# CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

# - MINUTES -

December 30, 2015

DRAFT

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.

ME.	MBERS PRESENT:
$\boxtimes$	Richard Swift, Chairman
	Bryce Powers, Vice Chairman
	Russell Adkins
	Geno Grubbs
$\boxtimes$	Wade Hadley
	Mark Kelly
	Bill Kimbrough
$\boxtimes$	Robert Nichols
$\boxtimes$	Linda Rudolph
<u>OT</u>	HERS PRESENT:
$\boxtimes$	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
$\times$	John Spainhoward, RPC Planner/Zoning Coordinator
	Jill Hall, RPC Transportation Planner
$\boxtimes$	Judy Burkhart, RPC Office Manager
$\boxtimes$	Mark Riggins, City Engineer's Office
	Greg Stewart, City Gas & Water Dept.
	David Shepherd, City Street Department
$\boxtimes$	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
Ш	Chris Brown, Ft. Campbell

# II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 11/24/15

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of November 24, 2015. Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nichols and carried unanimously.

# III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Dr. Ripple stated that the project engineer has requested deferral of case S-60-2015. S-67-2015 was withdrawn by the applicant and the applicant has requested deferral of SR-39-2015. There being no more discussion, Mr. Kelly moved to recommend deferral of S-60-2015 and SR-39-2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nichols and carried unanimously.

#### IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER Z - 33 - 2015 APPLICANT(S): Bill Mace

REQUEST: C-5 Highway & Arterial Commercial District

to R-2D Two-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property located 500+/- feet north of the Tiny Town Rd. & Heritage Pointe Dr. intersection fronting on

the east and west of Heritage Pointe Dr.

TAX MAP(S): 08 PARCEL(S): 13.05 & 13.06 ACREAGE: 9.54

CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2nd

REASON FOR REQUEST: Owner wants to build duplexes on the property.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan (as in the City) and adopted Land Use Plan. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request and adequate infrastructure serves the site. R-2D will allow construction of duplex (two-family) dwellings on individual lots. Mr. Spainhoward stated that this request has been amended to 3.26 acres with the potential for nine lots with 18 units.

No public comments received.

There was no one present to speak in favor or in opposition to this request.

There being no more discussion, Ms. Rudolph moved to recommend approval based on the reasons in the staff recomendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adkins and carried unanimously.

CASE NUMBER Z - 34 - 2015 APPLICANT(S): River Investments G P

Agent: Gary Keckley

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District

to MLUD Mixed Land Use District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the west frontage of Warfield Blvd. west of the Warfield Blvd. & Rivermont Dr.

intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 064 PARCEL(S): 1.00 p/o ACREAGE: 15.71 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6th

9

#### REASON FOR REQUEST:

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan (as in the City) and adopted Land Use Plan. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request and adequate utility infrastructure serves the site. The submitted comprehensive development site plan facilitates an appropriate arrangement of uses and buildings with acceptable vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Submitted traffic assessment identifies the existing Level of Service of Warfield Boulevard. Proposed development does not adversely impact capacity of the transportation and does not necessitate offsite transportation improvements. He stated there were no phone calls, but there were two people to come to the office with questions. A traffic assessment was done, and there would be no adverse impact on Warfield Boulevard. (The two proposed development entrances onto Warfield Boulevard were determined to be a Level of Service C.) The development is not in the flood plain.

Mr. David Smith, agent, stated that he was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Chris Bollen, adjacent property owner, stated he had concerns about traffic. Mr. Spainhoward stated a traffic assessment was completed on the property; the City Street Department had no concerns with the proposed locations of the entrances; and the proposed development had minimal impact on the existing Level of Service.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval based on the reasons in the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nichols and carried unanimously.

# IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER CZO - 1

- 2015

APPLICANT(S):

Regional Planning Commission

REQUEST: County

to

LOCATION:

TAX MAP(S):

PARCEL(S):

ACREAGE:

CIVIL DISTRICT(S):

REASON FOR REQUEST:

Mr. Spainhoward read the request and stated that this is an amendment to the County Zoning Resolution Update and is to:

1. Drop the side yard requirements in the R-3 and R-4 Districts from 20 feet to 10 feet, and 2. Drop the "total of both side yards" at 30 feet in the R-1A and RM-2 Districts leaving only the minimum side yard of 10 feet.

These changes come after a meeting with the development community and also with County Attorney Tim Harvey and County Building and Codes Director Rod Streeter. The next scheduled meeting is January 19, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. with the Development and Engineering Community.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Nichols moved to recommend approval of the two side yard amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried unanimously.

#### V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 60 - 2015

APPLICANT: Todd Morris

REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of NORTHPARK VILLAS

LOCATION: South of Ringgold Road, north of the 101st Parkway, and east of and adjacent to Grassmire Drive

MAP: 030 PARCEL(S): 035.02 ACREAGE: 3.57

# OF LOTS: 8 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer for 30 days at the request of the Project Engineer.

CASE NUMBER: S - 65 - 2015

APPLICANT: Joel Prather

REQUEST: Replat Approval of REPLAT OF EASTLAND GREEN SECTION 4 LOT 108

LOCATION: 745 Heatherhurst Court

MAP: 086C PARCEL(S): B 009.00 ACREAGE: .79

# OF LOTS: 1 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 5

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

CASE NUMBER: S - 66 - 2015

APPLICANT: Triple J Partners

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of TINY TOWN PLAZA

LOCATION: North side of Tiny Town Road, south of Egret Drive, and approximately 1,030 west of the

intersection of Tiny Town Road and Sand Piper Drive.

MAP: 008 PARCEL(S): 011.00 ACREAGE: 6.94

CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2 # OF LOTS: 7

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Preliminary Plat Approval, subject to the following condition(s):

- 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, excavation, 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.

VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting a variance from Table 4.1 of the Subdivision Regulations to allow a right of way width of 40' instead of the minimum required 50' for the proposed Tiny Town Court. The reason given by the applicant is that the roadway will still have the minimum required 28' pavement width, and a turn lane with a 40' right of way will be provided at the intersection with Tiny Town Road. Additionally, the request is to allow additional area for parking and landscaping on the site.

VAR. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

# V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 67 - 2015 APPLICANT: Duane E. King

REQUEST: Replat Approval of REPLAT OF MEADOW WOOD PARK SECTION 1D LOTS

82-83

LOCATION: 2276 & 2280 Killington Drive

MAP: 040G PARCEL(S): A 046.00 & 047.00 ACREAGE: .39

# OF LOTS: 2 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Withdrawn by the project engineer prior to the meeting.

\*

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.

There were no cases pulled from the agenda.

Mr. Parker read the cases and gave the staff recommendations.

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

\*

# VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS:

CASE NUMBER: SR - 38 - 2015 APPLICANT: JASON SENSENEY

Agent: Herbert Patrick

DEVELOPMENT: PROVIDENCE BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL

LOCATION: 609 PROVIDENCE BLVD.

MAP: 055-H-H-024.00 ACREAGE: 0.24

CIVIL DIST.: 7

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

CONDITIONS: 1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer.

2. Approval of a landscape plan.

\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 39 - 2015 APPLICANT: TELECAD WIRELESS VERIZON WIRELESS

Agent: Penny Cox

DEVELOPMENT: COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

PROPOSED USE: UNMANNED CELL TOWER

LOCATION: 3107 PROSPECT CIRCLE

MAP: 063, 069.00 ACREAGE: 37.84

CIVIL DIST.: 11

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFERRAL, PENDING SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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.

There were no cases pulled from the consent agenda.

Ms. Russell read the cases and gave the staff recommendation.

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

# VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- A. A. MONTHLY PROFIT & LOSS STATEMENT: Dr. Ripple asked for approval of this month's statement. There being no more discussion, Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nichols and carried unanimously.
- B. PROGRESS REPORT ON COMMON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD IMPLEMENTATION: Dr. Ripple explained that on January 7, 2016 will be the effective date for the ordinances creating the Common Design Review Board and amending the Zoning Ordinance. The position of the Design Review Coordinator was fully funded on December 14, 2015, by the County. Mayor McMillan will be nominating four new members to the Common Design Review Board in addition to the seven members on the Historic Zoning Commission for confirmation by the City Council on January 7, 2016. The application deadline for the Common Design Review Board will be the first Tuesday of each month. The first meeting of the new Common Design Review Board will be January 25, 2016.
- C. RPC AUDIT FY 2014/15: Dr. Ripple stated that there were no findings during the audit. He then asked for approval of the finalized audit. There being no more discussion, Mr. Nichols moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adkins and carried unanimously.
- D. REVISED FEE SCHEDULE: Mr. Spainhoward stated that there is a need to update the fee schedule with Common Design Review Board Overlay information and update the cost to duplicate the County Zoning Resolution. He then asked for approval to make those changes. There being no more discussion, Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nichols and carried unanimously.

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

ATTEST: