



# City of Franklin

109 3rd Ave S  
Franklin, TN 37064  
(615)791-3217

## Meeting Minutes Franklin Municipal Planning Commission

---

Thursday, April 23, 2015

7:00 PM

Board Room

---

### CALL TO ORDER

- Present** 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Hathaway
- Absent** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

### MINUTES

1. [15-0414](#) March 26, 2015 FMPC Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [MeetingMinutes032615](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that this Planning item was approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, and Commissioner Orr
- Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

### CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Ms. Hunter stated that the Land Use Plan public meetings will be held at the Eastern Flank Battlefield Event Facility, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. on Monday, May 4, Tuesday, May 5, and Wednesday, May 6. The meetings will offer a citywide Land Use Plan update, and everyone living in the City of Franklin is invited to attend the meetings to discuss how Franklin plans to grow in the future.*

*Mr. Anthony stated that the City hosted a Smart Growth Workshop in March of 2015. One of the ideas discussed at the workshop was form base zoning, which is not at all a new idea in Franklin as it has been floated around for a long time. After a discussion with the infill working group in late March, staff decided to pursue additional information on form base zoning and has invited two nationally recognized form base experts, Mary Madden and Geoff Ferrell, to come to Franklin and conduct an introductory workshop on form base codes for both the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission (FMPC) and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen (BOMA). Ms. Madden and Mr. Ferrell will be at the public presentation on form base zoning on Tuesday, June 16, 7:00 p.m., at City Hall. They will also lead a workshop for the FMPC and the BOMA the following morning, and Mr. Anthony will send an invitation to everyone.*

*Chair Hathaway asked Ms. Hunter if she would like to be more specific regarding the Land Use Plan and the days the different character areas would be discussed.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that staff planned to divide the City into different parts and talk about different areas each night, but staff does not want to discourage people from coming the night they can actually make it. Staff will discuss any neighborhoods, which they need, regardless of the night, but in general Monday night would be West Harpeth and Berrys Chapel, so mainly West Franklin. Tuesday night would be Central Franklin, Carnton, and McEwen Character areas, so most of the central part of the City and Cool Springs. Wednesday night would be the southern and eastern portions of the City, which would be Seward Hall and Goose Creek, South Hall and McLemore Character areas. Again, she urged everyone to not worry about everything in too much detail because staff would love to see the public whenever they can make it.*

## VOTE TO PLACE NON-AGENDA ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

## CONSENT AGENDA

### Approval of the Consent Agenda

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Orr, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, and Commissioner Orr

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

## SITE PLAN SURETIES

2.     [15-0396](#)     Alexander Plaza Subdivision, site plan (Zaxby's); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
3.     [15-0397](#)     Avalon PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 3, 97 dwelling units in 117 lots; accept the landscaping improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
4.     [15-0398](#)     Avalon PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 5; accept the landscaping improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
5.     [15-0399](#)     Cool Springs East Subdivision, site plan, section 24, lots 11 and 703 (Hilton Garden Inn/Medical Office Building); accept the landscaping Lot 703 improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
6.     [15-0400](#)     Franklin Housing Authority PUD Subdivision, site plan, revision 1 (Granbury and Strahl Street); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping future improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
7.     [15-0401](#)     Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, sections 1-4; accept the landscaping section 1, landscaping section 1 (street trees), landscaping section 3 and landscaping section 3 (street trees) improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**
  
8.     [15-0402](#)     Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 8 and 9; accept the landscaping street trees, landscaping open space section 1, part 8 and 9 and landscaping open space lot 2001 and 1047 improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

9. [15-0403](#) Jamison Station PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 1; accept the landscaping (Phase 2) improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
10. [15-0404](#) McKays Mill PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 32 (Hadden Hall Area); extend the performance agreement for landscaping improvements for six months. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
11. [15-0405](#) McKays Mill PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 37; release the maintenance agreement for landscaping Phase 2 (lot 1517) improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
12. [15-0406](#) Morningside PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 9, lot 21; accept the landscaping and landscaping retaining wall improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
13. [15-0407](#) Through the Green PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 1 (The Grove at Shadow Green); accept the streets and landscaping improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
14. [15-0408](#) Village at Clovercroft PUD Subdivision, site plan, sections 1 and 2; release the maintenance agreement for landscaping Phase 8 improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
15. [15-0409](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 10; accept the landscaping (Phase 2) improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**

16. [15-0410](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 17, revision 2; accept the landscaping Phase 2 (north of Oleander) improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
17. [15-0411](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 19; accept the landscaping Phase 2 (open space) improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
18. [15-0412](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 24; accept the landscaping improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
19. [15-0413](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 29, revision 1; release the maintenance agreement for landscaping improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**

**REZONINGS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

20. [15-0392](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of Resolution 2015-27, To Be Entitled, "A Resolution Approving A Development Plan Revision 6 For Highlands At Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, With 3 Modifications Of Standards (MOS1-Parkland Dedication In Floodplain To Be Used As Canoe Access; MOS2-Allow Impervious Paving Surface For Canoe Access; MOS3-Receive Future Credit For Land Dedication In Excess Of 1.21 Acres), Located Along Carothers Parkway And Long Lane, By The City Of Franklin, Tennessee." (FMPC 04/23/15 7-0, 05/12/15 WS)

**Attachments:** [MAP](#)

[5800 Conditions of Approval](#)

[Development Plan Layout](#)

[Res 2015-27 Highlands at Ladd Park DP Rev 6](#)

*Mr. Andrew Orr stated that the most notable changes to this development plan include the reconfiguration of Section N, which is the section that is completely detached from Ladd Park and the addition of 53 homes to the Planned Unit Development (PUD). Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward this to the BOMA with a favorable recommendation.*

*The applicant is also requesting three Modifications of Standards (MOS), all related Parkland Dedication. They are as follows:*

*MOS1 - The applicant is requesting the dedication of land entirely in the floodplain. The land would be used as canoe and river access. The Parks Department and staff are in full support of this request because of the importance of this location to the Harpeth River Blueway, and it provides first responders access to the river. Staff supports this request.*

*MOS2 - The applicant is requesting using an impervious surface for the canoe access parking. The City owns and maintains a canoe access at the site of the former lowhead dam. In talking with the Parks Department, they believe the pavers are no longer functional because floods have filled the pavers with sediment, rendering them impervious. For the purpose of long-term maintenance, staff supports this request.*

*MOS3 - The applicant is requesting that future credit be given for parkland dedicated to the City in excess of 1.21 acres. The additional land would be used for any additional lots added to the PUD at a later date. Staff supports this request.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for comments from the citizens.*

*No one came forward.*

*Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.*

*Mr. Greg Gamble, of Gamble Design Collaborative, stated that he represented the applicant, and he requested a favorable recommendation to the BOMA.*

*Mr. Harrison moved to favorably recommend approval of item 20 to the BOMA, and Mr. Franks seconded the motion.*

*Ms. McLemore moved to recommend approval of MOS1 to the main motion, Mr. Harrison seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously (7-0).*

*Mr. Orr stated that he would like for staff to state their recommendation, again, for MOS2.*

*Chair Hathaway stated that the Planning Commission would get a motion first, and then staff could re-state the recommendation.*

*Mr. Harrison moved to recommend approval of MOS2 to the main motion, and Mr. Franks seconded the motion.*

*Mr. Andrew Orr stated that the applicant is requesting to use impervious surface for the canoe access parking. The rationale is that the City owns and maintains a canoe access at the site of the former lowhead dam. That is paved with pervious pavers. The Parks staff states that the pavers are no longer functional because sediment has built up in the pavers. To avoid the long term maintenance issues that could arise, staff recommends asphalt or something that is impervious.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that the idea of pervious pavers was intended to be a good thing. She had heard about this in other situations. She was sorry that Commissioner Lindsey was not at this meeting because he was one who had mentioned something about this. The original idea was to give better drainage, and there is not any compensation for not doing that.*

*Mr. Gamble stated that canoeing along the Harpeth has grown in popularity. Waters Edge is putting in a canoe launch. Rizer Point has a canoe launch. There are several that are being added along the river. This intersection of the Harpeth River and Carothers Parkway creates a unique opportunity for that emergency access that is not in some of the other neighborhoods or communities. One of the reasons that the applicant is asking for the canoe access parking to be asphalt for the permanence is for access down to the river for ambulances for emergency crews. In addition to some of the other things that the Parks stated, is seen as one of the critical sites or critical canoe launches for the emergency access off the river.*

*Ms. Gregory asked if there were different types of pervious pavers and if this would always happen in a floodplain.*

*Mr. Orr stated that it would always happen in a floodplain.*

*Mr. Orr stated that the canoe access would be in an area that floods frequently versus an area that does not flood.*

*With the motion to recommend approval of MOS2 having been made and seconded, it passed unanimously (7-0).*

*Mr. Harrison moved to recommend approval of MOS3 to the main motion, and Mr. Orr seconded the motion.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that if the applicant asked for additional units, did this mean that it would only be granted up to what was necessary for the number of units?*

*Chair Hathaway stated that she was correct.*

*With the motion to recommend approval of MOS3 to the main motion having been made and seconded, it passed unanimously (7-0).*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Orr, that this Resolution was recommended favorably to the Board of Alderman Work Session meeting on 5/12/2015. All three modifications of standards were also favorably recommended. The main motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, and Commissioner Orr

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

#### **SITE PLANS, PRELIMINARY PLATS, AND FINAL PLATS**

21. [15-0084](#) Cool Springs East Subdivision, final plat, section 1, revision 5, lots 5 & 6, located at 9009 & 9021 Carothers Parkway. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Attachments:** [MAP](#)

[4719 Conditions of Approval April 2015](#)

[4719 Plat](#)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

22. [15-0390](#) The Carothers Development Property Subdivision, final plat, revision 2, easement revisions, on 16.60 acres, located at 1217 Liberty Pike (Venture Office Building). (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Attachments:** [MAP](#)

[5810 Conditions of Approval](#)

[5810 Final Plat](#)

**This Planning Item was approved.**



23. [15-0382](#) Fair Park Cottages Subdivision, preliminary plat, creating 9 single-family residential lots and 2 open space lots on 3.10 acres, located at 1006 Fair Street.

Attachments: [5751 Fair Park Cottages PP Map](#)  
[5751 Fair Park Cottages PP, Conditions of Approval\\_01](#)  
[5751 Fair Park Cottages PP PLAN](#)

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that staff feels that this site is an appropriate location for infill, as it utilizes existing infrastructure, creates a variety in housing type, and promotes walkability. It creates 8 new buildable lots accessed by a private drive off of 11th Avenue. The floodplain for the site is contained within open spaces. All houses front a single drive, and all new development is contained behind the existing setback line along 11th Avenue. All of the new lots will maintain the minimum lot size required for traditional design standards, although several of the proposed lots are very close to the minimum and include part of the private drive within the lot. An 18' incompatible lot size buffer is required along the south, west, and east borders of the development. Lastly, the majority of the lots lie within the Historic Preservation Overlay, so the houses will be reviewed against the historic guidelines before the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) will be granted. Therefore, staff recommends approval with conditions.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for comments from the citizens.*

*Mr. John Ordnung, of 311 11th Avenue North, stated that he had lived at this address since 1995, and this was the first time that he had spoken before the Planning Commission. Essentially item 23 is a situation where an astute businessman has asked to subdivide his piece of land in such a fashion as to have 9 opportunities for development, which is effectively going to increase the value of his investment. Against that one has to weigh the impact that this has on the integrity and the nature of the adjoining neighborhood. Mr. Ordnung stated that he had grown up in Fort Lauderdale, Florida in the early 60s. He remembered Fort Lauderdale as a town before it became a city. Eventually with the condominiums and zero lot lines, he saw it become New York south. At some point and time, Franklin will have to face the realization of what is done with two lane highways, such as Hillsboro Road, Franklin Road, Highway 96, and what the weekday morning traffic. There are unintended consequences that impact the unique neighborhoods that Franklin has. Eventually with incremental measures, such as this, one destroys a situation like this and ends up with a situation like south Florida. He encouraged the Planning Commission to consider this and to vote no.*

*Mr. Jim Crutchfield, of 1012 Fair Street, stated that he and his wife had lived at this address for 42 years. He concurred with what his neighbor, Mr. Ordnung, had said and added that there is a very large square block bounded by Highway 96, Fair Street, 9th Avenue North, and 11th Avenue North. The backs of their houses face a nice rural type atmosphere with woods and a little bit of open land, which means a lot to them. He was not against progress, but it looked to him as though there should come a time when development balances its wishes and desires against what homeowners and small business owners desire. He wanted his name to go on record that he was opposed to item 23.*

*A gentleman in the audience stated that he also opposed item 23.*

*Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.*

*Mr. Sean DeCoster, of Civil Site Design Group, stated that he was representing the applicant, they agreed with staff comments and requested approval of item 23.*

*Mr. Harrison moved to approve item 23, and Mr. Franks seconded the motion.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that some of the lots included parts of the private drive. It was difficult to see this, even with the paper copy. However, it looked as though some of the lots had the entire private drive. She could understand the driveway, but she could not understand the private drive for the subdivision, and she would like to hear staff discuss this.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that she believed the intent was that since this was going through the Preliminary Plat process to get the square footage required by ordinance, the private drive may have been placed in those lots and have an easement over it rather than taking the right-of-way and taking it out of the actual lot in order to meet the City's current Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance requirement for minimum lot size. That was Ms. Hunter's perception from just looking at this.*

*Alderman Petersen asked how it was allowed that a normal street would be included as part of a lot.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that a public right-of-way could not be included in a portion of a lot, but since private streets are essentially PUDEs with an access easement, they can be included within a lot.*

*Alderman Petersen asked if there was another situation in the City where that has occurred.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that it had occurred in LedgeLawn.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that the property lines go to the middle of the street.*

*Ms. Allen stated that she had a problem with that. Her opinion was that this was a mistake. She thought if one did not have enough land to qualify for minimum lot sizes without including the private drive, one had too many lots. She would not be able to support item 23.*

*Alderman Petersen noticed that part of it would have to be two lanes. Maybe on the piece, which she had discussed, the northern most part could be one lane; however, on the other part it would have to be two lanes because one would have to go in and out.*

*Mr. Jason Goddard, of Design Studio, stated that he had been working with the applicant and staff over the past year in the development of this plan. The intent with the private driveway and the easement development was not to squeak in with the lots. When they started working with staff several months ago, they had the intent to build a street that was more like a private driveway, similar to what was developed at LedgeLawn. They felt that it was a driveway rather than a through street to bring some intimacy to the street with the houses that are on it. It was at that point and time that it was discussed with Engineering and staff that the best method would be to have a right-of-way rather than to have a private driveway, which has an easement associated with it rather than right-of-way.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that it did make the numbers work.*

*Mr. Goddard stated that this was the way the numbers worked out, but it was the intent to create that driveway and that character, and then the plan was driven in conjunction with that driveway.*

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that was 18 feet of paved surface.*

*Mr. Goddard stated that they provided Auto turn templates, showing the City's Fire Department's vehicle.*

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that this was a modified version and not the standard street section, but it was approved through the Design Review Team (DRT). All of the city departments looked at it, which included Fire and Engineering and agreed that it would be acceptable. It is not the usual, it is smaller by 2 feet.*

*Alderman Petersen asked how the sidewalk and grass strip were going to work with what she considered to be the building envelope.*

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that the public utility drainage and access easement did abut the building setback line. The buildings do not have to be placed at the setback line, but they could be.*

*Alderman Petersen noticed that it said, "the drainage easements were within the 5 foot side setbacks." The topography there goes down rather fast.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that it was common practice to have 5 feet between buildings with a drainage easement. They had looked at the drainage areas, and they should be able to handle that with the areas provided. They are also providing a pervious driveway to facilitate the capture of stormwater as well as bioretention areas to meet the current regulations.*

*Alderman Petersen asked about the bioretention areas.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that there were three bioretention areas, and only one area was in the floodplain.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that it was very difficult to see where the floodway and floodplain were on her plans, but everything was going to it.*

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that no new lots were being created in the floodplain, but they were very close.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that she could not tell where lot 100S was located.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that 100S was right outside of the floodplain. It was adjacent to the stream buffer that will be created, but the floodplain was actually about 20 feet farther towards the stream than the stream buffer.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that much of the stream buffer was floodway.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that all of the floodway would be located in the stream buffer. This was not any where near the floodway.*

*Mr. Franks asked if the private drive was built to City standards, and if the applicant would lose the number of lots, or if stays the same where the City takes it over.*

*Mr. DeCoster referred the question to Mr. Goddard who stated that they would have to go back, study, and re-work the calculations.*

*Mr. Franks' point was that the applicant would have much more runoff and more hard surface there if the applicant went with a wider right-of-way in such a small development.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that more than likely, having a public right-of-way in this development would require going through the PUD process in order to get this number of lots because of the setbacks and minimum lot size. One would end up having smaller lots, and that would trigger a PUD submittal to alter that lot size from what is in the Zoning Ordinance.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that the lot size in an R-3 zone was 4,000 square feet in Traditional. In Conventional, the minimum lot size was 5,000 square feet.*

*Mr. DeCoster stated that all of their lots exceeded 4,000 square feet with most being over 5,000 square feet. One lot is 4,137 square feet, but that was the closest one.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that the one that was 4,000 square feet was out in the road. It had both lanes inside the lot.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that someone from the City's Engineering Department should comment if this would even be accepted as public right-of-way. It was more than likely a private street because of the way it is designed. This may be the only option in terms of acceptance by Engineering and the City's DRT.*

*Ms. McLemore stated that this was a good opportunity for an infill development. The infill guidelines need to come sooner than later. The process needs to be sped up as much as possible because more and more infill will be coming to the Planning Commission. Existing neighbors are most likely going to be in opposition, so staff needs to come up with some guidelines.*

*Mr. Franks stated that if this was a Community Housing Project, they would want 25 or 30 units if they were trying to fill Workforce Housing, so it is inevitable that something is going to happen there. Whether it is a 4,000 square foot lot or a 2,000 square foot lot the amounts of lots are the same.*

*Alderman Petersen asked if the City had 2,000 square foot lots, and Mr. Anthony stated that some were very close.*

*Ms. McLemore asked if the process with item 23 qualified for the applicant to not have a neighborhood meeting.*

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that the applicant had to do a public notification, so all neighbors within a 500 foot radius were notified of this public meeting, but they did not have a separate neighborhood meeting.*

*Ms. Allen stated that she knew they had to think about infill; however, she felt as a Planning Commissioner they would have to on a case-by-case basis still decide what is and what is not appropriate for a particular piece of land, and infill for the sake of infill*

*does no one any good.*

*Mr. Scott Black, of Bristol Development, stated that the applicant still had to go before the Historic Zoning Commission for review of the design. He felt it was important that they engage the neighborhood and make sure that the neighbors are involved in that part of the process and are committed to do that in that process so that they will be involved and engaged throughout. What is presently before the Planning Commissioners is what they understand the regulations allow on that site. There will be continued approval processes, so this is not the last process.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that there are some modifications that the Planning Commissioners have not generally seen.*

*Ms. Allen wanted to make sure this would be accepted as a City street and not a private road from now on.*

*Ms. Hunter stated that it would be private, and if staff needed to look into whether a public street under this configuration would be accepted, it would need further review and could not be done at this meeting.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Franks, that this Planning Item was approved with conditions. The motion failed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 3 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner McLemore, and Commissioner Franks

**No:** 4 - Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, and Commissioner Orr

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

24. [15-0395](#) Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, site plan, revision 4, lot 137 (Touchstone Office Building) a 21,000 square foot building on 1.45 acres, located at 1360 Moher Boulevard.

**Attachments:** [5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, MAP, Site Plan, Lot 137.pdf](#)  
[5740 Conditions of Approval Gateway Village PUD Site Plan Lot 137.pdf](#)  
[5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Site Plan, Lot 137, Full Set Final.pdf](#)  
[5740 Arch Elevations Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Site Plan, Lot 137, Full Set Final.pdf](#)

*Mr. King stated that at the March 26 Planning Commission meeting, the site plan was deferred based on the architecture. Staff has worked with the architect during the last month, based on the comments received from the members of the Planning Commission. Staff has prepared a similar side-by-side comparison that was seen last month along with the revised design. With the existing buildings that are built in Gateway, the architect was trying to balance the client's desire for a distinctive building while still replicating other features found within Gateway Village. In each one of the facades, Mr. King annotated the modifications that were made, based on the feedback from the Planning Commission and the feedback staff gave to the architect and the continuing features found in other buildings within the site. Staff recommends approval with conditions for item 24.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for comments from the citizens.*

*No one came forward.*

*Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.*

*Mr. Michael Hindman, of H. Michael Hindman Architects, representing Touchstone Medical Imaging, stated that he had met with staff, and Mr. King had been very helpful in working with them. Mr. King had previously described very well the changes that had been made to the building, and Mr. Hindman requested approval of item 24.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner McLemore, seconded by Commissioner Harrison, that this Planning Item was approved with conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, and Commissioner Orr

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lindsey

25. [15-0394](#) Longview Subdivision, final plat, revision 1, lots 11 and 12, one light industrial lot on 3.32 acres, located at the intersection of Werthan Circle and Merrill Drive (Private Drive) off Columbia Avenue. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Attachments:** [5798 Longview Subdivision, FP, Lots 11+12.pdf](#)  
[5798 Longview Subdivision, Lots 12+13, FinalPlatfull.pdf](#)  
[5798 Longview Subdivision, FP, Lots 11+12, COA](#)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

26. [15-0380](#) Tywater Crossing PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 4, creating 18 single family lots and 2 open space lots on 4.796 acres, located on Downs Boulevard, between Willow Springs Boulevard and West Main Street. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Attachments:** [5804 Tywater Crossing PUD Subd, FP, Sec 4, MAP](#)  
[5804 Tywater Sect 4 FP, Conditions of Approval\\_01](#)  
[Tywater PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 4 PLANS](#)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**ADJOURN**

*There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.*

---

*Chair Michael Hathaway*