



City of Franklin

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft Franklin Municipal Planning Commission

Thursday, March 26, 2015

7:00 PM

Board Room

CALL TO ORDER

Present 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

MINUTES

1. [15-0310](#) February 26, 2015 FMPC Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [FMPCMeetingMinutes2-26-15](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Petersen, seconded by Commissioner Lindsey that this Planning Item was approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Lindsey

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Powers stated that public hearings would be held for the upcoming Growth Management and Character Area Updates for the Land Use Plan. They are presently scheduled to be held on May 4 to May 6, 2015. Staff does not have all of the information, but the Planning Commission was encouraged to schedule the days in their calendars so that they would be available for the meetings. The meetings would be an accumulation of all of the activities that had been discussed last budget year in terms of density to infrastructure and doing some visualization of what needs to be in character areas. Staff will also be looking at infill and infill options over the next several months, and meetings will be coming up for that as well. She anticipates it will be a busy time for the Planning Commission.

Chair Hathaway stated that the Planning Commission would love to get a variety of responses from these public meetings. It would help the Planning Commission, and the elected officials would love to hear the citizens' comments.

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 McLemore, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused: 1 - Commissioner Franks

SITE PLAN SURETIES

2. [15-0305](#) Generals Retreat PUD Subdivision, site plan; extend the performance agreement for sidewalk and streets improvements for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)
This Planning Item was approved.

3. [15-0306](#) Silver Grace PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 1; release the maintenance agreement for sewer improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)
This Planning Item was approved.

REZONINGS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

4. [15-0317](#) Consideration of Ordinance 2015-04, "An Ordinance to Rezone 2.2 Acres from Estate Residential (ER) District to Detached Residential 3 (R-3) District for the Property Located at 1048 Carlisle Lane."

Attachments: [Ord 2015-04 ORDINANCE 1048 Carlisle Lane.docx](#)
[5778 Map Carlisle Lane, Rezoning, Section 1, Revision 2.pdf](#)
[5778 Site Layout Carlisle Lane Rezoning.pdf](#)
[5778 Affidavit of Public Notice Carlisle Lane Rezoning.pdf](#)
[DSmith_Email.pdf](#)
[5778 FullSet_CarlisleLane Subdivision. Rezoning Request.pdf](#)

Mr. King stated that the applicant was requesting a rezoning to Detached Residential 3 District (R-3) from Estate Residential. As noted in the staff report, the rezoning request is compatible with the neighboring properties on the east side of Carlisle Lane. The site currently has one single family detached residential unit and with the rezoning the 2.2 acres could have a maximum of four units. The site is gently sloping to the interior of the site with no floodplain or other notable features. There is a utility easement running across the rear one-third of the site.

It is important to note two items at this time:

- 1. At this time, no development plan or entitlements are being requested by the applicant. Staff has had discussion with the applicant regarding the property's future uses, but there are no entitlements associated with this rezoning request.*
- 2. The City of Franklin's Major Thoroughfare Plan calls for selected improvements to Carlisle Lane. The final alignment of these improvements is not yet finalized. City Planning and Engineering staff have been working with the applicant and keeping them informed of the progress of the separate plan revision. As no entitlements are associated with this rezoning, the applicant is aware of the potential risk the roadway improvement project could have on this site.*

Staff has spoken with three neighbors of the site, two of which were included in the Planning Commission packets. All have expressed concerns over the traffic impacts on this site.

With these issues in mind, staff recommends a favorable recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen (BOMA) for this rezoning.

Chair Hathaway asked for comments from citizens, and no came forward.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant present.

Mr. Greg Gamble, of Gamble Design Collaborative, stated that his client was interested in a future preliminary plat and a final plat that would subdivide this property into four lots. This property is approximately two acres, and these lots would be much larger lots than the 60' x 120' lots at Blossom Park. They are also taking into account the transition as they are going from Blossom to Carlisle Lane and feel that this would be appropriate. The applicant requests a favorable recommendation to the BOMA for this rezoning.

Mr. Harrison moved to favorably recommend approval of Ordinance 2015-04 to the

BOMA, and Ms. McLemore seconded the motion.

Alderman Petersen asked if any of the citizens wanted to speak on behalf of item 4.

Chair Hathaway stated that he had given that opportunity for citizen comments before the applicant had spoken.

Mr. Tim Gill, of 1044 Carlisle Lane, stated that he was unaware that he had been called and that his property adjoined this proposed project. All of the houses on Carlisle are multiple acres, which is much different from what the applicant was proposing. He asked how close the proposed property setbacks would be and if this would affect his view. They had spent money on screening along that property line to screen for one house. Now there would be possibly four additional houses, which would be much closer to the property line.

Mr. Gamble stated that with the R-2, R-3 zoning, both of them had setbacks of five feet. The property, to which Mr. Gill referred, was one of the wider lots that the applicant would be proposing. Many of these issues would be worked through with the preliminary plat. The applicant had not had a chance to discuss transitional features and transitional landscape buffers with staff. These are part of the Zoning Ordinance, so as one transitions from larger lots to smaller lots the Zoning Ordinance does require some landscape features. The applicant will work with staff to satisfy those. He will be happy to meet with the neighborhood as well as walk them through the landscape plan.

Chair Hathaway asked if anyone else wanted to speak. He stated that he did not want to cut off citizens who may not have realized that they could have spoken earlier.

Alderman Petersen asked Mr. Gamble if he could tell everyone about the setbacks.

Mr. Gamble stated that in R-3 zoning, a sideyard setback was five feet with a six foot setback between dwellings. Again, because of the nature with the triangle lot, when this is seen at the preliminary plat stage it is much wider, and there would be more of a setback along that property line as a result. It was hard to explain without the visual of a preliminary plat. He will be working with staff, and if he needs to meet with the neighbor and walk him through that, he would be happy to do so.

Alderman Petersen asked what the frontyard setbacks were, and Mr. Gamble stated that they were 30 feet.

Mr. King stated that he thought there might be confusion as to whether the proposed development would be under a conventional or traditional design, and more information would be known with the preliminary plat.

Alderman Petersen asked about the work on Carlisle Lane, which had been shown. Several possibilities were going to be shown at the BOMA, but because the meeting ran over so late, the Aldermen did not get to look at them.

Mr. King stated that Planning and Engineering had been working both internally and with the applicant's representative to convey the potential risks to the site to all the different alignments, and this is something that all sides are aware of at this time.

Alderman Petersen asked if there would be a neighborhood meeting in the Carlisle area.

Mr. King stated that the path that had been chosen did not require a neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Holzen stated that there was an April 9 public meeting scheduled at 6:30 p.m. to look at all of the different alignments with all of the homeowners adjacent to this property. The purpose of the meeting is to get input from the residents on the future alignment and the impact it has on the various properties in this area. Staff can then take the information and get approval on the alignment study from the BOMA. Ultimately this would come back to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Lindsey asked Mr. Holzen if he was talking about a realignment of Carlisle Lane.

Mr. Holzen stated that the Major Thoroughfare Plan calls for realignment as development occurs in this corridor. Engineering has to reserve the right-of-way for future improvements. There are no improvements being done at this time, or any time in the near future, but as this area develops, this is something for which the City staff has to plan.

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner McLemore, that this Planning Item was recommended favorably to the BOMA Worksession and to the Board of Mayor and Alderman meeting on 4/14/2015. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Lindsey

5. [15-0312](#) Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, development plan, revision 5, (Apollo Burger) a -3,894 square foot building on 1.16 acres and revision to formal open space, located at 3020 Stansberry Lane.

Attachments: [5739 MAP Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, DevPlanRev5.pdf](#)
[5739 REVISED Conditions of Approval 032615](#)
[5739 Site Layout Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Development Plan Revision 5, Apollo Burger.pdf](#)
[5739 Color Elevations, Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Development Plan Revision 5, Apollo Burger.pdf](#)
[5739 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Development Plan Revision 5, Apollo Burger.pdf](#)

Mr. King stated that the applicant was requesting a development plan revision to allow for a 3,894 square foot restaurant located near the intersection of Moores Lane and Franklin Road. The original development plan called for a different alignment of buildings and a 15 foot walkway to the intersection.

While staff has seen the proposed elevations of the building, full design elevations are approved at the site plan stage. Staff has been working with the applicant on the preliminary stormwater on the site as well as the number of required parking spaces as both have been issues with other sites in Gateway Village Subdivision.

Staff recommends approval with conditions for this development plan revision.

Chair Hathaway asked for comments from citizens, and no came forward.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant present.

Mr. Ray Flake of Civil Engineering Services stated that he represented the applicant and requested approval with conditions for this development plan revision.

Mr. Harrison moved to recommend approval of item 5, and Ms. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Orr stated that there would be a drive-through burger restaurant in the gateway to Franklin, and Chair Hathaway stated that he was correct.

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Allen 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 Lindsey

No: 1 - Commissioner Orr

SITE PLANS, PRELIMINARY PLATS, AND FINAL PLATS

6. [15-0322](#) 7007 Moores Lane PUD Subdivision, final plat, (surety revision), 3 lots on 18.3 acres, located east of the intersection of Moores Lane and Franklin Road and on the south side of Moores Lane. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [4628 7007 Moores FP Map](#)
[#4628 Conditions of Approval_01](#)
[2014-09-04 13-134-01 Final Plat](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

7. [15-0302](#) Andover Park PUD Subdivision, final plat, 5 lots on 1.57 acres, located at 1126 Liberty Pike. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5789 Andover Park PUD Subd. FP MAP](#)
[5789 Andover Park PUD Subd. FP. Conditions of Approval_edited](#)
[5789 ANDOVER FINAL PLAT](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

8. [15-0301](#) Carawood Subdivision, final plat, 7 residential lots and 4 open space lots on 2.85 acres, located at 3150 Boyd Mill Avenue. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5777 Map Carawood Subdivision, Final Plat.pdf](#)
[CarawoodConditions of Approval_01.pdf](#)
[5777 Carawood PUD Subdivision, Final Plat.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

9. [15-0311](#) Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 3, lot 136, abandonment of a 15 foot access easement, located at 3020 Stansberry Lane. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5741 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, MAP FP, Section 3.pdf](#)
[5741 GatewayVillage FinalPlat Conditions of Approval_01.pdf](#)
[5741 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, FP, Section 3.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

10. [15-0304](#) Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, site plan, 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](#)
[5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision Layout Plan.pdf](#)
[5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Site Plan, Section 1, Revision 4, Colorelevations.pdf](#)
[5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Touchstone Imaging Architecture.pdf](#)
[5740 Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, site plan, Lot 137, Full Set .pdf](#)
[Architecture of Gateway Village](#)

Mr. King stated that at the January 22, 2015, the members of the Planning Commission expressed their desire to review the architecture of this site plan, so it was being brought back at this meeting as a side-by-side with some of the existing architecture within the Gateway Village Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mr. King referred to the architecture, projected on the screen, and stated that the Touchstone Imaging Center was the building on the right, and the buildings on the left were examples of other commercial buildings within the development. Some of them showed different varieties of flat roofs while others had pitched roofs, but predominantly staff was looking at the window styles of the two buildings, the roofs and the overall design of the structures. Staff is recommending disapproval of item 10, but ultimately it is the Planning Commission's decision.

Chair Hathaway asked for comments from citizens, and no came forward.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant present.

Mr. H. Michael Hindman, of H. Michael Hindman Architects, stated that he represented the applicant Touchstone Imaging Center. He stated that Touchstone was a corporation, currently located in Maryland Farms. They are owners and managers of medical imaging facilities around the country. They have outgrown their facility in Maryland Farms and are looking forward to moving to Gateway Village in Franklin. The applicant had previously presented a more contemporary design, and based upon the comments from staff had revised the design to where it is today. They are extremely pleased with their concept and what they are proposing. Although they are not trying to duplicate what is there at Gateway Commons, they are trying to match the scale and the quality of materials that are there. This building is substantially brick with half stone and only some accent materials up at the top. The windows on this building are different from the other buildings. Their goal is to try to create a building that looks like it is an old industrial or factory building on the edge of town that does allow for the large windows. These windows are a common thing that one would find in a traditional environment such as this. The building steps down to the buildings behind it, which are two stories. The front of the building has three stories. This building is approximately 90 feet from the buildings behind it. Mr. Hindman requested approval of item 10 from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Franks moved to approve item 10, and Mr. Orr seconded the motion.

Mr. Orr asked why the building was stepped down in the back.

Mr. Hindman stated that there were two reasons. The first was that they had a goal of reaching 21,000 square feet for the building, but they were restricted in their footprint, which was why they had three stories with a half story on the third story. This allowed for the great roof terrace placing that towards the back, which was also placing it towards the south side. This is appropriate for the location of that terrace plus it also steps down towards the existing building.

Chair Hathaway stated that he thought it was clear that the applicant had put a lot of effort into trying to make a nice building. The question for the Planning Commission was does this building have the same character as Gateway Village, which is fully developed. The character and context of Gateway Village had to be considered. He was not saying this was good or bad, but if it were in a different part of the City would the Planning Commission think that it fits in with that character.

Mr. Franks stated that the buildings behind the proposed Touchstone Imaging Center building were very institutional and predictable looking. He thought that the variety that this building offered out in front was an excellent transition to representation of a quality building in the variety that is out there and has a nice blend. He thought it was a great looking building and would improve the property values for the institutional buildings behind it.

Ms. Allen stated that although she was usually harping on how the City makes the applicants get into "pretty," looking at the building standing alone, she thought it was a great, progressive building. However, when she looks at it in comparison to the surrounding buildings, it sticks out like a "pretty sore thumb." When this building is taken outside of the village, it looks a little off.

Mr. Harrison stated that he would like to echo Ms. Allen's comments. The building does look good; however, it does not appear to fit in architecturally with the Gateway design, and he will not support it.

Vice Chair Lindsey stated that the Planning Commission fought to get industrial-looking buildings around the Factory but not around Gateway Village.

Mr. Franks stated that the alternative to Mr. Hindman's drawing was what was seen at Gateway presently. The apartments, that are directly behind this proposed building, are not seen on the drawing, and that is what stands out in Mr. Franks' mind. Does the Planning Commission want the proposed building to go all the way to the road, or does it want something that enhances the apartments and institutional look that is behind it? The illustration of the one-story building that is beside it is not a fair representation of what the entire site plan is showing.

Mr. Hindman stated that the photographs compare the proposed building to the one-story buildings that are some distance away. It does not show that there are three and four-story buildings immediately behind this building. In scale, it is in keeping with the existing three-story flat roof commercial buildings that are in the park. It is shown next to the Goddard School Building, which is 260 feet away. He does not think it is a fair comparison.

Alderman Petersen stated that going to the bottom of the site plan, it showed Camden Commons, and it showed another one that was in the corner.

Mr. Orr stated that if the top of the building could just be clipped off, it would help.

Mr. Hindman stated that, at this point, they would be willing to do this. They have asked for input over the last couple of months, and they have not had any comments other than what was in this report.

Chair Hathaway stated that he would entertain an amendment to the motion if anyone wanted to made the amendment.

Mr. Franks asked if Mr. Hindman would be better off to withdraw item 10 until the April 23, 2015, Planning Commission meeting and come back, remove the parapet on top, and look more like the apartments behind the proposed building.

Ms. Powers stated that removing the parapet might make the proposed building look more like the apartments behind it, but the windows were the big issue. The industrial feel of the windows was not what Gateway was trying to attain when it was conceived. The Planning Commission should also look at the roofline and the parapet. The roof is very different than what is seen in Gateway Village. The proposed Touchstone Imaging Center would be a great building for the Cool Springs area.

Vice Chair Lindsey asked if there were components in the pattern book that lend to the three story office building such as this.

Ms. Powers stated that there could be a three-story office building, but the architecture was the issue.

Mr. Hindman stated that they had complied step-by-step with everything in the pattern book and everything that was in the Gateway Standards. They are willing to make modifications, they just do not know what modifications are being requested. Mr. Hindman stated that they would rather get deferred to the April 23, 2015, Planning Commission meeting than to be turned down and have to submit a month from now for a meeting two months from now.

Mr. Franks moved to withdraw his motion to approve item 10, and Mr. Orr withdrew his second.

Ms. McLemore stated that the applicant needs to bring something back to the April 23 meeting that is consistent with the buildings that are in Gateway Village.

Mr. Hindman stated that he understood that, and in his opinion Gateway Commons was not what anyone anticipated that it would be. There is a mixed bag of quality at Gateway, and they had tried to step-up from what is there. There is much EFIS and sub-standard materials in Gateway, and they had tried to put a building there that is several steps above what is at Gateway Village. They want to be compatible, they just do not want to take several steps backward.

Ms. Allen stated that Mr. Hindman could still use quality materials, just in a different way. She recommended that he get with staff and ask what they would like to see there.

A motion was made by Commissioner Franks, seconded by Commissioner Allen that this Planning item was deferred to the April 23, 2015, Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Lindsey

11. [15-0314](#) The Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 27, 37 residential lots and 3 open space lots on 10.07 acres, located east of Carothers Parkway along Ryecroft Lane and Newcomb Street. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Map](#)
[5783 Conditions of Approval](#)
[Final Plat](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

12. [15-0265](#) The Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 13, second 6-month site plan extension to October 16, 2015, for 38 detached residential units and 4 open space lots on 11.75 acres, located along Snowden Street and Alfred Ladd Road, west of Carothers Parkway. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Map](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

13. [15-0318](#) Peak 10 Subdivision, final plat, one lot on 8.84 acres, located at 4600 Carothers Parkway. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Peak 10 Map](#)
[5784 Conditions of Approval](#)
[Final Plat](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

14. [15-0303](#) Rizer Point PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 4, 18 residential lots and 2 open space lots on 15.47 acres, located along Reese Drive, north of Del Rio Pike. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5779 Map Rizer Point PUD Subdivision, Final Plat, Section 4.pdf](#)
[5779_RizerPointPUD_Conditions of Approval_01.pdf](#)
[5779_Rizer Point PUD Subdivision, final plat, Sec 4signedplat.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

15. [15-0320](#) Selah Subdivision, preliminary plat, 12 detached residential lots and 4 open space lots on 9.55 acres, located at 3140 Garden Club Court.

Attachments: [5793 Selah Subd, PP MAP](#)
[5793Conditions of ApprovalREVISED](#)
[5793 Selah Preliminary plat](#)

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that this proposal subdivides a 9.55 acre lot into 12 detached residential lots. A cul-de-sac is extended off of Garden Club Court into the property. An incompatible lot size buffer is provided in the northeast corner of the development, but the majority of the property is surrounded by already developed and subdivided land. Information from TDEC now qualifies the wet weather conveyance at the south end of the property as a stream and as such, buffers will need to be extended; but otherwise this meets all zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Chair Hathaway asked for comments from citizens, and no came forward.

Ms. Barbara McDole, of 140 Coreopsis Court, stated that she was a member of the Homeowners Association (HOA) for Garden Club Estates. When she moved into her house, McEwen was the first street in the area before the turn-around and 4-lanes were opened. This was closed and renamed Garden Club Court, so they do not have the traffic that they had in the past. If someone is coming in to develop this property, will it be opened back up for the new McEwen entrance and for the entrance. What will the homes be priced for this new development? The Garden Club Estates have held their price and actually gone up in price since she and her husband bought theirs in 2009.

Mr. David McDole, of 140 Coreopsis Court, asked what was the plan for ingress and egress in their area.

This ended citizen comments.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant present.

Mr. Daniel Woods, of the Addison Group, stated that he represented the applicant, and they were in agreement with staff comments. This project will not be connected to McEwen Drive and will only connect to Garden Club Court. He has had those discussions with Carl Baughman, Traffic Engineer, for the City of Franklin. As far as the value of the homes, he could not give an exact number because these will be at market level and are at the 2015 prices, he would anticipate that these will be significantly more expensive than Garden Club Court, which is next door. He felt confident in the value of the homes as well.

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

Aye: 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Lindsey

16. [15-0267](#) Spencer Creek Place Subdivision, final plat, revision 7, two detached residential lots on 2.74 acres, located at 1107 Gray Fox Lane. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5780 Map, Spencer Creek Place Subdivision, FP.pdf](#)
[5780 Spencer Creek Place Subdivision Conditions of Approval_02.pdf](#)
[5780 FP, Spencer Creek Place Subdivision, Revision7.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

17. [15-0321](#) Westhaven PUD Subdivision, final plat, Section 30 (Surety Revision), 12 detached residential homes and 3 open space lots on 17.61 acres, located along Cheltenham Ave. (CONSENT AGENDA)

This Planning Item was approved.

LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENTS

18. [15-0298](#) Franklin Land Use Plan Amendment for Central Franklin Special Area 9 and the addition of a Special Area 10 (5th Avenue North area).

Attachments: [CF Special Areas 9 and 10 FMPC 3 26 2015.pdf](#)
[MAP CF SA revised 9 and new 10.pdf](#)

Ms. Kelly Dannenfelsler stated that the amendment before the Planning Commission tonight was the result of the Community Planning Assistance Study through their American Planning Association (APA) study, stake holder input and illustrations created by local design professional volunteers on the Fifth Avenue North area. It also includes the direction staff was given at the January 22, 2015, Joint Conceptual Workshop. The amendment calls for allowing redevelopment to occur along the outer fringes of the floodplain in this corridor while continuing to recommend open space and recreational uses in the deeper floodplain. Staff recommends approval of this Land Use Plan amendment with one correction to the text. On the third page, under the heading Fourth Avenue North, North Margin Street, the second sentence should read, "Small scale office uses are appropriate, and building height should not exceed two stories." If the Planning Commission approves this amendment, staff will begin to draft the text amendments to allow the implementation of this Land Use Plan.

Chair Hathaway asked for comments from citizens.

Ms. Mary Pearce, of 103 Woodview Court, stated that since the flood the whole Fifth Avenue area had been so down in the hills. It does need the attention that the City's Planning Department and Planning Commission are giving it. She is concerned that the Juice Bar has reopened, and French's has redone their building recently. There is another building for sale that has an opportunity to be raised up and redone, and this looks to her as being beautiful. She thought, however, that it contemplates the things that have been done just going away, such as when one sees the drawing and no longer thinks the Juice Bar belongs there, French's Boots, or Alexander Automotive. She did not know if this should be addressed, but that is a concern she has. The Fifth Avenue area seems to be emerging more in a small town way where downtown is being broken away and going more into a suburban use. She thought this would be a great building somewhere else but needs to be tweaked a little at this location.

Ms. Powers stated that this was a vision of what could be built at this location. The City does not have any requirements nor does it have any intention of taking out the things that are there and are producers for the City. Staff is looking at should those businesses go out of business or 50 years from now, what can be placed there and what does the City see as a vision for that area. This is the vision for the area where it is not built up. The City is not looking to displace anyone.

Mr. Harrison moved to approve the Land Use Plan Amendment for Central Franklin, and Mr. Franks seconded the motion.

Alderman Petersen stated that her concern was that perhaps this study was not realistic whenever one looks at how much money would have to be put into this area that basically is in the floodplain. As the CPAT people stated, it would be financially difficult as well as architecturally difficult to get something that would work there. She appreciated the design that was shown where there was parking on the bottom floor. The things that she has seen, which have been built back from the flood and where parking was on the first floor, were things like hotels or motels. The houses that she has seen that are in this area are in a depth of flood and have parking underneath them, and then they have big

steps that come up. She does not see the amount of investment that these nice looking pictures would require. She also has a very definite feeling about encouraging development in the floodplain. It seems a very large reach to go this far. The drawings showed a future connection through Alexander and up onto the John Deere place and over Sharps Branch. Sharps Branch would require a bridge, not just a culvert. The study seemed unrealistic to her.

Vice Chair Lindsey asked the Planning Commission to bear in mind that this study was done by unpaid, but extremely talented and knowledgeable volunteers. This was a conceptual look at what could be done at this location and what is a significant commercial corridor coming into the City. Accepting the fact that one cannot build at ground level, the Juice Bar did not exist when this drawing was created. Also, French's and Alexander Automotive were rebuilt. However, much of the area has stood vacant for years. In the event of another flood who knows if Alexander or French's will bounce right back into their facilities. Multiple floods have a way of dampening one's enthusiasm for the location and the business. The Juice Bar had to take the roof off of their building to get the ground floor high enough to meet the floodplain standards. Anything that gets built will have to get built on an elevated foundation. This site has an elevated use level with the parking garage below it. It can flood, and one can pressure wash the mud out and open up for business the next week. This plan is conceptual, but it does go to the whole concept that much consideration has to be given when building in a place that has this much floodplain.

Alderman Petersen stated that this was where she had the concern, and this would require a large financial commitment.

Mr. Franks asked if all of this area was in the floodplain.

Maps were shown to indicate how much was in the floodplain.

Mr. Franks stated that it looked as though staff was identifying the corridors coming into Franklin from whether it is from Franklin Road or whether it is from Columbia Avenue or Hillsboro Road. It seemed to him to be consistent architecture. He asked if this was the goal of staff.

Ms. Powers stated that this was just a vision. What staff receives when someone actually applies may not look exactly like this, but staff likes the idea of underground parking where it allows a pedestal to build up. Staff hopes to encourage that type of vision as they move forward in this area.

Ms. Allen asked if the money for fees in lieu of sidewalks and in lieu of parks could be taken and the area made into a park if no one decided to put money into the project and develop it.

Ms. Powers stated that there are areas where staff says that there is no development and that the floodplain is just too deep for development.

Ms. McLemore stated that this area was difficult, and she thought this team did an excellent job and came up with this concept. These things may not happen, but at least there is now something to look at and go by.

Vice Chair Lindsey stated that in the event of additional disaster, the potential for FEMA to do buyouts would potentially come in to play in a place such as this. The floodplain

can be built in as long as consideration is given for cuts and fills, and that was the intent of leaving an open parking structure underneath.

Alderman Petersen asked what was the depth of the 100 year flood in parts of this area.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that she believed the base flood elevation was currently about 637 and it raises up to 639 with the new FEMA maps. It increases the average base flood elevation by about 2 feet in this area. It spans 8 to 10 feet between Bridge Street and North Margin Street, so it goes from about 640 to 630 in that stretch of the Fifth Avenue corridor.

Alderman Petersen asked if that meant that an additional 10 feet would have to be built above plus another foot. She stated that this is an area that is very difficult to build in.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that the stakeholder meetings were split about 50 percent with about one-half wanting to see open space and one-half wanting to see re-development opportunities. That is why this design concept is being seen with re-development allowed in the southern block and green space to the north of North Margin and Mount Hope Streets where French's Boots and Sonic are located, which is along the stretch with deeper floodplain.

Alderman Petersen stated that it was also deep right around North Margin Street.

Chair Hathaway asked if it would be appropriate to add language to say that the City does not discourage individual buildings and a smaller scale streetscape along this area.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that there was something that said that, "The recent rehabilitation (referring to the Juice Bar) was to further address the street infill within this framework." She referred to the streetscape rendering and asked everyone to visualize the Juice Bar in the streetscape flow, and that would be appropriate.

Chair Hathaway stated that he liked the exercise, and it gave a sense of the most intense plan that everyone would be comfortable with, and one could back off from that. Maybe this could be perceived as a Cool Springs look, but he still would not want to discourage a more eclectic kind of street if that were to be how it would naturally develop.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that this was a conceptual design. There could be many, and this was not vetted through the Historic Zoning Commission for architectural design, so there is that additional scrutiny and review on anything that would be done on that side of the corridor.

Alderman Petersen stated that there was nothing else close to this that was three stories. She asked if this was the Land Use Plan.

Ms. Dannenfelser stated that it was, to which Alderman Petersen stated that this would only go to the Planning Commission.

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Franks that this matter was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, and Commissioner Lindsey
- No:** 1 - Commissioner Petersen

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.