



# City of Franklin

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

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Franklin Municipal Planning Commission

---

Thursday, October 22, 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. September 24, 2015 FMPC Minutes

**Attachments:** [9-24-15-FMPC Minutes](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Lindsey to approve the September 24, 2015, Minutes as presented. The motion carried b the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

### CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

NON-AGENDA ITEM: Eddy Lane Industrial Office Subdivision, site plan; extend the performance agreement for landscaping Phase 1B improvements for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)

*Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that this was a landscape performance agreement extension that was prepared for the agenda, but was placed on the wrong agenda, and the staff asked that the Planning Commission consider this item to be placed as a non-agenda item because it does have a time sensitivity attached to it.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner McLemore, seconded by Commissioner Harrison, to hear the item, which would be added to the consent agenda as item 21. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

## CONSENT AGENDA

### Approval of the Consent Agenda

**A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Allen, to approve the Consent Agenda for items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, and 21. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

## SITE PLAN SURETIES

2. Cool Springs Life Science Center Subdivision, site plan; extend the performance agreement for landscaping and landscaping street trees improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
3. Hardison Hills PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 3; release the maintenance agreement for landscaping (section 6) improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
4. Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, sections 1-4; release the maintenance agreement for landscaping section 2 (street trees) and landscaping section 4 (street trees) improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
5. Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 5 (Neighborhoods H and F); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping Phase 1 improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
6. Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 7 (Neighborhood A); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping Phase 1A and landscaping Phase 1B improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
7. McEwen Place PUD Subdivision, site plan, lots 145, 146, 147 and 157 (Parking Revision); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping lot 145 improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**

8. South Park Subdivision, site plan, section 1, revision 2, lot 7 (Keystone Center); extend the performance agreement for access and sidewalks improvements for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
9. Town of Franklin Subdivision, site plan, (Harmony Home); release the maintenance agreement for landscaping and drainage bioretention improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
10. Village of Eddy Lane Subdivision, site plan; extend the performance agreement for landscaping and landscaping tree replacement improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**
11. Westhaven PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 15, resubdivision of lot 4032 (Live-Work Units); extend the performance agreement for landscaping improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)  
**This Planning Item was approved.**

#### **REZONINGS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

12. Consideration of Ordinance 2015-58, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Rezone 38.5 Acres From Specific Development-Residential District (SD-R 9.16) To Specific Development-Residential District (SD-R 10.6) For Property Located At Southwinds Drive, 1801 Brockton Place, And 549 Oak Meadows Drive." (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0; 1st Reading 8-0 11/10/15)  
SECOND OF THREE READINGS

**Attachments:** [ORD 2015-58 Southwinds redline](#)  
[5946 Woodlands RZ Lots 12 13 14 15](#)

*Mr. Humber stated that the purpose of Ordinance 2015-58 was to correct a mathematical error.*

*When this property was classified as Special Development--Residential District (SD-R), it was given a 9.16 density. Ordinance 2015-58 will correct it to what it should have been given, which would be a density of 10.6.*

*It is recommended that Ordinance 2015-58 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for approval.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

*Alderman Petersen asked if the problem was that there were many things that had been approved but had never been built.*

**Commissioner McLemore moved, seconded by Commissioner Harrison, that approval of Ordinance 2015-58 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

13. Consideration Of Ordinance 2015-59, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Rezone 5.19 Acres From Specific Development-Residential District (SD-R 9.16) to Attached Residential 20 District (RM-20) For Property Located At 780 Oak Meadow Drive" (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0; 1st Reading 8-0 11/10/15)  
SECOND OF THREE READINGS

**Attachments:** [ORD 2015-59 OakMeadow redline](#)

[5946 Woodlands RZ Lots 21](#)

[Woodland Subdivision \(Oak Meadow Drive\), rezoning lot 21 PLAN](#)

*Mr. Humber stated that Ordinance 2015-59 also corrected a mathematical error in the density. This property was incorrectly classified as SD-R 9.16. Ordinance 2015-59 will it rezone the property to Attached 20 Residential District (RM-20), which would allow approximately 102 units to be built on this 5.19 acres. That will be consistent with the original entitlement this property was given. Approval of Ordinance 2015-59 is recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

**Commissioner Lindsey moved, seconded by Commissioner Harrison, that approval of Ordinance 2015-59 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

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



14. Fair Park Cottages Subdivision, preliminary plat, creating 8 single-family residential lots and 2 open-space lots on 3.10 acres, located at 1006 Fair Street.

Attachments: [5939 Fair Park Cottages PP.pdf](#)  
[Fair park Prelim Plat resubmittal.pdf](#)  
[5939 Fair Park Conditions of Approval 01.pdf](#)

*Mr. King stated that this preliminary plat had some modifications made to the one that the Planning Commissioners had seen previously. The number of lots had been reduced to eight single residential lots. The staff recommends approval of item 14.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments.*

*Mr. John Ordnung, of 311 11th Avenue North, stated that this was the third time that he had had the opportunity to speak about item 14. One of the first times that the Planning Commission spoke about this item, they discussed infill. He stated that infill was simply intended to provide a more efficient use of a city's infrastructure. If this request is approved, a more efficient use of Franklin's infrastructure will not be provided but rather the traffic congestion will be increased, green space will be reduced, and mature tree life will be destroyed. The applicant has engaged both attorneys and professional engineers who will come to this meeting to state that this application meets the letter of the law, and Vandalia Cottages met the letter of the law, and another Vandalia Cottages is not needed. This application is incompatible with the adjoining neighborhood. The applicant has chosen to never engage the community and make a case. He urged the Planning Commission to reject item 14.*

*Mr. Bryan Echols, of Waller Law, represented item 14 and stated that this was a redo of a plat that had come before the Planning Commission on April 23, 2015. In addition to the reduction of two lots on this new plan, there were significant other changes, mainly responding to the concerns raised by the Planning Commission and the inclusion of a public street including onstreet parking. He quoted a couple of sentences from Mr. Julian Bibb, of 918 Fair Street, who had sent a letter to the Planning Commissioners. "A decade ago, I was fortunate to chair the Steering Committee for the development of the Central Franklin Area Plan. Over 14 months, 23 community meetings, a walking tour together with City staff, and we created a plan designed to guide further activity and development into the City. Infill development is addressed in that plan. The shared proposal is precisely what the plan envisioned for these few remaining properties. The plan mentioned this property specifically and encouraged maintaining high residential, now R3 zoning, in Hincheyville, on the south side of Highway 96 and resisting the push back for office, residential and/or more commercial. Under the residential infill section, the plan sites several reasons why the construction of new homes in the historic core is desirable, calling it an effective means of increasing the variety of housing types and price ranges available within Central Franklin and ensuring the continued vitality of the downtown core." Mr. Bibb's position is that the proposal is well within the current zoning as has been recommended by the City's Planning staff after 18 months of study and alterations, and it is the highest and best use of the property. The applicants believe that they have responded to the concerns addressed by both neighbors, staff, and the Planning Commission. The applicants are accepting of the one condition of approval and they requested approval of item 14.*

*Mr. Harrison moved to approve item 14, and Mr. Franks seconded the motion.*

*Ms. Allen asked Mr. Baughman to address how the traffic stacking would be effected in this area.*

*Mr. Baughman stated that left turns into the site were prior to the intersection. Turning left out could have a challenge, but it would be an all way stop so the vehicles would take their turn.*

*Alderman Petersen asked what the dimensions were for the lots.*

*Mr. King stated that he had measured each of the lots, and all of them were above the 4,000 square foot minimum.*

*Alderman Petersen asked about page C3.00, note three, the first nine residential lots.*

*Mr. Echols stated that this was a typographical error. There were eight residential lots on the plat, which differed from the previous plat because there were two existing homes on this plat that were not on the previous one. However, there were six new lots with eight total.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that now they had the street, which met the standards.*

*Mr. Orr asked if each of the houses had their own driveway.*

*Mr. Scott Black stated that this would be determined when they worked through Engineering at the site plan stage. They would have to go through the Historic Zoning Commission for the house design, and when this was done they would incorporate the driveways as well.*

*Ms. Gregory stated that she had gone out and walked this site, and the property could not be seen from Highway 96, Fair Street, or 11th Avenue because of all of the trees and the vegetation. She would support item 14 because she felt that it was almost a pocket neighborhood, and she thought it was well designed.*

*Vice Chair Lindsey stated that a lot of good and bad infill are seen. He appreciated the changes that were made to this project to reduce the density size and to make it more drivable. Excessive density is a great danger to producing a good infill project. The City needs infill, and it is early in the process of continuing discussions within the Planning staff. It is important that the Planning Commission give consideration to what is good for Franklin relative to how the lots are filled inside the City and the center core of the City.*

**Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Franks, that approval of item 14 be approved with conditions. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

15. Franklin Industrial Park Subdivision (APCOM), Site Plan, 57,750 square foot warehouse addition on existing Light Industrial Use on 15.11 acres (Consent Agenda)

**Attachments:** [Franklin Industrial Park Subd. site plan APCOM Map.pdf](#)  
[Conditions of Approval 01.pdf](#)  
[2015.10.01 APCOM REV-1.pdf](#)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

16. Williamson County Agricultural Exposition Center, Site Plan, Revision 1 (Parking Addition)

**Attachments:** [5851 AgExpo Center Site Plan.pdf](#)  
[5851 MAP Ag Center Parking Addition.pdf](#)  
[5851 Conditions of Approval 6.15.2015.pdf](#)

*Mr. King stated that the site plan before the Planning Commission was a parking lot addition for the Williamson County Agricultural Exposition Center, located on Long Lane. The site plan has been significantly modified from the item that was deferred a few months ago. The applicant and their engineer have gone back and redesigned the site to reduce the visual viewshed impacts. The entire lot is still within the City's hillside/hillcrest overlay, and that was the main decision behind the staff recommendation of disapproval for this item.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

*Mr. Jason Deal, of Collier Engineering, stated that they were the engineers for the county. As Mr. King stated, this site plan was for a parking lot expansion that the county was requesting to facilitate larger events that are occurring at the Agricultural Center to facilitate the extra overflow parking. Their initial directive from the county was for over 1,000 parking spaces, and that did significantly impact the hillside. They went back and had reduced that number to about 300 parking spaces just due to how that facility was built. The existing facility was built back to the edge of the hillside, and there is really no way to avoid impacting the hillside or the hillside overlay. They certainly understood the staff's concerns, and they understood that they were directly impacting the zoning ordinance, but they did request the Planning Commission's approval of item 16.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that this was probably the case except for stormwater.*

*Mr. Deal stated that a grading permit still had to be pulled so they had worked and put together a stormwater quality element to the parking expansion that they were proposing.*

*Mr. Harrison asked how high into the hillside the applicant would be cutting.*

*Mr. Deal stated that the center cut would be about 32 feet, and it sloped down from there to grade at both ends. A similar cut had been made at the Peytonsville section where Long Lane ties in. The original approach was about a 75 foot cut so that was reduced some.*

**Commissioner Allen moved, seconded by Commissioner Franks, that item 16 be approved. The motion passed by the following vote:**



**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

## ORDINANCE AND TEXT AMENDMENTS

17. \*Consideration of Ordinance 2015-21, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Amend Chapter 8, Section 8.3, And Chapter 4, Sections 4.1.4 And 4.1.6, Of The Franklin Zoning Ordinance, Which Regulate Accessory Uses And Structures, And Chapter 3, Section 3.5.6, Central Franklin Character Area Overlay District, To Permit Accessory Dwellings in Certain Special Areas." Establishing a Public Hearing for December 8, 2015. (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0)

**Attachments:** [Ordinance 2015-21 - Accessory Dwellings Text Amdt ZO.docx](#)

[MAP CFCO Special Areas to Allow Accessory Dwellings.pdf](#)

[MAP Residentially Zoned Properties within CFCO Accessory Dwelling Special Areas.pdf](#)

*Ms. Dannenfelser stated that Ordinance 2015-21 allowed accessory dwellings in some areas of Central Franklin. It had been discussed and vetted at two Joint Conceptual Workshops. It was before the Planning Commission with a change to address how height is measured for one story structures to address grade changes across the lot. Accessory dwellings are recommended by the Franklin Land Use Plan and by the City's housing assessment needs' study, and approval is recommended for Ordinance 2015-21.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that she did have some concern about accessory dwellings in some of the areas. This can be discussed more when it gets to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. It seems more appropriate in some of the areas that have been looked at than others.*

**Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Orr, that approval of Ordinance 2015-21 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

18. Consideration Of Ordinance 2015-54, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Amend The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Franklin, Tennessee, Chapter 3, Section 3.3, Subsection 3.3.2, Table 3-5, Entitled "Base District Density And Building Height [1], [2]," And Section 3.5, Subsection 3.5.6 (2)(b)(xi), Entitled "Landscape," And Chapter 5, Section 5.5, Subsection 5.5.3(1), Table 5-7, Entitled "Required Open Space Set-Aside" In Order To Revise The Landscape Surface Ratio And Open Space Requirements Within Central Franklin Character Area Overlay District, Special Area CFCO-1 And Special Area CFCO-9." ; (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0; 1st Reading 8-0 11/10/15) SECOND OF THREE READINGS

**Attachments:** [Ordinance 2015-54 - LSR CFCO1 ZO Text Amendment Approved by Legal](#) [Edit-Add CFCO-9 Approved by Legal](#)  
[LSR CFCO1 and 9 Map](#)

*Mr. Svoboda stated that Ordinance 2015-54 an ordinance to amend various sections of the Zoning Ordinance to exempt development within the Central Franklin Character Area, Special Areas CFCO-1 and CFCO-9, from the Landscape Surface Ratio (LSR) and open space requirements. This was discussed at the September 24, 2015, Joint Conceptual Workshop. Approval of Ordinance 2015-54 is recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

**Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that approval of Ordinance 2015-54 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.  
The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

19. Consideration Of Ordinance 2015-55, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Amend The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Franklin, Tennessee, Chapter 3, Section 3.2, Subsection 3.2.3, Table 3-2, Entitled "Permitted Uses," And Chapter 3, Section 3.2, Subsection 3.2.5(1)(B), To Add The Use Classification Clinics As A Permitted Use In The CC - Central Commercial District, And Amend Chapter 5, Section 5.9, Subsection 5.9.4, Table 5-9, Entitled "Minimum Off-Street Parking Standards [1] [2] [3] [4] [6]" To Revise The Use Type For Clinics." (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0; 1st Reading 8-0 11/10/15) SECOND OF THREE READINGS

**Attachments:** [Ordinance 2015-55 - Add Clinic Use to CC Amend Parking Table Law](#)  
[Approved](#)  
[Clinic Use Map](#)

*Mr. Svoboda stated that Ordinance 2015-55 was to add the use "Clinics" as a permitted use in the Central Commercial (CC) District and to amend the minimum off-street parking standards table (Table 5-9) to revise the use type for clinics. The Parking Standards' correction was to just move it into an esthetic and institutional use category. Approval is recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.*

**Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that approval of Ordinance 2015-55 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.  
The motion passed by the following vote:**

- Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway



- z20. Consideration of Ordinance 2015-51, To Be Entitled, "An Ordinance To Amend The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Franklin, Tennessee, Chapter 3, Section 3.2, Subsection 3.2.7(5) Pertaining To Convenience Stores And Automotive Fuel Sales And To amend Chapter 5, Section 5.3, Subsection 5.3.6(3) Pertaining To Automotive Uses On Lots Located At Major Intersections, And To Modify Figure 5-37 Which References Subsection 5.3.6(3), And To Amend Chapter 5, Section 5.3, Subsection 5.3.6(9), Which References Roof Types On Nonresidential Structures." (10/22/15 FMPC 9-0; 1st Reading 8-0 11/10/15) SECOND OF THREE READINGS

**Attachments:** [Ordinance 2015-51 Convenience Stores and Automotive Uses.pdf](#)

[CoolSpringsCorridor AutoUses](#)

[EasternQuadrant AutoUses](#)

[NorthenQuadrant AutoUses](#)

[SouthernQuadrant AutoUses](#)

[WesternQuadrant AutoUses](#)

*Mr. King stated that Ordinance 2015-51 was an ordinance to modify the Zoning Ordinance to remove certain restrictions based on intersections and automotive uses and to amend some design guidelines for those uses as well. The staff recommends approval to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.*

*Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments.*

*Mr. Charlton Bell, Vice President of Tri Star Energy (dba Twice Daily), stated that he had had the opportunity to speak with the Planning Commissions on, at least, two different occasions. He was in support of the staff recommendation, and he looked forward to building some Twice Dailys in the City of Franklin.*

*Mr. Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that approval of Ordinance 2015-51 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.*

*Ms. Gregory stated that she wanted to clarify "pitched roof." This could also mean sloped like a shed roof. There were other options besides pitched roof.*

*Mr. King stated that there were other roof options. The Planning Department had received feedback from the Planning Commission and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on gas stations that they felt were appropriate. They all had a unifying theme, especially over the refueling canopy as having a pitched or more of what one would expect in a residential area. The staff felt that it was best to include that, based on the feedback that the Planning Department received from the Planning Commission.*

*Mr. Orr asked about Mr. King's idea of pitched.*

*Mr. King stated that the staff left it as pitched without getting into the specifics or degree of slopes to allow more design flexibility options. A different variety of roof styles had been added, but the staff did not want to see the traditional flat roof.*

*Chair Hathaway stated that the term "low slope roof" was also considered a flat roof.*



*Mr. Franks asked if the Planning Commission would consider the language that, "A ridge would be associated with a pitch on the roof. There could be a 1 to 12 pitch or an 8 to 12 pitch." The ridge would be important to add to the language.*

*Ms. Gregory asked if this would be addressed at the design standards.*

*Ms. Allen asked if the Zoning Ordinance spoke to this.*

*Mr. Harrison stated that the Zoning Ordinance could be amended so that it also prevented the use of a low slope roof.*

*Mr. Martin stated that Mr. Franks had said that, "It should include a ridge."*

*Mr. Franks stated that the intent was to give it a residential feel as opposed to a commercial feel. As long as the roof was attached to a ridge and had a pitch, one would essentially have a pitched roof that was residential in character.*

*Ms. Gregory stated that there were some shed-type roofs that would fit in certain residential environments.*

*Mr. Franks stated that a shed would not have a ridge.*

*Ms. Gregory agreed and stated that she wanted flexibility so there could be different designs. There were types of roofs that would be appropriate in certain developments that did not have ridges but were not flat.*

*Mr. Orr asked what kind of roof Ms. Gregory would prefer.*

*Ms. Gregory stated that she would like the option of a shed roof.*

*Some of the Commissioners did not like the idea of a shed roof.*

*Mr. Martin suggested to get a motion and a second on the amendment and how it should be worded.*

*Mr. Harrison moved to amend the motion by stating that, "The homes shall include a ridge."*

*Chair Hathaway asked if the language could be stated to "prohibit low sloped or flat roofs."*

*Ms. Allen asked if there was a definition for low sloped roofs because the definition of low sloped roofs might vary from person to person.*

*Mr. Franks stated that one could have a crown-style ridge, which would have four ridges and could be very low-sloped. He asked if this was not allowing the parapet to extend above the sloped roof and if this ordinance was not going to allow a parapet to extend above the sloped roof to hide air conditioning units.*

*Mr. King stated that the design, as it was written in the ordinance, would affect both the main building and any canopy structure.*

*Ms. Gregory stated that one should have the opportunity to put the mechanicals on top*

*on the main building behind the parapet.*

*Mr. Franks agreed and stated that an air conditioning unit was unattractive sitting on a roof if a parapet could not extend above the sloped roof to hide the unit.*

*Mr. Bell stated that in their new store design they had a symphony pit where they put their air conditioning units down into a pit, which was lower than the actual roof. He would like to request to maintain that ability because even with a sloped unit they could put that on the backside of the building into a symphony pit. Walking or driving by, one would be unable to see the units plus it avoided having to place the units on the ground.*

*Chair Hathaway stated that there were places where a parapet on the main building would still make sense. He did not understand why one would say that it could not be a low sloped roof.*

*The canopy discussion ensued.*

*Mr. King stated that there were other design guidelines relating to canopies covering fueling stations within the zoning ordinance that were not being modified in this ordinance. This was specifically related to the pitch of the roof and the location of the automotive uses. The ordinance, as it was designed, gives the staff the flexibility to work with applicants on an appropriate roof style that mirrors the character area that they are in.*

*Mr. Harrison stated that he wished to go back to his original motion and not amend it.*

*Alderman Petersen stated that sometime it was very difficult whenever the Planning Commission reviewed items for it to be said that the staff was going to work with the applicants separately. There is somewhat of a disconnect with this if there is a rule, and the staff is able to work with the applicant.*

*Ms. Allen stated that she thought it was because the rule was being kept general so that it was not so "cookie cutter," however, she did think with this ordinance that it did get away from the tabletops.*

*Mr. Bell stated that he had a symphony pit on the building where the rooftop unit could be installed on a flat roof or a pitched roof.*

*Ms. Gregory asked if the Planning Commission voted on this same pitch would it still be allowed.*

*Mr. King stated that the majority of the roof would still be pitched, and if the HVAC equipment was screened from view, this would be considered a pitched roof.*

*Ms. Gregory asked about the word "majority."*

*Mr. King stated that the problem with dissecting Ordinance 2015-51 was that it would create many more problems down the road.*

**Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that approval of Ordinance 2015-51 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 9 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

- 21.** Eddy Lane Industrial Office Subdivision, site plan; extend the performance agreement for landscaping Phase 1B improvements for one year.  
(CONSENT AGENDA)

**This Planning Item was approved.**

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**ADJOURN**

*There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.*

---

*Chair, Mike Hathaway*