



City of Franklin

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

Meeting Minutes Franklin Municipal Planning Commission

Thursday, September 24, 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. [15-0882](#) August 27, 2015 FMPC Minutes

Attachments: [August 27 FMPC Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner Orr, to approve the August 27, 2015, Minutes as presented. 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

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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 Allen, to approve the Consent Agenda for items 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 18. 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

Approval of the Secondary Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Commissioner Lindsey, seconded by Commissioner McLemore, to approve the Secondddary Consent Agenda for items 2, 14, and 15. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused: 2 - Commissioner Franks, and Commissioner Gregory

SITE PLAN SURETIES

2. [15-0849](#) Berry Farms Town Center PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 1, revision 1, lot 62 (Amenity Center); accept the drainage improvements, release the performance agreement and establish a maintenance agreement for one year. (CONSENT AGENDA)
This Planning Item was approved.
3. [15-0850](#) Cool Springs East Subdivision, site plan, section 24, lots 11 and 703 (Hilton Garden Inn); release the maintenance agreement for drainage improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)
This Planning Item was approved.
4. [15-0851](#) Jamison Station PUD Subdivision, site plan, section 1; release the maintenance agreement for stormwater drainage/detention improvements. (CONSENT AGENDA)
This Planning Item was approved.

REZONINGS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

5. [15-0855](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of Ordinance 2015-52, "Ordinance To Rezone 21.31 Acres Into The Height Overlay District (HTO) For The Properties Located Within The Cool Springs East Subdivision 501 & 1000 Corporate Centre Drive (Lots 370 & 372)" (09/24/15 FMPC 7-0; 10/13/15 1ST BOMA Reading 7-0) SECOND OF THREE READINGS

Attachments: [ORD 2015-52 Cool Springs East Subd Sec 1 Rev 3 HTO Rezoning.doc](#)
[Cool Springs East Subd Sec 1 Rev 3 HTO Rezoning Map.pdf](#)
[20140454_Cool Springs East Section 1 Rezoning - Combined.pdf](#)

Commissioner Gregory recused herself from item 5.

Mr. Baumgartner stated that the applicant was requesting to be included within the Height Overlay District (HTO), which would allow the maximum allowable building height of 12 stories. This site is surrounded by parcels within the HTO and is an appropriate area to extend the HTO overlay district. Approval of Ordinance 2015-52 was recommended.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments.

No one came forward.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.

Mr. Jeff Heinze, of Littlejohn Engineering, stated that they agreed with the staff conditions of approval, and he requested a favorable recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner McLemore, that approval of Ordinance 2015-52 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused: 1 - Commissioner Gregory

6. [15-0827](#) Consideration of Ordinance 2015-50, to be Entitled, "An Ordinance to Rezone 7.43 Acres from Estate Residential (ER) District to Residential 3 (R-3) District for the Properties Located at 1034 and 1040 Carlisle Lane." (9/24/15 FMPC motion to recommend disapproval 7-1) (10/13/2015 WS) FIRST OF THREE READINGS

Attachments: [ORD 2015-50 Cardel Village PUD Subdivision Rezoning Request.doc](#)
[5915 MAP CARDEL VILLAGE REZONING.pdf](#)
[5915 Rezoning Full Set Cardel Village PUD.pdf](#)

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that the proposed zoning, Detached Residential 3 District, (R03), was supported by the Land Use Plan. At this density, the property could develop at a maximum of 22 dwelling units, but 20 are proposed. Development of this subdivision will present a concern for the health, safety, and welfare of these residents. The alignment and rural cross-section of Carlisle Lane are in need of costly upgrades. Since Carlisle Lane is not an arterial roadway, the road impact fees cannot be used for improving this street. Funding for the improvements to Carlisle Lane will need to be identified and scheduled in conjunction with the City's Capital Investment Program.

If the Plannid the need for improvement to Carlisle Lane. Disapproval of Ordinance 2015-50 was recommended until construction of safety improvements to Carlisle Lane had begun.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments.

Ms. Dana Gill, of 1044 Carlisle Lane, stated that her property was on the northern border of this property. She understood that there had been an alleyway, and she thanked the City for working with the applicant by not requiring it to extend to the property line. She never thought that she would speak in favor of a development because she likes the rural feel around her property; however, she felt Mr. Melz's proposal would preserve that to the best that it could. The development would have only 20 homes. She and her husband supported Ordinance 2015-50, as it had been presented, and she requested that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Ordinance 2015-50.

Mr. Bill Quaglia, of 163 Cornerstone Circle, stated that his backyard would be up against this subdivision. He wanted to make sure that an extensive traffic study had been done on Carlisle Lane, which was an extremely busy road, counting vehicles and bicycles, and seemed to be a connector for Westhaven. A lot of Westhaven and Boyd Mill Drive traffic used it. He would like to have attention put on Carlisle Lane to make it the best it could be to accommodate both automobile and bicycle traffic. When starting the construction on this project, some kind of encouragement should be added so the traffic can continue to flow on Carlisle Lane.

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.

Mr. Greg Gamble, of Gamble Design Collaborative, stated that he was representing the applicant, DeerCreek. He believed that the staff was looking to tie the rezoning and development plan together at the same time. Carlisle Lane had curvature and a cross-section that did not meet the City's standard for development. Cardel Village was not the first development proposed within this area. They had heard from the neighbors and worked very closely with the neighbors in developing a plan very compatible with this area and with the Land Use Plan. The applicant would appreciate the Planning

Commission's endorsement of the sensitivity that they have had in working with the community and the neighborhood on the plan that they had put together. They planned to move ahead to the BOMA, working closely with Mr. Gerth and Mr. Holzen. The developer had a few options for improving Carlisle Lane, one of which was to add an additional fee for collector streets. This would involve discussion with the BOMA and the Planning Commission. If it would be possible to endorse this item with a condition of approval that certain items be approved by the BOMA, the applicant would certainly appreciate that consideration.

A motion was made by Commissioner Petersen, moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that disapproval of Ordinance 2015-50 be rerecommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye:** 8 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Franks, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway
- No:** 1 - Commissioner Orr

7. [15-0828](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration Of Resolution 2015-79 To Be Entitled, "A Resolution Approving A Development Plan For The Cardel Village PUD Subdivision, Located At 1034 And 1040 Carlisle Lane, By The City Of Franklin, Tennessee" (09/24/15 FMPC motion to recommend disapproval 6-2) (10/13/2015 WS)

Attachments: [Res 2015-79 RESOLUTION Cardel Village PUD Subdivision Dev Plan.doc](#)
[5916 MAP Cardel Village PUD Subdivision.pdf](#)
[5916 CardelVillageCOA](#)
[5916 Elevations Cardell Village PUD Development Plan 9.3.2015-2.pdf](#)
[5916 Site Layout Cardell Village PUD Development Plan 9.3.2015.pdf](#)
[5916 Complete Set Cardell Village PUD Development Plan 9.3.2015.pdf](#)

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that, based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission that Ordinance 2015-50 be disapproved, disapproval of Resolution 2015-79 was also recommended.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments.

No one came forward.

Mr. Vernon Gerth, Assistant City Administrator, stated that he and Mr. Holzen wanted to share a little more in detail about what they have started to experience. When Resolution 2015-79 came to the Joint Conceptual Workshop, Mr. Gerth had mentioned that the City was starting to see development push out into the rural part of the community. What is seen with Carlisle Lane is starting to arise more frequently, and Mr. Holzen will share with the Planning Commission some of those areas within the City's community. A resident and an applicant had worked closely with staff to develop a plan for this property that coincides with the City's Land Use Plan and development regulations. A neighbor spoke in support of that. Unfortunately, Carlisle Lane needs some improvement, not just for capacity, but for safety. Because of the lack of infrastructure, the staff cannot recommend approval. Mr. Gerth and Mr. Holzen have met on several occasions with Mr. Melz and Mr. Gamble and talked about this situation. Mr. Gamble had mentioned on a previous item that the discussion of unimproved collector roads is addressed for both safety and capacity to maximize the use of their property. This should be a discussion of the BOMA. It should also be a discussion with the development community and others in the community. It is something that the City has to face or else the staff will be making similar recommendations of not to approve development until there is a commitment to improve roads, such as Carlisle Lane.

Mr. Gerth discussed some of the alternatives. The applicant had spoken and even written a letter in support of providing some additional funds. One of recommendations was similar to Duncan and Associates, who had created and reevaluated the City's Road Impact Ordinance to include collector roads into that framework. That is from where the recommendation came of them paying the additional fee. There is a framework that the City asked Duncan and Associates to look at, back in 2014, of what that might look like in the way of additional impact fees should the BOMA try to include collectors. The decision was not to include it at that time. The staff realized at that time that this type of situation would arise. Right now, the Road Impact Fee Ordinance and the fees collected

are for improving the capacity of arterial roads. The other option that was looked critically with this development was, "What improvements could minimally be done to improve the safety of Carlisle Lane." The staff outlined those, and they were very expensive for someone trying to develop this property with 20 homes, and it was simply not realistic. In areas of the community where there are rural cross-sections of collector roads and large parcels of property, the opportunity, when those large parcels redevelop would be to have those roads improved was more realistic, but that was not the case throughout the community. There are many parcels with four, five, six, or ten acres, and there is no way that the City can require those types of improvements to be made. It is a good thing that this item is being moved on to the BOMA because it is a discussion that the staff needs to have. As Mr. Gamble and Mr. Melz have recognized, they are caught in the middle. Other developments in this area have been approved, and it is time that this is addressed as a community.

Mr. Holzen stated that the plan was great, and the neighbors seem to be in support of it; however, the infrastructure is just not there. The staff has been very transparent with the applicant. Richland Close and Blossom Park have recently come in and have been approved. They did dedicate right-of-way as part of the projects. That is what sparked the engineering department to do an alignment study to make sure that there was adequate right-of-way to address these safety concerns long-term. The alignment study went through a public process with a few neighborhood meetings that were ultimately approved by the BOMA and the Planning Commission. The estimated cost of this roadway was around \$2.1 million dollars. Presently, the City has a road impact fee, which is dedicated only to arterial roadways. The staff has presented options to do collector road impact fees in the past; however, the number was a little higher, and this has prevented the staff from being able to move forward with this. When the plans came in for submittal, the staff felt that the right-of-way for such a small development was good enough. It became a question of when does the City stop continuing to allow development along this roadway with horizontal and vertical issues. Unfortunately, for Mr. Melz this is when the staff said, "We really have to have this conversation." Presently, there are about 12.5 miles of collector roadways, north of highway 96 and west of Hillsboro Road that do not have a fronting source. These roadways are improved with development, by developers, as they occur. To address this issue, long term, in the most equitable way is that the impact fee pays for upgrades to these roadways, or it is completed by the developer. Presently, that is not an option because a collector impact fee does not exist. The staff has worked hard with the applicant and the developer to try to come up with some possible alternatives that is if the BOMA and Planning Commission try to move it forward. However, the staff's opinion is that the rezoning should be disapproved, and the development should be disapproved until a way is figured out to fund these improvements and address the safety concerns as these developments move forward.

Chair Hathaway asked to what extent the safety issue was a concern today.

Mr. Holzen stated that the horizontal curves were completely substandard. As more development is approved along this corridor, one could expect accidents to increase because the trip generation will increase. It is also heavily biked, and there is very limited site distance. From an engineering standpoint, the staff is at a point knowing that there is no long-term plan and no funding source for this road that the staff can no longer approve development in some of these areas of the City. If the staff does not have a plan as these rural areas develop, it will become very difficult and that is a conversation that the staff would like to have with the BOMA to try to help facilitate development in the future.

Chair Hathaway stated that it seemed as though there was a little of a Catch-22 here in that there was some current need for that because of safety, and that balanced with, "How does one pay for it."

Chair Hathaway asked if there was an applicant.

Mr. Greg Gamble, of Gamble Design Collaborative, stated that he represented the applicant, that they had been working very closely with Mr. Gerth and Mr. Holzen, and they would be looking toward the BOMA to work with them on a fee-based option for improving the collector roads.

Chair Hathaway stated that he would like to hear about any concerns regarding the layout of the plan.

Ms. McLemore asked at what point the applicants were notified that their developments may not occur because of the roadways.

Mr. Holzen stated that they should be notified at the pre-application meeting, and the applicant had been notified at the pre-application meeting with this item.

Ms. McLemore asked if that was the case with this item, did the applicant choose to bring it forward anyway.

Mr. Holzen stated that the staff asked the applicant to continue to bring the item forward so that this issue could be highlighted and a conversation could be had with the BOMA and hopefully come up with a long-term plan.

Alderman Petersen moved to disapprove Resolution 2015-79, and Ms. Allen seconded the motion.

Ms. Allen stated that she did not have any problems with this item, she was just glad to see that this was going to be addressed with the BOMA. It was important to her to have a plan and address it before there was an actual problem.

Mr. Franks asked if a multi-million dollar intersection had not just been recently added at this intersection. There has been a lot of investment made at this intersection that obviously needs to be recognized for accelerated improvement for the road. Why spend the money on all of the intersection if one is not going to deliver additional density in this area?

Alderman Petersen wanted everyone to remember that all of this was partly based on the idea that that section of Mack Hatcher will be built. That was the reason that the intersection became so important.

Mr. Franks asked why the City spent the money at this location and why did it not put the money somewhere else that would deem more appropriate.

Alderman Petersen stated that since that part of Mack Hatcher had been number one on the City's priority list for, at least, eight years she thought the idea was that something was going to happen.

Ms. Allen stated that even though this new intersection is big, nice, and new, it does not

help that area that much in the mornings. The Westhaven area is humming even without Carlisle Lane.

Mr. Orr stated that he did not understand why a moratorium was placed on development in this area.

Mr. Franks stated that he did not understand why a moratorium was being placed in this area when millions of dollars had been spent on the intersection in this area.

Mr. Gerth stated that he wanted to emphasize that in no way was the City putting a moratorium on development. The City is looking forward at the impact of its decision and how the City can best leverage City funds with private development funds to move development. One of the discussions that has been coming up over the last several years with development professionals, and others in the community, is trying to direct development where private development is being combined with the City's limited resources. That is what this discussion is heading to because the City is so fortunate with its historic, well-maintained core of the community as the communities develop outward 360 degrees. The City is starting to realize now as it is getting out to the fringe areas where rural roads exist that there are smaller properties, and how do the road improvements get funded. Carlisle Lane highlights this, and the City is getting in front of it so that development is not being hindered and providing equitable opportunities for people to develop their property in accordance with the City's Land Use Plan Development and Regulations. It is not an easy decision, but the City does have individuals who want to develop about eight acres of land and want to contribute their fair share. The road impact fees, which the City collects from developers, will not provide for the improvements to arterial roads or the collector roads. The City has to focus its efforts on those areas where there is existing infrastructure where development potential can be generated to put all of those dollars into improving the roads. In that way, the City can continue to build and maintain the same quality of roads that everyone expects.

Mr. Orr asked if there was a timeframe when this applicant could expect to come back to develop this land.

Mr. Gerth stated that the staff would be talking with the developer and give him that guidance, if he wants to proceed with this plan. Property owners still have their existing underlying zoning district, which they can develop. The applicant was gracious enough to work with the staff to help get this in front of the Planning Commission and the BOMA.

Alderman Petersen stated that it would go to the BOMA whether the Planning Commission recommended disapproval or not.

Commissioner Petersen moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that disapproval of Resolution 2015-79 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The motion carried with the following vote:

- Aye:** 7 - Commissioner Harrison, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner McLemore, Commissioner Gregory, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Lindsey, and Commissioner Hathaway
- No:** 2 - Commissioner Franks, and Commissioner Orr

8. [15-0877](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration Of Resolution 2015-80, To Be Entitled, "A Resolution Approving A Development Plan For 231 Public Square PUD Subdivision, With 1 Modification Of Standards (MOS-1 Location Of Drive-Thru Structure), Located At 231 Public Square, By The City Of Franklin, Tennessee."; (09/24/15 FMPC 8-0; 10/13/2015 WS)

Attachments: [Res 2015-80 231 PUBLIC SQUARE PUD Subd DP Resolution with 1 MOS](#)
[231 Public Square DP MAP](#)
[Conditions of Approval 231 Public Square DP](#)
[Development Plan 5927 231 Public Square](#)
[Elevations 5927 231 Public Square COPY](#)
[COA 231 Public Sq St development plan PUD concept](#)

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that Resolution 2015-80 would expand the existing footprint of the First Tennessee Bank Building by bringing it closer to the street and by creating a setback consistent with the other three corners of the public square. The bank and offices would remain, and a restaurant would be added on the first floor and the roof, which would require approval of a fourth floor through a PUD plan. The building height would be lower than the existing building, and the maximum height of the circulation towers would be within the 56-foot maximum required by the Zoning Ordinance. The elevations were representative of the conditions that were placed on the project at the initial Certificate of Appropriateness by the Historic Zoning Commission (HZC), which would come back to the HZC for approval at the site plan stage.

One modification of standards was being requested, which was for the location of the drive-through structure..The proposed stand alone, drive-through structure would not adversely affect the streetscape any more than the existing structure. The site had three street-facing sides, and, without tearing down the existing building, the proposed drive-through structure could not be placed behind a principal structure. The structure could queue several vehicles before encouraging them to the drive isle and eventually to the right-of-way.

Approval of the modification of standards and Resolution 2015-80, with conditions, was recommended to the BOMA.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Mr. Matt Taylor, of Studio8 Design, represented the applicant and requested approval of Resolution 2015-80, with conditions, to the BOMA.

Mr. Orr moved to recommend approval of Resolution 2015-80, with conditions, to the BOMA, and Mr. Harrison seconded the motion.

Alderman Petersen moved to approve the modification of standards, Ms. Allen seconded, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Franks stated that this project had been previously looked at, and he thought it had a cross-access with a City property. He asked if that had been removed.

Mr. Taylor stated that that was still in the project, and he explained and showed where it

was located.

Commissioner Orr, moved, seconded by Commissioner Harrison, that approval of Resolution 2015-80, with conditions, 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

9. [15-0862](#) Harbison Subdivision, final plat, revision 2, 2 lot subdivision on 5.09 acres, located at 4061 Clovercroft Rd. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Final Plat Map Harbison Subd](#)
[Conditions of Approval_02](#)
[Harbison Final Plat](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

10. [15-0837](#) Highlands at Ladd Park PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 32, 30 lot subdivision on 13.62 acres, located at 0 Carothers Pkwy. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Highlands at Ladd Park, Final Plat Map](#)
[Ladd Final Plat](#)
[Conditions of Approval_01](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

11. [15-0842](#) Lockwood Glen PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 6, 25 residential lots and 1 open space lot on 4.02 acres located at 0 South Carothers Road. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Lockwood Glen Section 6 FP Map.pdf](#)
[Lockwood Glen PUD Subdivision, Final Plat, Section 6 - submittal_002.pdf](#)
[5919 Conditions of Approval_01.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

12. [15-0829](#) Medcore Medical Office Subdivision, site plan, phase 1, Lot 3, (Scott Hamilton Proton Therapy Centre), 110,030 square feet of commercial office space on 11.62 acres, located at 4588 Carothers Parkway between Liberty Pike and Murfreesboro Road across from Williamson Medical Outpatient Building, (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [5918 MAP Medcore Medical Office.pdf](#)
[5918 Elevations Medcore Medical Subdivision-2.pdf](#)
[5918 Full Set Medcore Medical Subdivision.pdf](#)
[5918 Site Layout Medcore.pdf](#)
[5918 MedCoreSubdConditionsofApproval](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

13. [15-0835](#) Nature's Landing Subdivision, preliminary plat, 29 lot subdivision on 32.5 acres, located at 1093 Lewisburg Avenue

Attachments: [Natures Landing Preliminary Plat Map](#)
[Nature's Landing PP](#)
[Conditions of Approval_01](#)

Mr. Humber stated that the preliminary plat for Nature's Landing subdivision zoned Detached Residential 2 (R-2) and met the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Regulations. It was located at 1093 Lewisburg Pike and had 52 percent open space, when 15 percent was required. The subdivision would tie in with River Bluff Subdivision, which would contribute to the connectivity of developments. Approval of the preliminary plat, with conditions, was recommended.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Mr. Sean DeCoster, of Civil Site Design Group, represented the item and stated that the applicant agreed with the conditions of approval and requested approval.

Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that item 13 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

14. [15-0844](#) Simmons Ridge PUD Subdivision, final plat, Section 1, 19 residential lots, 2 open space lots, 5 on-street parking lots on 1.63 acres located at 4408 South Carothers Road. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Simmons Ridge Section 1 FP Map.pdf](#)
[Simmons Ridge PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 1 - submittal 002.pdf](#)
[5921 Conditions of Approval_02.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

15. [15-0854](#) Simmons Ridge PUD Subdivision, Section 2, final plat, 23 residential lot 1 open space and 2 on-street parking lots on 2.31 acres located at 4408 South Carothers Road. (CONSENT AGENDA)

Attachments: [Simmons Ridge Section 1 FP Map.pdf](#)
[Simmons Ridge PUD Subdivision, final plat, section 1 - submittal 002.pdf](#)
[5923 Conditions of Approval 01.pdf](#)

This Planning Item was approved.

ORDINANCE AND TEXT AMENDMENTS

16. [15-0860](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration Of Ordinance 2015-53, To Be Entitled “An Ordinance To Amend The Zoning Ordinance Of The City Of Franklin, Tennessee, Chapter 3, Section 3.3, Subsection 3.3.1 (3) Pertaining To Lot Measurements And Amend Chapter 3, Section 3.3, Subsection 3.3.3, Table 3-6 Entitled “Site Development Standards For Residential Building Types In Conventional Areas [1], [2], [3], [10]” And Table 3-8 Entitled “Site Development Standards For Traditional Areas [1], [2], [3]” To Add Minimum Lot Frontage Requirements For Residential Detached; (09/24/15 FMPC 8-0; 10/13/15 BOMA 1st Reading 7-0) SECOND OF THREE READINGS

Attachments: [2015-53 Lot Frontage Text Amendment Law approved](#)

[HZC Recommendation for Consideration of Minimum Lot Frontage Requirements 9 15 15](#)

Mr. Svoboda stated that Ordinance 2015-53 was a text amendment to the Franklin Zoning Ordinance to establish the minimum lot frontage requirements for new residential detached lots. The Planning Commission and the BOMA had been discussing compatible lot dimensions and sizes as part of infill development. There had been concern about lots being developed off of access easements that did not have street frontage. That prompted a review of the Zoning Ordinance, and an initial draft of that ordinance was discussed at the Joint Conceptual Workshop on February 26, 2015. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance states how wide a lot a building has to be at the building line, but not how wide it must be at the street. This has enabled lots to be created that either do not have street frontage at the building line or are accessed by an irregular-shape lot, with a flag lot and very narrow street frontage. As a result, lots have been created that are incompatible and out of character with the established neighborhoods.

Ordinance 2015-53 will clarify the definition of lot width and establish a required minimum lot frontage for detached residential uses. Lots located in conventional areas will require the minimum lot frontage to be 80 percent of the minimum lot width. Lots located within traditional areas will require a minimum lot frontage of 40 feet, and lots accessed by alleys will require 30 feet of lot frontage. In both conventional and traditional areas, lots located on the turning radius of a cul-de-sac would be exempt from the minimum lot-frontage requirement. Approval of Ordinance 2015-53 was recommended.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Alderman Petersen moved to recommend approval of Ordinance 2015-53 to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, and Commissioner Lindsey seconded the motion.

Ms. Allen stated that she had a lot in one of these areas. The house has been torn down. The frontage of the street was not 40 feet, and she wondered how the ordinance would affect this.

Mr. Svoboda stated that that was an existing lot that would not be affected, and there would not be any changes to make to it. Ms. Allen stated that she just wanted to be sure of this for the record.

Mr. Franks stated that he did not recall visiting this ordinance at the workshop. It was hard to read the tables, and it looked as though the staff would have simpler illustrations.

With that said, he asked if the Planning Commission should defer Ordinance 2015-53 to get more educated on it. He also asked how it would affect future development.

Chair Hathaway stated that he believed Ordinance 2015-53 was discussed at the August 27 Joint Conceptual Workshop.

Mr. Svoboda stated that a draft of Ordinance 2015-53 was discussed at the February 26, 2015, Joint Conceptual Workshop, and this was the first time that it had been back since that time. Essentially, what was changing with the ordinance was that a line was being added for a minimum lot-frontage requirement. Presently, only a minimum lot width is required. There was a very basic graphic in the Planning Commissioners' packages that showed where the lot frontage would be measured, which would be along the lot lines of the street. The lot width would be measured at the back of the front yard setback. The minimum lot frontage would have to be maintained to the front yard setback. For example, an R-3 District that requires a minimum lot frontage of 48 feet would be maintained from the street right-of-way line to the setback line.

Mr. Franks asked about a narrowed frontage.

Mr. Svoboda stated that traditional areas were matching the lot width and the lot frontage and for alley-loaded and street-loaded properties. In conventional areas, the lot frontage would have to be 80 percent of the lot width. Presently, there is no requirement as to how wide or narrow that lot has to be at the street.

Mr. Franks asked about a lot that tapered back, and had a wider envelope for the house. Alderman Petersen stated that this ordinance would not apply to that.

Alderman Petersen stated that Ordinance 2015-53 would take care of flag lots where one would have a driveway that would be the street frontage for the back lot. Mr. Orr stated that the 40 feet had to go from the street to the building. Mr. Svoboda stated that, in conventional areas, it would be a different width, depending on the zoning district.

Commissioner Petersen moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindsey that approval of Ordinance 2015-54 be recommended to the Board of Mayor and Alderman. The motion carried unanimously, with the following vote:

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

LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENTS

17. [15-0834](#) Presentation of Land Use Plan Amendment To Move The Existing Boundary Between Central Franklin Character Areas 4 And 6, Located At 405 Eddy Ln. (09/24/15 FMPC 8-0)

Attachments: [CFCO 4 and 6 LUP Excerpt](#)
[405 EDDY LANE LUPA MAP](#)
[405 Eddy Lane LUPA-Applicant Submittal](#)

Chair Hathaway recused himself from item 17 and turned the chair over to Vice Chair Lindsey.

Ms. Hunter stated that the Land Use Plan Amendment would expand the CFCO-4 character area to include one property just north of the existing boundary. The CFCO-4 area supported attached or detached residential land uses, while the CFCO-6 area, where the property was located, supported nonresidential land uses. Although the property was zoned Light Industrial, three single-family dwelling units are located there. A large data center was to the north and east and screened from the residential property with landscaping.

Given the residential character of the southern section of Eddy Lane, and the existing residential land uses on the property, continued residential use was appropriate. The property could support attached or single-family dwelling units to serve as a transition between the light industrial and residential areas along Eddy Lane. Additionally, Eddy Lane has no shoulders, curb, or gutter, and the lanes appear to be inadequate for large truck traffic needed in LI Districts. This, too, makes the area more conducive to residential, rather than light industrial, uses.

Based on these reasons, the Planning Department recommends approval of the Land Use Plan Amendment.

Vice Chair Lindsey asked for citizen comments. No one spoke.

Mr. Greg Gamble, of Gamble Design Collaborative, represented the item and stated that this property had been purchased with the intent of keeping it residential. No improvements could be made to the existing dwelling units without a Land Use Plan amendment and a rezoning. He requested a favorable recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Allen, that this Land Use Planning Item be approved.. 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

Recused: 1 - Commissioner Hathaway

18. [15-0833](#) Land Use Plan Amendment request to move the existing boundary between Central Franklin Character Area, Special Area 3, and Southall Character Area, Special Area 6, located at 302 Avondale Drive and 1543 Columbia Ave.

Attachments: [AVONDALE LUPA MAP](#)
[CFCO3 and SOCO6 LUP Excerpt](#)
[REQUEST FOR AMENDING THE FRANKLIN LAND USE
PLAN 9 03 15](#)
[Avondale LUPA Exhibit 09 03 15](#)

This Planning Item was deferred until the December 17, 2015, FMPC meeting.

19. [15-0825](#) Presentation Of Land Use Plan Amendment For McEwen Character Area, Special Area 6, To Add A Neighborhood Commercial Node Along Carothers Parkway, Between Murfreesboro Road And Long Lane. (9/24/15 FMPC 8-0)

Attachments: [MECO6 LUPA MAP](#)
[McEwen 6 LUP Excerpt](#)

Ms. Hunter stated that approximately 2,500 dwelling units had been approved in the area along Carothers Parkway between Murfreesboro Road and Long Lane in recent years. As more residential development is planned and constructed in the area, the need for nearby neighborhood commercial uses would increase. The distance from Murfreesboro Road to Goose Creek Bypass was about three and a half miles, more than three times the recommended distance for proximity to services specified in the Land Use Plan. The scale and character of the proposed neighborhood commercial area should be similar to the commercial nodes located in Fieldstone Farms, McKays Mill, and Reid Hill Commons.

The Planning Department recommended that the Land Use Plan be amended to add an additional statement in the McEwen, Special Area 6, section, as follows: "Neighborhood commercial uses are appropriate for the three lots fronting the connector street between Carothers Parkway and South Carothers Road and for the lot located immediately to the east of these three lots on the south side of South Carothers Road."

If the Land Use Plan amendment passed, the affected property owners would be contacted, and rezoning to a Neighborhood Commercial (NC) District would be recommended.

Chair Hathaway asked for citizen comments. There were none.

Alderman Petersen asked about the distance in the Land Use Plan. Ms. Hunter stated that it was one mile, and this would be about one and three-quarters of a mile from Murfreesboro Road and about that distance from Goose Creek Bypass. It would still exceed the standard, but, given that so many residential developments had been approved in this area, these parcels presented a prime spot to prepare for some type of commercial uses.

Alderman Petersen asked where there was a similar 17 acre tract of commercial development. Ms. Hunter stated that there was one in Fieldstone Farms that was very similar in size, as well as McKays Mill.

Mr. Franks asked where Ms. Hunter came up with 17 acres. Ms. Hunter stated that it was part of an existing PUD plan.

Commissioner Harrison moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindsey, that this Land Use Plan amendment be approved. 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

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Chair, Mike Hathaway