

CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT

- MINUTES -

December 27, 2017

2:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ROOM
329 MAIN STREET

I. CALL TO ORDER/QUORUM CHECK:

Mr. Swift called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Richard Swift, Chairman
- Bryce Powers, Vice Chairman
- Russell Adkins
- Geno Grubbs
- Wade Hadley
- Mark Kelly
- Bill Kimbrough
- Robert Nichols
- Linda Rudolph

OTHERS PRESENT:

- David A. Ripple, Director of Planning
- J. Stan Williams, RPC Transportation Planning Coordinator
- Ruth C. Russell, RPC Planner/Address Manager
- Brad Parker, RPC Subdivision Coordinator/Planner
- Brent Clemmons, RPC GIS Manager
- John Spainhoward, RPC Planner/Zoning Coordinator
- Jill Hall, RPC Transportation Planner
- Judy Burkhart, RPC Office Manager
- Garth Branch, City Engineer's Office
- Greg Stewart, City Gas & Water Dept.
- David Shepherd, City Street Department
- Jack Frazier, Chris Cowan Jeff Bryant, City Street Department
- Mike Baker, City Building & Codes Department
- Mike Frost, County Highway Department
- Rod Streeter/John Doss/Justin Crosby, County Zoning Enforcement Office
- Mike Roberts/Ray Williams/Ricky Cumberland, Clarksville Fire Department
- Chris Brown, Ft. Campbell

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 11/29/2017

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of November 29, 2017. Mr. Kelly moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried unanimously.

III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Dr. Ripple stated that the project engineers have requested a 30-day deferral of subdivision cases S-58-2017, S-77-2017, S-88-2017, S-92-2017, S-95-2017 and SR-38-2017. There being no more discussion, Ms. Rudolph moved to recommend deferral. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kimbrough and carried unanimously.

Dr. Ripple stated that the project engineers have also requested a 30-day deferral of SR-38-2017. There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend deferral. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously.

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER ZO - 1 - 2017 APPLICANT(S): Regional Planning Commission

REQUEST: Text

to

LOCATION:

TAX MAP(S): PARCEL(S): ACREAGE: CIVIL DISTRICT(S):

REASON FOR REQUEST:

Mr. Spainhoward stated there were no new zoning cases this month, however there is a zoning amendment for temporary signs. Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. He stated this is a temporary sign ordinance amendment that follows State Legislation. He stated that the original proposal shows the amendments in red and there was one staff recommended change which is shown in blue.

Dr. Ripple stated that the revision would need to be brought on the floor with a first and second motion for approval and then amend it to add the recommended change shown in blue. He stated that this is due to the fact that the recommended change in blue was added after this amendment was advertised to the public.

There was no one present to speak in favor of or against this case.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval of the original revision in red. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rudolph and carried unanimously.

Mr. Swift stated a motion was needed for the one line change to the amendment shown in blue. There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 53 - 2017 APPLICANT: Magnolia Drive Partnership
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of SANGO MILLS SECTION 1 (CLUSTER)
LOCATION: North of US Hwy 41-A, South of Sango Road, north of and adjacent to Towes Lane.
MAP: 087 PARCEL(S): 023.02 ACREAGE: 28.94
OF LOTS: 67 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 10/11
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 58 - 2017 APPLICANT: Advanced De. Const. Co. Inc.
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of ADVANCED DEV CONST CO. INC. PROPERTY E. PINE
MOUNTAIN ROAD LOTS 1 & 2
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to the 101st Airborne Parkway, east of and adjacent to the terminus of E. Pine
Mountain Road.
MAP: 042 PARCEL(S): 030.00 ACREAGE: 3.18
OF LOTS: 2 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 73 - 2017 APPLICANT: Eagles Bluff TGp

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of EAGLES BLUFF, SECTION 5

LOCATION: Immediately south and east of the intersection of Trenton Road and Kennedy Road.

MAP: 017 PARCEL(S): 049.00 ACREAGE: 6.27

OF LOTS: 30 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

The reasons for disapproval are:

- 1) The revised Preliminary Subdivision plat fails to preserve adequate right-of-way for the corridor of the Northeast Connector as adopted in the Major Thoroughfare Plan since 1995 (as referenced in Section 4.1.1(4.) of the Subdivision Regulations) and because preliminary engineering/environmental studies are before TDOT and FHWA for approval. Thus, sidewalks and multi-use paths will be within PUDE's on private land throughout the length of the Northeast Connector, not just short sections.
- 2) There is no public interest served by revising the original preliminary subdivision plat approved on 7/30/2014 that set aside 125 feet plus 50 feet of Kennedy Lane preserving adequate right-of-way width for the Northeast Connector.
- 3) There is no mechanism for remediating the inadequate right-of-way without creating unconstructable lots.
- 4) The acquisition of additional right-of-way for the Northeast Connector will affect approximately 10 to 20 feet of already built Subdivision Eagles Landing to the north.
- 5) To enable rear access to the properties (so as to meet the internal local road requirements of a cluster subdivision) requires the creation of a dedicated private access easement (alley) of 20 feet in width along the Corridor, it reduces the lot depth to 90 feet requiring a variance from the 100-foot minimum lot depth in the subdivision regulations.
- 6) The 20-foot setback requirements of a dedicated private access easement will require subdivision variances to avoid affecting the already platted properties to the south and to achieve an adequate structure footprint for lots to the north.
- 7) The narrow alley and shallow lot depth poses concerns for traffic flow and off-street parking for the alley.

SD CONDITIONS (CONT.)

8) Small single-family lots facing an arterial with 20,000 vehicles per day is an inappropriate land use subject to conversion to commercial uses in the future decades.

9) Section 3.2.4(3.) of the Subdivision Regulations states that "The Regional Planning Commission shall not approve the Subdivision of land if from adequate investigations conducted by all public agencies concerned, it has been determined that in the best interest of the public the site is not suitable for platting and development purposes of the kind proposed."

If the RPC chooses to approve this preliminary subdivision, the RPC Board must find that:

1) The 65 to 70-foot right-of-way provides adequate right-of-way for the 5-lane pavement of the arterial roadway although sidewalks and paths are outside the right-of-way, and thereby achieves the intent of the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

2) Rear access to the lots avoid direct access to the Northeast Corridor, preserving the functionality of the arterial roadway that is consistent with the Access Control Ordinance.

3) The rear alley enables cluster subdivision lots to be created; thus, increasing practical lot yield and property tax revenues.

4) The revision of the original preliminary plat is in the best interest of the community.

5) The following variances are appropriate -

- The reduction of the minimum lot depth from 100 feet to 90 feet
- The reduction of the 20-foot setback to five feet on the north side of the dedicated private access easement so that adequate space for a building pad is available for the primary and any accessory structures.
- The reduction of the 20-foot setback to ten feet to the south of the dedicated private access easement so that accessory structures can be built within 10 feet of the property line and the property rights of existing platted lots are not affected.

Conditions if approved:

1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.

2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage and erosion control plan.

3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.

4. Upgrades to Kennedy Road as required by the Clarksville Street Department.

5. A Private dedicated access easement providing rear driveway access will be required. This easement shall be owned and maintained by the Home Owners Association.

VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting several variances to the Subdivision Regulations. The first request is to Section 4.4(9) and is to allow lot depths of ninety (90) feet instead of the required one-hundred (100) feet. The other two (2) variances are to Section 3.2.5 (3) and would allow a five (5) foot PUDE and MBSL on the north side of the private dedicated easement and a ten (10) foot PUDE and MBSL on the south side of the private dedicated easement instead of the required twenty (20) foot PUDE and MBSL. See the file or the Planning Commission Packet for the full request.

VAR. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

V. SUBDIVISIONS

Pulled from the consent agenda, Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. Mr. Parker read the 9 reasons for disapproval, the section titled "If the RPC chooses to approve this preliminary subdivision, the RPC Board must find that," conditions if approved, and the variances along with justification. Mr. Parker also stated there was a lot of information and if there were any questions he would be happy to attempt to answer them.

Mr. Jeff Burkhart stated he was available to attempt to answer any questions. He stated Mr. Weakley, Engineer, was also available.

Mr. Kimbrough asked what were the issues with the original preliminary plat from July 30, 2014 that prompted this revised plat. Mr. Burkhart stated he believed the plans for this road were drawn in 1995, which was 22 years ago. He stated they are not against the road but at some point someone is going to have to do something. He stated Chris Cowan could probably answer this question but he believes there has only been \$400,000 put in the City Budget for this entire road in the last 22 years. He stated this does not sound like a fast moving project. They would love to see the road built and support the project but they also need to know for their purposes and for tax purposes what the value is and what will have to be sold to the City or donated to the City for this road project. He stated their purpose is just to try to figure out a value.

Mr. Burkhart stated the same thing happened to him a half mile down the road from this location. He stated it is almost the last day of the year and a check just had to be written for seven hundred dollars for County taxes on a strip of land that runs down off of Trenton Road. He stated there was going to be a road built on it 15 years ago and he is still paying taxes on it. He stated no one will build a road there because CDE built a substation on it. He stated he is still having to pay taxes on it because he was told in this same room and standing at this very microphone that if he did not give it to them, they would not approve his preliminary plat. He stated he has been on both sides of this issue.

Mr. Vernon Weakley stated that this is being referred to as a revised preliminary but the original preliminary plat showed all of these lots. He stated the primary reason for this is to set a value for the property in an effort to move the construction of the road forward. He stated this will be a win for the City and a win for the applicant because it will allow the applicant to assist the City in going forward with their road project. He stated they are just asking for preliminary plat approval, just the first step, which does not really do anything for anyone other than to establish value. Ms. Rudolph asked how this will help the City. Mr. Weakley stated they are entertaining the idea of donating the property to the City and with a good enough appraisal they will be able to do this.

Mr. Powers stated with preliminary plat approval there could be houses sitting there right in the middle of a thoroughfare. Mr. Powers stated there are no barriers between preliminary plat approval and final plat approval other than building the private access easement and recording the final plat. He stated it is simply a formality from there, just engineering and surveying. Mr. Weakley stated it is going through the Street Department's approval and they are working with them. Mr. Powers stated the design standards of the twenty foot rear alley are the only thing the Street Department would be reviewing at that point. Mr. Weakley stated they are not moving forward with the project and are doing it for the purpose which has been stated. Mr. Weakley asked how long a preliminary plat lasts. Dr. Ripple stated three years unless it is a revision to the preliminary which kicks it out for another three years. Within the three year period the applicant must proceed to get all approvals for the plan, turn dirt and record at least one lot. If this is not done the rights will expire.

Ms. Rudolph asked why a valuation could not be done based on the 2014 plat and why is it necessary to get this plat approved. Mr. Weakley stated to get the appraisal it would be appraised as lots based on this plat approval.

Mr. Kimbrough stated he would like to hear from Mr. Cowan's comments on the time frame of the road construction. Mr. Kimbrough asked what the time frame would look like for either land acquisition or construction startup, and as far as funding, where did this project stand right now. Mr. Cowan stated that right now there is no funding identified specifically for this project. He stated they are making every effort to get the environmental approved, which is an absolutely required step. Next, they would move on and develop right-of-way plans. He stated they are taking each step forward as soon as they are able. He stated it was difficult to give a specific time

frame. Ms. Rudolph asked what was his best guess and he said he really could not speculate. Ms. Rudolph asked what the normal time frame was for this type of process. Mr. Cowan stated probably five to ten years.

Ms. Rudolph stated that Mr. Weakley had mentioned discussions with the City about donating the land and she asked Mr. Cowan was he privy to those conversations. He stated that in such a case they are not allowed to have those types of discussions or be a part of those discussions.

Mr. Burkhart stated that it is not true that they cannot accept the land and get federal grants. He stated he has spoken with Laurie Matta at the City. He stated a grant cannot be accepted to purchase the land or have value in the land but land itself can absolutely be accepted. He stated as far as to build a road, Ms. Matta assured him that the City could absolutely take the land as a donation.

Mr. Powers stated that the bottom line is if they approve it today, there could be houses there. He stated that he feels there is too much at stake for this plat to go through today. Mr. Kimbrough asked if it was disapproved today would it be possible for them to bring it back up next month. Dr. Ripple stated that it could be brought back up within a 8month but there must be a substantive change, not merely bringing back the same plat again.

There being no more discussion, Ms. Rudolph moved to recommend disapproval based on the fact that the revised preliminary subdivision plat fails to preserve the adequate right-of-way for the corridor of the Northeast Connector as adopted by the Major Thoroughfare Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers. Mr. Kelly stated that he was still not clear on item number five and asked if the private dedicated easement had been done. Dr. Ripple stated that they are proposing to do so but have not done so. Dr. Ripple stated that it is critical that they have internal access such that they could choose the cluster option so they could increase their practical lot yield. Otherwise, they would have to fall back to the typical lot size of R-2 which is minimum lot size of 9,000 square feet. He stated with this they can drop down to a smaller lot size of 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Kelly asked if we choose to approve this, has item number one been met or can it be met. This states that the 65 to 70-foot right-of-way provides adequate right-of-way for the 5-lane pavement. Dr. Ripple stated yes, they have agreed to dedicate additional 15 to 20-feet for right-of-way in addition to the current 50-foot of right-of-way, so overall they will have 65 to 70-foot of right-of-way which is sufficient to build the 5-lane pavement section but the sidewalks and walk path would be outside of the right-of-way in the Public Utility easement. In the past, short sections of paths or sidewalks have been placed in utility easements but usually not long sections of sidewalks.

Mr. Kelly asked about number 2 which states rear access to the lots avoid direct access to the Northeast Corridor, preserving the functionality of the arterial roadway that is consistent with the Access Control Ordinance. Dr. Ripple stated that they have proposed a dedicated private access easement such that it would be 20-feet in width, would meet all subdivision standards as determined by the Street Department, in terms of pavement design and width. This rear access will enable access to all 30 lots from an internal roadway system such that direct access would not be necessary to the Northeast Connector. This private easement would prevent frequent driveway cuts onto the Northeast Connector which would destroy its functionality. He stated all cluster developments shall have internal roadway access.

Mr. Kelly asked if the variances that are listed are consistent with the variances that are required. Dr. Ripple stated that in order to achieve what they have proposed the number one variance is the typical subdivision lot depth is 100 feet. They are suggesting they want to reduce to 90 due to the dedicated additional right-of-way and the alleyway which allows them to use the cluster provision due to internal access. Dr. Ripple stated that there is a gain from the developer's standpoint that they increase lot yield, there is a gain from the public standpoint that they are able to eliminate access of these individual lots directly onto the Northeast Connector. He stated the other variance has to do with off of the alley and it is within the subdivision regulations if there is a dedicated private easement, there must be a 20-foot setback from this alley or dedicated private easement. He stated we are suggesting that the 20-foot setback be reduced 5 feet north of the alley such that the primary structure and accessory structure could be 15 feet closer to the alley. Dr. Ripple stated that number two is south of this proposed alley we are suggesting a variance from 20-feet down to 10-feet such that there is no effect on the already platted and recorded property to the south.

Mr. Parker stated that basically the only way this revised preliminary can be approved is if the variances are granted. In order to meet the subdivision regulations these variances have to be approved. Ms. Rudolph asked Mr. Cowan how he felt the building of this subdivision would affect the Northeast Connector. Mr. Cowan stated that the Northeast Connector is a roadway project which has been on the books for quite some time. He stated that several developments have been subdivided leaving reservation of right-of-way which can be purchased once everything is in place for the project to move forward. He feels if the property is subdivided, it hurts the ability to build the Corridor. Ms. Rudolph asked how many properties would have to be purchased for this project. Mr. Cowan stated he was aware of three property owners currently. If this preliminary is approved and the lots are sold, it would add thirty.

Dr. Ripple stated that it must be stated why it is not in the public interest to approve this subdivision since a motion has been made to deny the subdivision. Ms. Rudolph stated one reason she feels this is not in the public interest is the fact that there would be thirty lots to be purchased for the Northeast Connector Roadway Project, as opposed to three. She feels that the 90 foot lot makes it almost an unconstructable lot. The small alleyways are of concern because she does not feel you could have easy access. Mr. Kelly stated that both Mr. Burkhart and Mr. Weakley have stated what their intentions. He stated that just as this roadway project has been in the works for several years and may or may not be built, things can change which could cause them to make a different decision, which they would have the ability to do. He stated that he believes anyone who lives, as do they, recognizes importance of this project for relief on Trenton Road as well as other things the Northeast Connector will provide. Mr. Kelly stated that he feels that the Commission puts themselves in an extremely precarious position if the project is approved. He stated that he is in agreement with Ms. Rudolph.

Mr. Grubbs stated that he is in a unique role because he is not only a member of the Planning Commission but also the City Council. He stated that sometimes tough decisions must be made. He stated that number 9 under the reasons for disapproval section, which was previously read into the record, pretty well summarizes this. He stated this road needs to be built. He stated he is aware that this is a tough decision for everyone on this Commission. He stated that he feels they have to go with this motion because this roadway project has to be done.

There being no more discussion, the motion for disapproval is carried unanimously.

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 77 - 2017 APPLICANT: Exit 8 Properties
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of ROSSVIEW COMMONS SECTION 2 LOTS 1-3
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Hancock Road (S.R 237), immediately southwest of the intersection of Hancock Road and International Boulevard.
MAP: 058 PARCEL(S): 001.00 ACREAGE: 3.26
OF LOTS: 3 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 80 - 2017 APPLICANT: Michael Connerth
REQUEST: Replat Approval of REPLAT OF RUDOLPHTOWN SECTIONS 1 & 2 LOTS 17, 25, 26, 27
LOCATION: West of and adjacent to Stonemeadow Road, immediately northwest of the intersection of Haystack Road and Stonemeadow Road.
MAP: 064H PARCEL(S): C 006.00 ACREAGE: 5.00
OF LOTS: 6 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL REPLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 82 - 2017 APPLICANT: greenspace partners
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of WOODLAND HILLS CLUSTER
LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Ashland City Road, north of the intersection of the Ashland City Road and Avondale Drive.
MAP: 079 PARCEL(S): 025.03 ACREAGE: 24.7
OF LOTS: 52 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED.

- 1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading, and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage and erosion control plan.
3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.
4. A traffic impact study shall be submitted to an approved by the City Street Department prior to construction plan approval.
5. A landscape plan and/or tree survey will be required prior to final plat approval for the area(s) that are using the landscape buffer section of the Zoning Ordinance.

VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting several variances to the Subdivision Regulations. The first is to Section 5.2(33) and is to allow the development to not connect to the existing Beverly Hills Drive. The next variance is to Section 4.1.9(1) of the Subdivision Regulations to allow a cul-de-sac length that is in excess of the maximum allowed 500'. The last variance is to Table 4.1 Note (c) and is to allow a 40' ROW and 24' pavement width on Old Charlotte Trace from the intermediate turnaround to the intersection of Old Charlotte Court. See the file for the complete variance requests.

VAR. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 84 - 2017 APPLICANT: Fields of northmeade
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WELLINGTON FIELDS SECTION 3A
LOCATION: West of Kirkwood Road at the terminus of Upland Terrace.
MAP: 039 PARCEL(S): 008.00 ACREAGE: 14.72
OF LOTS: 30 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: WITHDRAWN

CASE NUMBER: S - 88 - 2017 APPLICANT: Exit 8 Properties
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of INTERNATIONAL BOULEVARD RIGHT-OF-WAY
DEDICATION
LOCATION: Located south of the intersection of Hankook Road and International Boulevard.
MAP: 058 PARCEL(S): 001.00 (portion) ACREAGE: 0.52
OF LOTS: 0 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 90 - 2017 APPLICANT: Richard Collins
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of MORRISON ESTATES SECTION D
LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Dover Road, east of and adjacent to the intersection of Morrison Drive and Paula Drive intersection between Paula Drive and Aurelia Lynn Drive.
MAP: 054G PARCEL(S): C 010.00 ACREAGE: 4.20
OF LOTS: 3 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 7
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL BY MINOR PLAT PROVISIONS

CASE NUMBER: S - 91 - 2017 APPLICANT: Kruekeberg LLc
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WHITEWOOD FARM
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Sango Road, North of Highway 41A, approximately 1,264 feet west of the intersection of S. Woodson Road and Sango Road.
MAP: 082 PARCEL(S): 087.03 ACREAGE: 35.52
OF LOTS: 58 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 92 - 2017 APPLICANT: IMER DEVELOPMENT LLC
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WEST CREEK FARMS 3A
LOCATION: West of Peachers Mill Road and south of and adjacent to Henry Place Blvd.
MAP: 019 PARCEL(S): 004.02 ACREAGE: 35.47
OF LOTS: 90 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 93 - 2017 APPLICANT: Courtney Caudill, et al
REQUEST: Replat Approval of REPLAT OF IVY BEND SECTION 2 CLUSTER LOTS 52-54
LOCATION: 277-285 Ivy Bend Circle
MAP: 087f PARCEL(S): A 020.00, 021.00, 022.00 ACREAGE: 2.032
OF LOTS: 3 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 10
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL REPLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 94 - 2017 APPLICANT: JR DEVELOPMENT
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of FARMINGTON, SECTION 5B, PHASE 1
LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Remington Trace and Juniper Pass.
MAP: 039 PARCEL(S): 025.17 ACREAGE: 25.47
OF LOTS: 58 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 95 - 2017 APPLICANT: Chris Blackwell
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of LIBERTY PARK 5A
LOCATION: West of and adjacent to SR 374, east of and adjacent to Putnam Drive.
MAP: 053 PARCEL(S): 007.06 ACREAGE: 4.04
OF LOTS: 7 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS: Mr. Swift explained that these cases are heard on a consent agenda and if anyone wanted a case heard separately to let him know at this time.

Case number s-73-2017 was pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action).

There was no one present to speak in favor or against the other cases.

Mr. Parker read the staff reports. There being no more discussion, Ms. Rudolph moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried with Mr. Powers abstaining from S-82-2017.

VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS:

CASE NUMBER: AB -4 -2017 APPLICANT: ROBERT E. WHITE

Agent: Cindy Greene

DEVELOPMENT: ROBERT E. WHITE

PROPOSED USE: ABANDONMENT

LOCATION:

MAP: 066-G-G-6, 7, 9, 11, 12,13 ACREAGE: 0.00987

CIVIL DIST.: 12

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL (APPLICANT REQUESTED DEFERRAL, AFTER

Pulled from the consent agenda, Ms. Russell read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. She stated that Mr. Stanley Ross, agent for the applicant, had called at 11:00 A.M. requesting deferral.

Mr. Stanley Ross, agent for the applicant, stated that Mr. White has asked for an abandonment of the alleyway off of Strawberry Alley which goes in off of North Second. The reason for this is Mr. White is considering a project at one end of the alley. The other end is open and runs into a private corridor. He stated that when they became aware of the opposition, particularly from Mr. Thomas Meeks and Mr. Travis Meeks, he recommended to Mr. White that they request deferral to allow an opportunity to meet with everyone who owns a property along that alley. This would afford an opportunity to attempt to negotiate an agreeable plan for the alley which would allow access for everyone along the alley. This would also allow time in the event that there are any utilities which would need to be relocated such that Mr. White could seek funding to do this. He would also need to look for alternate access as opposed to North Second Street. He stated the deferral would allow them the time needed to meet with owners and he would appreciate that opportunity.

Mr. Thomas Meeks stated that he owns 137 Franklin Street. He stated he does not oppose allowing this to be deferred for one month to see if they are able to come up with an option, however he objects to the alleyway being abandoned due to the fact that he will have no accessibility to his building. He stated that the alley was constructed to allow access to the back of the buildings. He stated that his utilities run in the alley and in order to get on top of his building he has to access the alley. It cannot be accessed from the front and it is surrounded on the sides. He stated that the roof is problematic as well as the air conditioning units and the only access to them is through the alley. He stated he objects to the alley being abandoned but does not object to allowing them an additional month to attempt to find an alternate plan.

Mr. Travis Meeks stated that Mr. Thomas Meeks is his uncle. Travis Meeks owns 135 Franklin Street. He stated he is not opposed to a deferral either if there is a possibility they may be able to work something out. He feels it is in the best interest of everyone on this panel and everyone involved. He stated that in fact, Deborah Wall who owns 133 Franklin Street had called him with plans to attend the meeting in opposition. He stated that he had told her he did not think it was necessary and that the deferral would probably go through. He stated she is a landowner who has an interest and is adamantly opposed to abandoning the alley. He stated that this alley also acts as an escape from those buildings in the event of a fire.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend deferral. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously.

VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: SR - 33 - 2017 APPLICANT: TURNER AND REALITY, INC
Agent: Houston Smith

DEVELOPMENT: DOLLAR GENERAL - TYLERTOWN ROAD

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL

LOCATION:

MAP: 008, 007.00 (P) ACREAGE: 1.43

CIVIL DIST.: 2

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer, to include as built.
 2. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.
 3. Subdivision plat completed and recorded.
 4. Approval of a landscape plan.

CASE NUMBER: SR - 37 - 2017 APPLICANT: CLARKSVILLE COUNTRY CLUB
Agent: Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: CLARKSVILLE COUNTRY CLUB CONDOS

PROPOSED USE: MULTIFAMILY

LOCATION:

MAP: 064-I-A-020.00 ACREAGE: 166.5

CIVIL DIST.: 12

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer, to include as built.
 2. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.

CASE NUMBER: SR - 38 - 2017 APPLICANT: MAURICE AND BUSSEY
Agent: Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: S.M.A.S. TOW IN LOT

PROPOSED USE: TOW IN LOT

LOCATION:

MAP: 081-I-B-020.00 ACREAGE: 2.15

CIVIL DIST.: 11

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFERRAL, PENDING SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: SR -39 -2017 APPLICANT: BRUCE SAUNDERS
Agent: Weakley Brothers

DEVELOPMENT: MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION CHURCH

PROPOSED USE: RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION/CHURCH

LOCATION:

MAP: 043-D-E-029..00 ACREAGE: 5.0

CIVIL DIST.: 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S):

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer, to include as built.
 2. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.
 3. Approval of a landscape plan.

CASE NUMBER: SR -40 -2017 APPLICANT: JOHN S. FRAZIER
Agent: Weakley Brothers

DEVELOPMENT: WALTON'S CHAPEL UMC

PROPOSED USE: RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION/CHURCH

LOCATION:

MAP: 129,027.00 ACREAGE: 4.67

CIVIL DIST.: 14

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, NO CONDITIONS

Mr. Swift noted that site plan reviews were acted upon in a consent agenda and that anyone who wanted to discuss any particular case could request removal from the consent agenda. Case number AB-4-2017 was pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action) Ms. Russell gave the staff reports. There being no further discussion of the consent agenda, Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adkins and carried unanimously.

VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

A. MONTHLY PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT: Dr. Ripple read the report for November noting there were a number of project bills to be paid which left a net negative balance while waiting for reimbursement from the Federal Government.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rudolph and carried unanimously.

B. BUDGET AMENDMENT: Mr. Swift stated that he was suggesting an increase in compensation for Ms. Burkhart who is the Office Manager and for John Spainhoward for the zoning area and those increases will last for three months and/or for thirty days after a new director is found for the Planning Commission. There being no more discussion, Ms. Rudolph moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried unanimously.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

ATTEST:

Richard Swift, CHAIR