

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING

GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

August 30, 2021

Goodlettsville City Hall

5:00 p.m.

Massie Chambers-Auditorium

Present: Chairman Tony Espinosa, Vice Chairman Scott Trew, Jeff Duncan, Jim Hitt, Grady McNeal, Jeff Parnell, Judy Wheeler

Absent: Mayor Rusty Tinnin, Bob Whittaker

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

Espinosa called the meeting to order and read a scripture verse from the Psalm of David.

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

Item #2 Approval of August 2, 2021 Meeting Minutes: Trew made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 2, 2021 meeting, Hitt seconded the motion. Espinosa and Wheeler abstained since both were absent at meeting. Motion passed.

Ellis discussed concern with the minutes passing due to members abstaining.

Duncan made a motion to defer the minutes of the August 2, 2021 to next meeting, Hitt seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA

Item #3 Parkview Preserve 2- Insight Properties LLC: Performance Bond Extension

Item Representative: N/A

Staff Discussion:

- Project Status: Forty-one (41) of eighty-five (85) residential single family and townhouse lots currently completed. Forty-eight (48%) percent lot completion. Fourteen (14) additional townhouse units under construction.
- Subdivision Plat Information: Parkview Preserve Phase Two (2) recorded November 12, 2019
- Subdivision Roadways: Public: French Street section, Private: Exmoor Drive, Killarney Park section, and Wicklow Drive section
- Subdivision Bond Information: Performance Bond \$ 315,000-October 15, 2021 Expiration
- Remaining Improvements:
 - Any applicable concrete curb and asphalt binder surface repairs due to construction
 - Asphalt surface and pavement markings
 - Landscaping
 - Sidewalk sections
 - Storm water finish grading and detention pond final stabilization
- Remaining Improvement Cost Estimate: \$ 250,000
- Recommend approval of reduction and one-year bond extension and reduction at \$ 300,000.

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

Item #4 Rivergate Shell Building/Community Solutions by Design, LLC: Requests site plan approval for a 3,055 sq. ft. commercial center on 0.44 acres at 120 Rivergate Parkway and Donald Ave. Property referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02605014200 and is zoned CSL, Commercial Services Limited and CCO, Commercial Core Overlay. Property Owner: Rafee & Fatimah Syed (#5-21) (*Deferred at August 2nd Meeting*)

Item Representative: Jamarvis Boykin, Community Solutions by Design, LLC.

Staff Discussion:

- The project area includes an additional property on Rivergate Parkway being added to the previous property to provide a larger site for improved site design.
- The proposal includes an access point on Rivergate Parkway that is limited to a right-in and right-out only design with the center median in the area. The site plan also includes an access on Donald Ave.
- The site design includes a pervious concrete paving system.
- The site plan includes a proposal to maintain the existing sidewalk along Rivergate Parkway. The project is within the City's CCO, Commercial Overlay which requires an eight (8') feet sidewalk along new and existing projects and in this case would include both the Rivergate Parkway and Donald Ave frontages. An existing five (5') feet sidewalk is along the Rivergate Parkway frontage.
- The property is adjacent to a R-10 residential zoning district.
- The City's Zoning Ordinance includes a transitional buffer yard to be used within the CCO, Commercial Core Overlay district. The transitional buffer requires a solid wall within a minimum ten (10') feet landscape buffer.
- The adjacent residential property owner recently installed a wood fence along the property line.
- The proposed buffer design does not include a solid wall due to the adjacent solid fence.
- The design includes a building emergency exit sidewalk with small retaining wall within the ten (10') feet buffer area.
- Planning Commission to discuss the buffer yard design including if a design with two (2) solid fence/walls in the defined area would be preferred to a multi-layered evergreen screen design.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Duncan asked McCormick if the board needed to discuss the handicap ramp.
- McCormick states the handicap ramp is there but does not meet ADA requirements.
- McNeal questions McCormick about the interior restroom area and if the one-hour fire separation includes the doors.
- McNeal asked if the next-door property owner has trouble with his fence how will he repair if there is landscaping.
- McCormick explains the interior layout and the door openings would be rated as required by building code. The landscaping will be a problem another option would be a solid fence, but long term will be issues.
- Trew asked McCormick how close the landscaping is to the existing fence

- McCormick explains the property line landscape, solid fence area and maintaining the area.
- Boykin discussed the issues with building a brick wall three (3') ft. from the existing fence and having two (2') ft. of landscaping
- McCormick discussed the option of a solid fence on the boundary line with the gap maintained by the property owners.
- Espinosa asked for this agenda item will this impact the recommended stipulations.
- McCormick states no that it will be part of the Planning Commission's recommendation what type of landscaping will be appropriate.
- Trew discussed McCormick talking with the property owner and getting their feedback regarding landscaping or fence
- McCormick states he will talk with the property owner and report back at the October meeting.
- Parnell asked McCormick to explain why the number of parking spaces.
- McCormick explained the recommendation of parking spaces for a small site and employees with certain uses can take up a majority of parking spaces
- Hitt discussed issues with a fence and property owners not maintaining the area
- Espinosa asked McCormick what the recommendation is for a five (5') ft. gap?
- Trew discussed if no landscaping the property owner will see the upper part of the building and with landscaping the view would be obstructed and be more appealing.

Motion: Motion by Wheeler to approve the request with stipulations one (1) and two (2) (sidewalk) and defer stipulation three (3) (landscape design) until October, seconded by Trew. Motion passed unanimously.

Item #5 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) (*Deferred at July 12th Meeting*)

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

Espinosa-made a recommendation to follow the guidelines of the Planning Commission regarding Public Forum speakers.

Trew made a motion to allow speaking for agenda Item #5, seconded by McNeal. The motion passed.

Staff Discussion:

- The Planning Commission at the April 27, 2020 meeting approved the rezoning recommendation to the City Commission with the list of project design guidelines.
- The City Commission at the July 23, 2020 meeting approved the rezoning ordinance on first reading only with the 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.

- Staff discussed the City Commission guidelines.
- The project proposal includes two (2) story townhouse designs to include more square footage for the units versus a mixture of one-story designs.
- Unit cluster design to preserve 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
- The project representative discussed at the July meeting the intention for individual for-sale units. If the preliminary master plan is approved, the restrictive covenants submitted at the final master plan stage will need to include this statement.
- The project design includes a public exterior loop street with multiple small private drives for the residential unit connections.
- The revised design includes the loop street with designated parking.
- The revised design has been reviewed and agreed upon by the City's Fire Marshal.
- The revised design includes a wider entrance roadway section to accommodate a three (3) lane entrance section for the possible use of multiple emergency vehicles.
- 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
- Revised building design information including increase the garage dimensions. The City Commission at the August 26, 2021 meeting approved the garage dimension amendment on first reading.
- Staff would recommend approval with following stipulations being included on the preliminary master plan submitted for City Commission review:
 - Stipulation-revised building design information including increase the garage dimensions and exterior elevations reflecting City's Design Guideline requirements and Planning Commission's determination on revised design including all two (2) story units versus a mixture of one and two (2) story units per original guidelines
 - Stipulation-revised master plan defining the permitted commercial uses listed above for the commercial area at the front of the site
 - Stipulation-restrictive covenants submitted with final master plan to include statement of for-sale units.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Cleveland states TVA denied the release of TVA easement due to population growth
- Cleveland discussed the looped street design, the wider entrance roadway, and garage dimensions.
- Grundler discussed the traffic flow study and parking areas
- Espinosa asked applicant to share his opinion of one (1) level versus two (2) level unit
- Grundler discussed based on the market today the limitations of the one (1) level versus two (2) level units
- Glen Garrett discussed concern with seven (7) units per acre for the 19.2 acre for a total of 133 units and the units to the North that are adjacent to other property owners.
- Glen Garrett states he is not opposed to land being developed but if this is the last project design, he requests the Commission not approve this development.

- Cleveland discussed the properties cluster design regarding the acreage concern and the requirements for a mixture of green space
- Grundler discussed the fifty (50') ft. conservation easement along the Northern edge to preserve a natural boundary
- Hitt asked for explanation on the size of the units
- Espinosa asked for the footprint square footage
- McCormick states according to the plans for units A with one (1) car garage square footage is 1920 and units B with two (2) car garage square footage is 2304
- Trew asked applicant if there is a buffer where the commercial property will be located
- Grundler and Cleveland discussed the plans for storm water management and landscaping buffer in accordance with City guidelines for commercial to residential area
- Trew discussed concerns that if the City officials determined this should be a one-story (1) vs two-story (2) mixed use units would this be feasible
- Cleveland explained the previous project concept was with a developer considering the property as a one (1) and two (2) story product for senior living. That developer left. Based on market rate structure and residential this is now the proposal.
- Hitt asked McCormick to explain "Limitation on density"
- McCormick explains the planning commission has the ability to recommend limiting the density to blend in with the adjacent property.
- Espinosa discussed the challenges with the "scrunching" of the project, the design of the one (1) and two (2) story units cosmetically respecting the area.
- Espinosa asked McCormick to explain staff recommendation stipulation number one.
- McCormick discussed the City Commission Ordinance 20-974 (1st reading approved)
- McCormick discussed the intent and limitations with the site layout, looped street design, and the fifty (50') feet easement along the North side of the property.
- Espinosa states he struggles with the "scrunching" together and does it really work for this area
- Parnell states he will be abstaining from the vote but would like to comment on the project.
- Parnell shared his perspective on the best use of area in front of property being commercial, the distance between the commercial area and the residential area, the open space along the North and South side, and thirty (30') feet between units. Discussed the property along the South side being an apartment complex with higher density than this proposal.
- Cleveland discussed the best use of the front section for commercial property, the building design for master bedroom to be on base floor of unit for senior living with no stairs.
- Espinosa thanked everyone for their comments and asked McCormick if he had additional comments to share
- McCormick discussed the City's Comprehensive Land amendment, agrees the front section be designated commercial development and Planning Commission can review reducing the density.
- Trew asked McCormick if the landscaping buffer was adequate for adjacent property
- McCormick discussed the fifty (50') feet property acquisition conservation easement along the Northern edge to preserve a natural boundary with the single-family properties to the North
- McCormick discussed the Planning Commission design guidelines and the City Commission project guidelines
- Duncan discussed concern with the density calculation of the 19-acre property including residential and commercial.

- Duncan states this is a transition piece of property due to high density to the South and medium density to the North.
- Hitt expressed concerns with the distance between the units and the adjacent property owners also the calculation of the 19-acre
- Parnell explains the fifty (50') feet natural boundary distance between the units and property owners.
- Duncan states he is undecided about the property and suggest they defer and continue to work with the developer to satisfy the board
- Cleveland discussed the zoning and commercial square foot area
- McCormick asked if the item is deferred what do they think about that being commercial because if they do not approve that would be an area for the residential units also.
- Espinosa asked Mary Laine Hucks for her thoughts on the area for commercial development
- Mary Laine Hucks discussed traffic flow for the area and best possible options for developing the property
- Parnell stated from a real estate perspective more difficult to sale 19-acre as commercial but once it is developed the commercial out-lot parcel will sale
- Ellis discussed the possibility of not having enough votes with the member abstaining from voting and recommends deferral
- Espinosa states he knows something needs to be done and understands a lot has been put into this project so deferring would encourage further discussion

Motion: Hitt made the motion to defer the request, seconded by Wheeler. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #6 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#5. (*Deferred at July 12th Meeting*)

Motion: Duncan made the motion to defer, seconded by Hitt. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #7 Associated Wholesale Grocers, LLC/ Complete Signs: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the I-65 @ Long Hollow Pike Interstate Sign Zone Map to include a section of the twenty-seven (27) acre property at 500 S. Cartwright Street referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02600008600.

Item Representative: Blake Sheppard, Complete Signs

Staff Discussion:

- The request is to expand the Long Hollow Pike exit ninety-seven (97) Interstate Sign Zone Map to include a section of the Associated Wholesale Grocers Site to permit a sixty (60') feet height/ 170 square feet digital sign for promoting the company and employment opportunities.
- The proposed sign dimensions meet the Zoning Ordinance Interstate Sign Zone requirements.
- The proposed sign location is within one hundred feet on the I-65 interstate right-of-way.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Sheppard discussed expanding the interchange within the sign zone

- Duncan stated that most signs are service related, or travel related, how will this sign be used?
- Sheppard explains use will be advertising employment and product opportunities.

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

Item #8 Bojangles/ACES, Arnold Consulting Engineering Services: Request site plan approval for a 2,362 sq. ft. restaurant on the 1.19-acre property at the corner of Long Hollow Pike and Caldwell Drive. Property referenced as Sumner County Tax Map/Parcel# 143JG00402000 and is zoned CPUDL, Commercial Planned Unit Development Limited. (#10-21) Property Owners: SRK and Sunset Investments Partnership

Item Representative: Jonathan Cochrane and Arron Arnold, Arnold Consulting

Staff Discussion:

- The Planning Commission with the original Caldwell Square-Publix Center required brick veneer finish materials to be used for the entire complex. The Publix store building and two (2) shopping centers are consistent brick material, colors and building awning designs. The project is proposed to be constructed primarily of brick with a section of metal wall panel and EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish System).
- The proposal is to provide a separate design for the restaurant building.
- Staff has requested material colors to be submitted to provide a connection to the existing building designs. Due to the size, location, and use of the out-lot buildings, staff recommends a design that provides a type of connection with the exiting building designs but also ensure a separate design from the other buildings.
- The original master plan included the storm water quantity design connecting into the center drainage system behind the Publix store building. The front area including the existing parking areas in the area of the out-lots are draining directly into the Long Hollow Pike- TDOT (Tennessee Department of Transportation) roadway drainage pipe system which drains to Manskers Creek. Staff has requested individual site water quality and quantity design due to the out-lot area direct connection to the Long Hollow Pike drainage system.
- Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:
 - Provide building material colors to determine a design connection with the center design but still provide an individual design with colors and materials
 - Revised building plans to meet original intentions. The EIFS design meets the City's Design Standards but not the intention of the original Planning Commission approval
 - Revised landscape plan to include landscape screen in addition to brick wall around the dumpster enclosure
 - Provide storm water quality and quantity facility and support calculation design per the City's Storm Water Ordinance requirements and engineer consultant review comments
 - Provide additional details for sidewalk connection from building entrance to the Long Hollow Pike sidewalk including elevations and ramps at drive

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Cochrane discussed the preference of one brick color

- Trew states a good idea to be different from the other buildings as long as it is not too drastic, but he has concerns about the landscaping along Long Hollow Pike
- Parnell asked if they are approving the sign
- McCormick states the sign is next agenda item.
- Duncan asked if the dumpster enclosure is in the middle of parking lot?
- McCormick states across the lot which is adjacent to a drive aisle and the location relocate due to a man-hole issue
- Duncan discussed the location of the dumpster and the adjacent business with the new right-in, right-out
- McNeal asked if there is a conflict between people and cars with the drive-in set up?
- McCormick discussed the ADA parking access, sidewalks, and striping.
- Espinosa asked McCormick if the stipulation regarding building materials need to be designated and defined?
- McCormick discussed the staff recommended stipulations regarding metal wall panel and brick.

Motion: Trew made the motion to approve the request with stipulation's #1,#3,#4 and #5, referenced in meeting seconded by McNeal. The motion passed unanimously.

Item #9 Masstar Signs: Request revision to the Caldwell Square/Publix Center Final Master Plan regarding signage design for the Bojangles Restaurant at the corner of Long Hollow Pike and Caldwell Drive. Property referenced as Sumner County Tax Map/Parcel# 143JG00402000 and is zoned CPUDL, Commercial Planned Unit Development Limited.

Item Representative: Jeanette Rader, Masstar Signs

Staff Discussion:

- The Planning Commission approved the original signage plan for the Caldwell Square/Publix Center including ground type signs for the out-lots.
- The signage request is to elevate the sign to be visible from behind the decorative entry wall feature at the corner of Long Hollow Pike and Caldwell Square.
- The sign would be a similar design as the Walgreen's sign across Long Hollow Pike.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Rader discussed the maximum fifty (50') square feet of sign, the visibility of sign behind the entry wall and the design to be beautiful on all sides.
- Espinosa asked McCormick what are they approving?
- McCormick states ground type sign, location, and height
- Parnell discussed concern with the entrance and exit signs, and the location of the Bojangles sign behind the brick wall and if sign could be relocated to front Long Hollow Pike beside the corner area.
- Rader discussed the issue with sign visibility next to the Publix sign and the visibility of the corner intersection above the brick wall
- Parnell discussed the Caldwell Square/Publix Center sign and future development adding to the sign
- McCormick discussed the signage for the out-lots

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

Item #10 Zoning Ordinance Amendment-Planning Staff: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 14-101. Provisions Creation and Membership to reduce the number of Planning Commission members from eleven (11) to nine (9).

Staff Discussion:

- Due to recent Planning Commission membership changes and possible quorum issues, the amendment will reduce the number of Planning Commission members from eleven (11) to nine (9) members.
- Staff presented the Zoning Ordinance Amendment Section 14-101 amendment additions.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Duncan discussed the designation of “regional” and no control outside of City limits
- Ellis explained the request to reduce the number of Planning Commission members

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

Item #11 Zoning Ordinance Amendment-Planning Staff: Request recommendation to the City Commission to amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 14-205 (3)(ii)(F) Residential District Regulations to permit the extension of a single-family dwelling unit on a property in an accessory building in the R-7, High Density Residential and R-10, Medium Density Residential zoning districts.

Item Representative: N/A

Staff Discussion:

- A property owner contacted staff about remodeling an existing accessory building in a R10, Medium Density Residential zoning district for residential use for visiting family members.
- Staff discussed the City’s Zoning Ordinance does not permit accessory buildings to be used for a dwelling unit with living space.
- Accessory buildings can be used for non-commercial uses including game rooms, recording studios, storage uses, garages, swimming pool changing area and bathrooms, but the Zoning Ordinance does not permit the accessory building to be a dwelling unit living space including bedrooms and kitchens.
- The property owner discussed options including a possible variance.
- Staff discussed first submitting a request to the Planning Commission to review the possibility of an ordinance amendment to permit the requested item.
- The amendment includes the proposal being limited to the non-planned unit development base smaller lot (10,000 sq. ft.) R10 medium density zoning district and the non-planned unit development base R7 high density residential zoning district. The zoning districts are located adjacent to commercial zoning districts on Harris Street, Two Mile Pike, Jackson Street/Caldwell Drive, area between Brick Church Pike and Moncrief Avenue and sections on Church Street and Alta Loma Drive.
- The zoning districts permit one-and two-family dwellings and semi-detached dwellings. The proposed amendment is based on the above referenced property owner request.

- Staff requests the Planning Commission discuss including the proposed amendment and if the use should require a prior review by the City's Board of Zoning and Sign Appeals per the Conditional Use review process in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Staff presented a proposed amendment for discussion.

Planning Commission Discussion:

- Duncan discussed accessory buildings and the size of lots
- Trew discussed the changes to the ordinance years ago
- Espinosa asked McCormick for his thoughts
- McCormick discussed property owners are requesting alternative use of property and expansion of family members living on a property
- Duncan discussed more flexibility with the expansion of existing home vs an accessory building

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Planning Commission Review Process: Public Forum, Public Hearings, and Community Review Meetings

- McCormick discussed the best option to increase public comments at the meeting would be to advertise all agenda items as public hearings and prior to any votes open up a public hearing for anyone that has signed up to speak during the meeting on each item. The public forum part of the agenda could remain at the end of the agenda to allow someone to speak on a planning issue not related to an agenda item.
- Espinosa discussed the past meetings, public comments, and advertising of agenda items
- Hitt states he agrees with Espinosa regarding public hearings
- Duncan discussed agenda items and property owners have the right to speak on an agenda item
- Ellis discussed agenda items and standards for speaking
- McCormick discussed standards for public speaking
- Espinosa discussed the procedures for agenda items and public speaking
- Wheeler discussed the public signing in and what agenda item they are interested in speaking
- McCormick discussed a possible Zoning Ordinance amendment to either encourage or require a community meeting administered by a property owner/developer to gain input on projects requiring rezoning prior to the Planning Commission or City Commission agenda items being reviewed.
- Parnell expressed his opinion of community meetings.
- Espinosa thanked everyone for the discussion and comments

Planning Commission designation change from a Regional to a Municipal Planning Commission

- McCormick discussed the Planning Commission is currently a Regional Planning Commission and if approved the City's Planning Commission would be changed back to a municipal designation.
- Staff discussed the regional planning provisions per state law and only limited small acreage proposals received since and limited use with the Sumner County Highway Superintendent completing all roadway inspections and approvals outside the city limits.

Planning Commission Training

-McCormick discussed The Tennessee Chapter of the American Planning Association is planning a virtual four (4) hour training session on November 5th from eight (8) am to noon.

Public Forum on Planning Related Topics:

- Espinosa asked Freeman the process for allowing members of the public to speak at a Public Forum
- Freeman discussed the rules for the public to speak at a Public Hearing or Public Forum

No one requested to speak at the meeting the public forum was closed.
Hitt made a motion to close the public forum, seconded by McNeal.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Tony Espinosa, Chairman

Sharon Reed, Planning Assistant