

CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- MINUTES -

DRAFT

July 25, 2018

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
- Amanda Walker

OTHERS PRESENT:

- Director of Planning, Jeff Tyndall
- 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
- Sonny Emmert, RPC GIS Planner
- Judy Burkhart, RPC Office Manager / Angela Latta, RPC Admin. Support Clerk
- Garth Branch, City Engineer's Office
- Greg Stewart/Patrick Chesney, 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
- Tim Harvey, County Attorney

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 6/27/2018

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of June 27, 2018. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Powers about the spelling of the agent's name on case Z-15-2018. It was pointed out that the correct spelling was Daugherty and with that correction Mr. Kelly moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kimbrough and carried unanimously.

III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Mr. Tyndall announced the deferrals which included cases S-17-2018, S-29-2018, S-43-2018, S-51-2018, S-53-2018, S-54-2018, S-55-2018, S-57-2018 and S-59-2018.

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

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER Z - 17 - 2018 APPLICANT(S): Paul Landrum

REQUEST: O-1 Office, Medical, Institutional and Civic District
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the east frontage of Landrum Place, 820 +/- feet south of the Memorial Drive & Landrum Place intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 065-N-J PARCEL(S): 020.00 ACREAGE: 0.87 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: To better utilize the property

Mr. Spainhoward stated that he wanted to read a portion of the Land Use Plan into the record as a reminder of what the recommendations are based upon. This portion reads; "It is always to be assumed that the existing zoning in place is correct unless any of these statements are true: 1.) The proposed zoning is more consistent with the comprehensive or land use plan for the area involved. 2.) The parcel was improperly or mistakenly zoned in the first place. 3.) There have been major changes of an economic, physical or social nature within the area involved that was not anticipated in present plans and which have substantially altered the character of the area."

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The request is an extension of the existing R-4 multi-family district to the east. Adequate infrastructure serves the site. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Medical District planning area. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern. He stated that the historical estimate is for approximately 10 units of multi-family units on the property. He stated that there were no public comments of any concern. He stated that prior to the 2010 Zoning Ordinance change, multi-family was a permitted use in the O-1 District. In 2010 the multi-family allowance was taken out.

Mr. Paul Landrum stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

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

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 18 - 2018 APPLICANT(S): David Stiltner

Agent: J. Chris Fielder Dbs And Associates Eng.

REQUEST: C-4 Highway Interchange District
to C-2 General Commercial District

LOCATION: Property located at the southeast corner of the Martin Luther King Parkway & S. Gateway Plaza Blvd. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 063J-A PARCEL(S): 008.00 & 009.00 ACREAGE: 4.51 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: To conform more closely with the zoning of the property to the north and be in compliance with the zoning regulation for a childcare facility

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. The proposed zoning request is inconsistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The adopted Land Use Plan indicates that the present C-4 zoning classification is assumed to be correct unless the proposed zone is more consistent with the land use plan, the parcel was incorrectly zoned in the first place, or major changes of an economic, physical or social nature were not considered in the present plan which have substantially altered the character of the area. The availability of C-4 Highway Interchange Zoning District is limited to the areas of the Interstate Exits. It is not encouraged to reduce the stock of C-4 zoning in the immediate vicinity of the interstate. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Sango Planning Area. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern. He stated that in the informal meeting there was a question about driveway connections and he wanted to point out that this is two separate parcels and they are both able to have a driveway connection, one of which would be permitted for Highway 76 and the other would be on South Gateway Plaza. He stated that this would be looked at further, if development were to occur, at the site review phase. He stated that there were no public comments received in reference to this application.

Mr. Wayne Wilkinson, representing the seller of the property, stated that the property is under contract to be developed as a childcare facility. He stated that this property is adjacent to a parking lot that the State of Tennessee recently developed which has 259 parking spaces. He stated that in the month of June there were more than 6000 commuters who came in or out of that facility. He stated that their request is an extension of the existing C-2 zoning district. He stated that it is a 4.5 acre tract but that the back half of the property is a retention area and an injection well and cannot be developed. He stated that there was currently over 100 acres of undeveloped C-4 property there which should be sufficient to accommodate any future C-4 needs in that area.

There was no one present to speak in opposition of this case.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval based on the fact that there is a substantial amount of undeveloped C-4 property in that area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried unanimously.

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER CZ - 16 - 2018 APPLICANT(S): Mary Cocke

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District
to R-2D Two-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Sango Road, 825 +/- feet east of the Sango Road & Sango Drive intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 082 PARCEL(S): 053.00 ACREAGE: 2.62 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST:

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. R2-D zoning permits the development of medium density single family residences and duplexes on individual lots. It is encouraged to maintain a desirable mixture of housing types. Adequate infrastructure serves the site. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that the original letter that was sent out had a typo regarding the acreage and when we became aware of this we immediately sent out a letter of correction. He stated that this is not an extension of an existing R2-D zoning classification. He stated that this is in the UGB and Sango Planning Area. He stated that the City Engineer's Office stated that for utility main extension City Council approval will be required and that there is currently no sewer directly on the property. There was also a comment from the school system stating that Richview Middle and Clarksville High are currently over 90% capacities. This development could contribute 50 additional homes and this region already has 998 approved residential lots within its zone. Neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to meet the demands of housing development in this region. He stated that the applicant's estimate is approximately 58 units. He stated that for historical estimates there is not a lot of R2-D to compare but the estimate would be 50 to 55. He stated that there were no public comments via phone or e-mail. He stated that he did have a couple of phone calls questioning about the zoning classification.

Mr. Todd Morris stated that he had some copies of the site plan he would like to pass out and he was available to answer any questions. Mr. Swift asked if these were single-family. Mr. Morris stated that they are duplexes/condos probably ranging from \$275,000 to \$325,000. He said this would either be a gated community or a faux gated community in order to minimize HOA fees. Mr. Swift asked how something is faux gated. Mr. Morris stated that gates are put in place that look as if they could close but they do not.

Dr. Teresa Clark, 3412 Sango, stated that she was one of the people who was not notified that this was going to come right next to her house. She stated that her first concern was about traffic. She asked what was going to be done about the trees because a portion of those are on her land. She asked would everyone have access to City sewer if this goes in, because currently she is on septic.

Mr. Morris stated that there is no outer boundary fence. He stated that the trees that surround the property will not be disturbed if it is not necessary. He stated that they are not building on the back property line and that the tree buffer was one of the things that was appealing about this property. He stated that there will be water and sewer hooked up to all of these. He stated that the engineers may be able to comment about traffic counts.

Dr. Teresa Clark stated that she has lived there since 2000. She stated that this is a two lane road and the impact on the traffic alone is going to be terrible. Mr. Tyndall stated that we did receive one returned notification for a Perry Clark. He asked if she was related to Perry Clark and she stated that he was her husband and they live at 3412 Sango. Ms. Burkhardt stated that their tax record indicates a different mailing address. Mr. Spainhoward stated that there was also a sign on the property about the rezoning request.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval based on consistency with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously.

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 76b - 2007 APPLICANT: Billy Ray Suiter
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Extension Approval of HICKORY WILDS SECTION 2C (CLUSTER)
LOCATION: Terminus of Pitt Lane and John Duke Tyler Blvd.
MAP: 039 PARCEL(S): 016.05 ACREAGE:
OF LOTS: 20 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: 24-MONTH EXTENSION, BASED ON FOLLOWING STIPULATION:

NOTE: Any preliminary plats which are granted extensions beyond the 24-month period shall comply with any policies or regulations in effect at the approval date of the latest extension.

New expiration: July 25, 2020

NOTE: Hickory Wilds shall meet the requirements of the amended Clarksville-Montgomery County Subdivision Regulations adopted by the Regional Planning Commission on February 26, 2014, due to the preliminary plat extension.

CASE NUMBER: S - 10b - 2012 APPLICANT: Jimmy Bagwell
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Extension Approval of WESTHAVEN
LOCATION: East of and adjacent to Tobacco Road, east of the intersection of Sandburg Drive and Tobacco Road.
MAP: 030 PARCEL(S): 006.00 ACREAGE: 174.267
OF LOTS: 390 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: 24-MONTH EXTENSION, BASED ON FOLLOWING STIPULATION:

NOTE: Any preliminary plats which are granted extensions beyond the 24-month period shall comply with any policies or regulations in effect at the approval date of the latest extension.

New expiration: July 25, 2020

NOTE: Westhaven shall meet the requirements of the amended Clarksville-Montgomery County Subdivision Regulations adopted by the Regional Planning Commission on February 26, 2014, due to the preliminary plat extension.

CASE NUMBER: S - 57c - 2012 APPLICANT: Gordon Seay
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Extension Approval of THE OAKS (CLUSTER)
LOCATION: South of Dunbar Cave Road, east of Warfield Boulevard and north of the Red River
MAP: 057 PARCEL(S): 124.00 ACREAGE: 194.29
OF LOTS: 439 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: 24-MONTH EXTENSION, BASED ON FOLLOWING STIPULATION:

NOTE: Any preliminary plats which are granted extensions beyond the 24-month period shall comply with any policies or regulations in effect at the approval date of the latest extension.

New expiration: July 25, 2020

NOTE: The Oaks shall meet the requirements of the amended Clarksville-Montgomery County Subdivision Regulations adopted by the Regional Planning Commission on February 26, 2014, due to the preliminary plat extension.

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 17 - 2018 APPLICANT: J & N Enterprises
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of RIDGELAND ESTATES, SECTION 3 (CLUSTER)
LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Dover Road, east of North Liberty Church Road and southeast of the current southern terminus of Cameo Court.
MAP: 053 PARCEL(S): 010.04 ACREAGE: 33.31
OF LOTS: 124 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 29 - 2018 APPLICANT: Danell Welch
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WELCHTREE SECTION 3
LOCATION: South of Old Clarksville Pike, east of Ashland City Road, west of Walter Road, at the terminus of Rosebury Lane
MAP: 126 PARCEL(S): 068.01 ACREAGE: 26.07
OF LOTS: 13 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 10
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 34 - 2018 APPLICANT: Griffy Family Partnership
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of GRIFFEY ESTATES SECTION 3
LOCATION: South of Allen Griffey Road, east of the terminus of Harrison Way, north of Little West Fork Creek.
MAP: 031 PARCEL(S): 040.00 ACREAGE: 81.7
OF LOTS: 213 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED.

1. Prior to final plat approval, improvements to the existing Allen Griffey Roadway shall be made. These improvements shall be as determined by the Street Department at the time of construction plan approval.
2. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
3. 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.
4. 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.

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 37 - 2018 APPLICANT: Richard Tucker

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of MEADOWHILL PRELIMINARY ROW DEDICATION

LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Madison Street (Highway 41-A), east of Country Lane, west of Carney Road, at 2442 Madison Street (Highway 41-A)

MAP: 081 PARCEL(S): 113.00 ACREAGE: 50.7

OF LOTS: 5 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

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.

VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting a variance to Section 4.1.9 Subsection 1. of the Subdivision Regulations and is to allow a cul-de-sac that is in excess of the maximum allowed of five hundred (500') feet in length. The proposed cul-de-sac approximately thirteen hundred (1300') in length.

VAR. STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

Variance Request 1

Mr. Parker read the variance request.

Mr. Jimmy Bagwell stated he was available to answer any questions relating to this variance request. Mr. Tyndall asked Mr. Bagwell if, for the record, he could detail why this variance is needed. Mr. Bagwell stated that the southern portion of this property has some extensive sloping in the range of 20 to 25 percent. This does not allow them to make internal connections within the property. He stated that Rotary Park is also on two sides of this property which prevents them from stubbing a road on those sides. He stated that this is why they are requesting this variance.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he wanted to go on the record and state that he, the staff and Mr. Bagwell have tried to work a number of different scenarios based on what their future plans are here. He stated that it is a rapidly developing area and other options for connectivity are just not available for this property.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kelly moved to recommend approval of the variance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs and carried unanimously.

Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval.

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

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

CASE NUMBER: S - 43 - 2018 APPLICANT: Holly Point, LLC

REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of SUMMERFIELD SECTION 2C (CLUSTER)

LOCATION: North of Tylertown Road, west of Parade Drive, west of and adjacent to Winterset Drive.

MAP: 008 PARCEL(S): 004.00 p/o ACREAGE: 16.28

OF LOTS: 66 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

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

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 45 - 2018 APPLICANT: Fox Crossing Partnership
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of LOCUST RUN SECTION IB (CLUSTER)
LOCATION: West of of I-24, south of Rossvie Road, north and east of Powell Road, east of and adjacent to the terminus of Ellie Piper Circle
MAP: 057 PARCEL(S): 108.00 ACREAGE: 24.21
OF LOTS: 89 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 49 - 2018 APPLICANT: Edutech, Inc.
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of EDUTECH INC PROPERTY MCGREGOR ROAD LOTS 1-4
LOCATION: Immediately north of the intersection of Port Royal Road and McGregor Road.
MAP: 035 PARCEL(S): 022.06 ACREAGE: 6.16
OF LOTS: 4 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL BY MINOR PLAT PROVISIONS

CASE NUMBER: S - 50 - 2018 APPLICANT: Syd Hedrick
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WEST HIGH SUBDIVISION
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to West High Street, north of and adjacent to Blackman Street, west of Charlotte Street, east of Bradley Street, approximately 150 feet west of the intersection of West High
MAP: 066 O PARCEL(S): B 006.00 ACREAGE: 0.95
OF LOTS: 12 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 51 - 2018 APPLICANT: Welch Farms LLC
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of SAVANNAH GLEN
LOCATION: West of and adjacent to Sango Road, south of Lake Pointe Drive, west of the terminus of Summergrove Lane.
MAP: 082 PARCEL(S): 136.00 ACREAGE: 17.70
OF LOTS: 36 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 52 - 2018 APPLICANT: Welch Farms LLC
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of SAVANNAH CROSSING SECTION 2
LOCATION: South of Sango Road, at the terminus of Summergrove Lane.
MAP: 082 PARCEL(S): 136.00 ACREAGE: 1.98
OF LOTS: 6 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 53 - 2018 APPLICANT: Maynard Family Co

REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of WESTHAVEN SECTION 1

LOCATION: East of and adjacent to Tobacco Road, south of Nussbaumer Road.

MAP: 030 PARCEL(S): 006.00 p/o ACREAGE: 31.37

OF LOTS: 68 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

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

CASE NUMBER: S - 54 - 2018 APPLICANT: James Vick

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of JAMES VICK PROPERTY ASHLAND CITY RD LOT 1-3

LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Ashland City Road, approximately 205 feet west of the Glenstone Blvd. and Ashland City Road intersection.

MAP: 088A PARCEL(S): C 001.01 ACREAGE: 1.53

OF LOTS: 3 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS

CASE NUMBER: S - 55 - 2018 APPLICANT: Gordon Seay

REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of AUTUMNWOOD FARMS 11C

LOCATION: South of Tiny Town Road, north of Hazelwood Drive, east of Spring Haven Drive, at the terminus of Rushmore Road.

MAP: 018 PARCEL(S): 016.00 ACREAGE: 17.64

OF LOTS: 51 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 56 - 2018 APPLICANT: Reda Homebuilders, Inc.

REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of MORNINGWOOD

LOCATION: North of and adjacent to Ogburn Chapel Road, west of Dotsonville Road, east of Double R Blvd., approximately 1150 feet west of the Ogburn Chapel and Dotsonville Road intersection.

MAP: 077 PARCEL(S): 013.06 ACREAGE: 56.19

OF LOTS: 44 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

Recommendation for disapproval of final plat based on the fact that the name of the subdivision "Morningwood" and road name "Morningwood Drive" is a slang term and is reasonably inappropriate to the average citizen. In addition, there is a potential detriment to emergency response times which should be avoided. The applicant, potential buyers, and the neighboring residents, including children, must be considered when choosing names for subdivisions and roads. Public planning has long been charged with protecting the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of present and future inhabitants per TCA, and we will continue to uphold this charge.

Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval.

Mr. Reda stated that he received preliminary plat approval 18 months ago. He stated that there were some questions about some of the names at the time, such as whether Morningwood would be one word or two words. He stated that at that time he felt that everyone had their concerns addressed and it was passed. He stated that the name Morningwood is used for road names in many different locations, including in Nashville, and he provided a printout showing some of those.

Mr. Tyndall stated that Mr. Reda referenced an e-mail. He stated that we did furnish, within 12 hours of his e-mail, examples of subdivisions which have had names changed by the Commission after preliminaries approved the road names. He stated that Mr. Parker has that e-mail. He stated he would read into the record the list that was generated which included Griffey Estates, West Creek Farms, Whitewood and Tracy Lane. He stated that these are just some which have had road names changed within the last year or two. He stated that it is not unprecedented that something like this would be required as it has in the past.

Mr. Reda stated that he believes that is a little bit different. He stated that he believed that the investor or the developer wished to change the name and it was changed through the planning committee. He stated that there was not one example brought to him on a preliminary plat, of 18 months ago, where it was forced and approval of the subdivision was denied on a final plat. Mr. Parker stated that what normally happens when a road name is suggested to be changed, for whatever reason, be it duplication or other, the road name is changed. He cannot think of a time when it has not been changed and a recommendation of disapproval was needed. Mr. Reda stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he would go on the record as Planning Director and stated that due to the fact that other planning commissions, other cities and other counties in this great Country may have either missed it or these road names may have come to be passed before planning was even in place, maybe in the 1930s, 1940s or 1950s, it does not excuse future actions to do this. He stated that the word Morningwood is not a tree, it is not a plant. He stated that it refers to one thing and if you Google it, it will show up quickly what it refers to. He stated that he stands behind the Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Reda stated that when he was called on this issue two and a half weeks ago, he and the mayor spoke personally on the telephone. He stated that he is a friend of his and he did not see a problem with the name Morningwood. He stated that he did not see a problem with the name Morningwood Drive, either as one word or two words. He stated that the mayor asked him if he could compromise and he stated that he did so by removing Double D Court and replacing it with Joker Way. He stated that he is compromising and he asks that the Planning Commission approve this today.

S-56-2018 (CONT.):

Ms. Walker asked if for clarification she could be given the names of all of the roads in the subdivision. Mr. Parker stated that the roads included Morningwood Drive, Hemp Court, Woodpecker Way, and Joker Way. Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Reda did not see any possible effects of people willing to buy a property with road names such as hemp. She stated that very conservative people may not want an address that is Hemp Court. She stated that we are in the State of Tennessee which is a very conservative state. Mr. Reda stated that he is in the Tennessee Hemp Program. He stated that he is American Grown LLC and grows hemp and manufactures the oil. He stated that he sees nothing wrong with names such as these. He stated that he already has six buyers wanting to purchase lots and he does not foresee any problem with selling these.

Mr. Tyndall stated that for clarification, unlike when we deal with a sign or a mural or other things that involve a First Amendment right, what we are proving here today is the Government's acceptance of these road names and not necessarily an individual's right to express themselves through the First Amendment.

Mr. Reda asked how this was approved 18 months ago and now the sudden change. Mr. Powers stated that road names are not approved at preliminary because it could sit on the table for years and someone else could record the same road name. Mr. Tyndall stated that the final plat is when everything is recorded once it goes to the Register's Office. He stated that is when it gets addressed and the road names become official. Ms. Walker asked if this is clarified in the process. Mr. Tyndall stated that this is how it has always been done and that is how it is done in Tennessee. He stated that we will be working to further clarify this going forward.

Mr. Reda stated that he had not received one example where it was changed 18 months down the road. He stated that he would think something was being taken away from him if it is not approved today and if it has never been done in the past. Mr. Tyndall stated that we also do not have examples of developers proposing questionable road names. He stated that Mr. Spainhoward could provide some examples of road and subdivision names which had changed. Mr. Spainhoward stated that, as stated in the e-mail, when there is a road name change issue usually Ms. Russell is the one who comments on those and they are normally changed verbally. He stated that there were four instances in the past five years where there was a final comment sheet provided to an engineer or a representative where a road name had to be changed at the final. He stated that there were about 300 instances where road names were requested to be changed at a preliminary stage. He stated that he provided Mr. Parker with the comment sheets he had reviewed and as a courtesy to Mr. Reda had searched that information. He stated that it is not something that we track but that a couple of hours were spent gathering the information for a response to Mr. Reda.

Mr. Reda stated that Mr. Spainhoward would have been the one that, at this podium, voted this 100 percent 18 months ago and at the time he stated that they had discussed this name. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he does not know of any of the planning commissioners going through and vetting subdivision names. He stated that the review is done by the staff here. He stated that the majority of the time it is Mr. Parker and if he needs an opinion there is other staff to fall back on. He stated that in this case the subdivision name was brought up between the preliminary and the final and it was addressed. Mr. Reda asked if he had any e-mails back in the past where they had talked about Morningwood 18 months ago that Mr. Spainhoward was saying that did not take place. Mr. Reda stated that it did take place. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he is sure they have probably discussed multiple street names. He stated that he believes what initiated the process was that there was a name change. He stated that he believed there was a Reda Estates and the two subdivisions did not connect so we had asked for the subdivision name to be changed.

Mr. Reda asked why do the road names need to be included on the preliminary if they are not being approved at that time. Mr. Spainhoward stated that it is a multistep process. He stated that just because a preliminary is received for a subdivision does not mean it will ever be built. He stated that we request those names so that in cases where multiple developments are going on at the same time and we get in alignment, we get comments from the Fire Department. He stated that we want street names so that if they are going to be developed at the same time, and tie, there is continuity. Mr. Reda stated that if he does not keep the names someone is going to take them. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he was not going to debate this any further. Mr. Reda asked Mr. Spainhoward if he approved it 18 months ago and today was not going to approve it. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he does not have a vote on a subdivision and that is the basis of the Planning Commission based on the review of the subdivision coordinator. Mr. Reda asked if Mr. Spainhoward got an opinion on the matter. He stated that Mr. Spainhoward

recommended approval of this 18 months ago. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he believed Mr. Reda was mistaken. He stated that he does not make any recommendations since he has been the zoning coordinator.

Mr. Powers stated that he does not review road names. He stated that they look at the concept of it and as a previous design engineer he has made plenty of preliminary plats with Road A, Road B, Road C or a set of road names that ultimately change. He stated that it is not unusual for road names to change. He stated that Mr. Reda had stated this was approved as a preliminary and he stated that he totally disagrees. He stated that we are not approving road names at a preliminary and they are not locked in at preliminary. He stated that the fact that this came up between preliminary and final is a normal situation and he would encourage Mr. Reda to do what is right and do what is decent and just compromise. He stated that Mr. Reda had made some compromise and it was appreciated but he feels he should go one step further. He stated that the reason it has never come to this is that they have never had a developer say they are not going to change a name. He stated that just because it has happened in other places does not mean we should do it here.

Mr. Swift announced that the public hearing is closed. Mr. Kimbrough asked what was the availability for deferral. Mr. Tyndall stated that he would defer to Mr. Parker but stated that he does believe this can be deferred by the Planning Commission. Mr. Parker stated that the Planning Commission does have a right to defer it. Mr. Tyndall stated that a reason would need to be given for deferral. Mr. Nichols stated that he just wanted to clarify for the commissioners and he stated that it is the questionable word but he wished to speak it. He stated that he was looking at the definition on Google and proceeded to read the search results aloud.

Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend deferral to allow time to resolve the name issue to everyone's satisfaction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Grubbs. Ms. Walker asked Mr. Reda if he was willing to have these conversations to resolve this if they defer it. Mr. Reda stated that he would like to get it over with today. The motion carried with Mr. Nichols and Ms. Walker opposing.

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 57 - 2018 APPLICANT: Eagles Bluff
REQUEST: Final Approval of RESERVE AT SANGO MILLS (CLUSTER) (PREVIOUSLY CALLED THE JOINER PROPERTY)
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Sango Road, north of Hwy 41A South, west of Smith Lane, approximately 100 feet southeast of the Sango Road and South Woodson Road intersection.
MAP: 082 PARCEL(S): 093.04 ACREAGE: 36.52
OF LOTS: 97 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 10
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

CASE NUMBER: S - 58 - 2018 APPLICANT: JR Development
REQUEST: Final Plat Approval of FARMINGTON SECTION 5B PHASE 2
LOCATION: North of Rossview Road, east of Rollow Lane, west of Kirkwood Road
MAP: 039 PARCEL(S): 025.21 ACREAGE: 11.99
OF LOTS: 25 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: S - 59 - 2018 APPLICANT: Fields Of Northmeade Partnership
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of WELLINGTON FIELDS SECTION 4 (CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT)
LOCATION: North of Rossview Road, south of Kirkwood Road, west of Upland Terrace, north of and adjacent to the northern terminus of John Duke Tyler Blvd.
MAP: 034 PARCEL(S): 052.02 & 052.03 ACREAGE: 85.67
OF LOTS: 183 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS: Mr. Swift noted that these cases are heard on a consent agenda unless there is a need to pull one of the cases for separate consideration. Mr. Parker stated that there are two subdivision cases which need to be pulled from the consent agenda. He stated that the first was case S-37-2018 which has a variance request which needs to be discussed and have a separate motion and hearing. He stated that case number S-56-2018 also needs to be pulled from the consent agenda. Mr. Parker read the cases and gave the staff recommendation for approval. There being no more discussion, Mr. Grubbs moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Walker and carried with Mr. Powers abstaining from case number S-50-2018.

VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS:

CASE NUMBER: SR - 32 - 2018 APPLICANT: RISE HOLDINGS, LLC

Agent: David Buckel

DEVELOPMENT: CLARKSVILLE COMMONS REDEVELOPMENT

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL/RESTAURANT/DENTAL OFFICE

LOCATION:

MAP: 081,050.04(P) ACREAGE: 1.72

CIVIL DIST.: 11

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

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 33 - 2018 APPLICANT: SHANE LEMAY

Agent: Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: PREWITT LANE TOWNHOMES

PROPOSED USE: MULTI FAMILY

LOCATION:

MAP: 042,013.00 & 014.00 ACREAGE: 4.3

CIVIL DIST.: 6

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 by the City Traffic Engineer.
 3. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.
 4. Subdivision plat completed.
 5. Approval of a landscape plan.

CASE NUMBER: SR - 34 - 2018 APPLICANT: GRAYS CHAPEL

Agent: Pastor Jim Roberts

DEVELOPMENT: GRAYS CHAPEL NAZARENE CHURCH

PROPOSED USE: RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY CENTER

LOCATION:

MAP: 148,020.01 ACREAGE: 8.74

CIVIL DIST.: 22

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, NO CONDITIONS

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 35 - 2018 APPLICANT: MAIN STREET INVESTMENT

Agent: Houston Smith

DEVELOPMENT: JACK MILLER APARTMENTS

PROPOSED USE: MULTI FAMILY

LOCATION:

MAP: 019, 033.00 (P) ACREAGE: 13.27

CIVIL DIST.: 3

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

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval from the Airport prior to release of a building permit.
 2. Approval of a landscape plan.
 3. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.
 4. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer.

Mr. Swift noted that site plan reviews were acted upon in a consent agenda unless any particular case needed separate attention. Mr. Clemmons gave the staff reports.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kelly 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/YEAR TO DATE BUDGET TO ACTUAL: Mr. Tyndall stated that originally we were projected to have a loss of approximately \$147,000. He stated that we closed the year with a loss of only \$82,000. He stated that per our budget this year this situation should improve. Ms. Walker asked who covered the \$82,000. Mr. Tyndall stated that the Planning Commission has a fund balance that has annually been depreciating for about the last 8 years.

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

B. NEW BUSINESS: Mr. Tyndall stated that there has been a lot of discussion this past month regarding the Morningwood Subdivision Case which was heard. Due to that, we feel that there is an opportunity to update the Subdivision Regulations for more clarity. He stated that one of the applicants had stated that nothing says that your road names at preliminary are not your road names. He stated that there is but there are going to be some proposed small amendments to the Subdivision Regulations. He stated one will be to add the word proposed under the preliminary section that says all of the road names are proposed road names and proposed subdivision names. There will also be a couple of caveats under the final plat approval process that say this is the point where road names and subdivision names are approved by the Regional Planning Commission and those are final. He stated that this is the process which has always been in place but we are just going to add the language to clarify that. He stated that we are also going to use this opportunity to potentially look at other items such as increasing the cul-de-sac length, as this is a frequently requested variance. He stated that it is currently 500 feet. He stated that we would propose to possibly increase that to 750 feet and we are going to set up meetings with the Emergency Services and Street and Highway Departments. He stated that there are a couple of other things that we would like to look at and bring back a package next month. He stated that at this time he would like to have a motion that we look at the Subdivision Regulations for those amendments plus some other items which we have found. Mr. Tyndall stated that he would also like to add a clarification that regardless of what the Subdivision Regulations have, Mr. Reda has an active application which would be grandfathered in the previous version, however he does still feel that we are acting appropriately on that matter.

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

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

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

ATTEST:

Richard Swift, CHAIR