services Limited to RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity Limited Property Owner: Atlas, LLC

Item Representative: Dean Patel, 622 Rivergate Pkwy.

Staff Discussion:

- The request is to rezone the 4.73-acre properties from CSL, Commercial Services Limited to RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity to permit proposed redevelopment of the property as a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, retail, and office uses.
- The proposed rezoning from CSL, Commercial Services Limited to RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan Update that envisions the Rivergate area as a Regional Center that aims to serve a mix of uses, including commercial, retail, and office uses.
- The property at 622 Rivergate Pkwy lies within the Interchange Overlay, the proposed planned unit development district regulations for RC2PUD would set the permitted uses for the property.
- The RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity supports building heights up to seven stories, consistent with the preliminary concepts for the site.
- Motion Option 1; Recommend to the Goodlettsville City Commission approval of the RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity zoning district based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the proposal is in compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. (Staff Recommendation)
- Motion Option 2: Recommend to the Goodlettsville City Commission denial of the RC2PUD, Regional Center Planned Unit Development Low Intensity zoning designation 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 3: Defer the request to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Patel stated they are working hard to re-develop the whole corner property and hoping to open up the Atlas Hotel the front building in the next few weeks.
- Trew asked if the retail building will have rooms on the second floor?

- Patel responded on the front side it will have shops on the top and bottom and back side will be hotel rooms.
- Patel discussed renovations for the small businesses, professional building depending on the needs of the retail business.
- City Attorney Freeman clarified the proposed re-zoning includes the three existing buildings at 622 Rivergate Pkwy, plus the other two (2) parcels Patel owns.
- Patel responded in addition to 622 Rivergate Pkwy, there are three (3) parcels they own, 611 Wade Circle, 645 Wade Circle, and 647 Wade Circle.
- Parnell stated this is a PUD that is being requested so, how does that work if it does not work out with the retail design and wants to revert back to a hotel?
- Pfalzer responded once it goes through the City Commission he would come back with a final master plan for review, approval and changes.
- Trew commented if we change the zoning, the hotel as it stands will be fine and if he decides he can not make the retail work on the existing building facing Wade Circle and wants to revert back to hotel rooms he will be okay with that as well. Is that correct?
- West responded with the PUD it would be similar to what we're currently doing with Rivergate Mall.
- West responded the hotel use is already there so with the PUD zoning it allows the Planning Commission flexibility to review, design and approve or amend the PUD master plan.
- City Manager Ellis asked if the change in zoning would permit the hotel to be used as an apartment at some point?
- West responded they could make that a preliminary and final stipulation to remove that as part of the zoning.
- Mayor Tinnin asked City Attorney Freeman if that is a stipulation they can put on this, so that it can never be apartments?
- City Attorney Freeman responded in these situations we could create a new classification of zoning taking out the apartment usage.
- Commissioner Gilmore confirmed so we would add a stipulation with the motion.
- Parnell stated that he is grateful that Mr. Patel is here and doing what he is doing for the City of Goodlettsville and excited to see the retail part of the building.
- Parnell stated that he did not want the retail part to go away and is confident that he can get those spaces filled and in support of the retail component on the front of the building.
- Patel responded that it is the goal to bring more attention and people to the property.
- Parnell stated so, if I was to make a motion to approve it with the stipulation that the large building in the back stay hotel, the front building is half retail, half hotel, and the proposed commercial building is a five-story building and no apartments shall ever be would you be okay with that motion?
- Patel responded that's exactly what our goal is yes, sir.
- Patel stated that they are calling it the Atlas Hotel and Lofts because of extended stay these people stay weekly, no monthly and they want the ability to terminate their rental agreement anytime.
- Patel stated the goal is boutique hotel front side and lofts.
- Barnfield asked on the five-story building, did he know what the square footage was going to be?
- Patel responded he was guessing around thirty (30') to thirty-five (35') thousand square feet.
- Barnfield asked what is the requirement per square foot for parking?

- City Attorney Freeman responded he did not know the specific number but at a glance if you have a thirty-five (35') thousand square feet I don't think this is going to be enough parking.
- City Attorney Freeman discussed stipulations for parking based on how high and the square footage and stipulations for minimum size of retail space.
- Barnfield asked if they went a minimum size of 600 square footage for retail space would that be okay?
- Patel responded yes that there would be two rooms.
- Barnfield recommended he research the parking requirements as he is looking at building the building.

Motion: Motion by Parnell to approve the request with stipulations the large building staying a hotel, the back building staying a hotel, the front building changing to half hotel in the back, half retail in the front, and the five-story (5) commercial building approved as part of this RC2PUD and no apartments shall ever be on the site.

- Patel commented the building on the back side building #3 are like studios and people stay there from six (6) months to eight (8) months people like a traveling nurse or someone traveling for work.
- City Attorney Freeman confirmed with Patel they are a one (1) week stay it terminates and restarts weekly.
- Patel responded yes, it's a weekly rental and they reserve the right to terminate at any time.

Motion: Motion by Parnell to approve the request for RC2PUD, with stipulations, the large existing hotel building stay a hotel, the back existing hotel building stay a hotel, the front existing hotel building to be split half and half with hotel on the back side and retail on the front, and a five-story (5) proposed commercial building to be added to the site and no apartments shall ever be on this site which is classified as multifamily, seconded by Barnfield. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7 Richards and Southern, Inc./615 Design Group: Request site plan approval for a 4,536 square feet warehouse expansion on 1.59 acres at 114 Lindberg Avenue. The property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 01816004400 and is zoned CG, Commercial General and CSL, Commercial Services Limited. Property Owner: Terry Calonge

Item Representative: Eric Cox, 615 Design Group

Staff Discussion:

- The request is for site plan approval for a warehouse expansion at 114 Lindberg Avenue.
- The proposal is to expand the existing warehouse from 14,925 square feet to 19,461 square feet and provide associated parking, stormwater infrastructure, and landscaping improvements.
- The City is aware of ongoing drainage issue in the vicinity of the Bass and Lindberg intersection, East of N. Main Street in Goodlettsville.
- The proposal replaces some existing concrete parking with a paver system to help improve stormwater performance and reduce runoff impacts from the proposed expansion.

- Staff Stipulation- The exterior of the existing warehouse is predominately metal siding and the proposed minor addition aims to maintain a consistent exterior. The proposal requires a design variance from the design standards of minimum of seventy-five (75%) percent of exterior building materials be brick or stone.
- Motion Option 1: Approve the site plan that meets the City's Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines with the listed staff stipulation including any additional items determined by the Planning Commission. (Staff Recommendation)
- Motion Option 2: Deny the site plan based on the Planning Commission's determination during the meeting that the site plan does not meet the City's Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines and define the items needed to revise the plan to meet the City's Zoning Ordinance and Design Guideline site plan requirements.
- Motion Option 3: Defer the request to include additional information as determined by the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Gilmore asked Cox, was it a total of two (2) houses going to be demolished?
- Cox responded with just one (1) house right next to the site.
- Commissioner Gilmore commented since the existing building does not meet the new comprehensive plan, do we amend the request with the stipulation?
- Pfalzer responded they can approve with the staff stipulation.

Motion: Motion by Commissioner Gilmore to approve the site plan with staff stipulation, seconded by Mayor Tinnin. The motion passed unanimously.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Scott Trew, Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant