

CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT

- MINUTES -

June 24, 2020

2:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ROOM
329 MAIN STREET

I. CALL TO ORDER/QUORUM CHECK:

Mr. Swift called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Richard Swift, Chairman
- Bryce Powers, Vice Chairman
- Thom Spigner
- Richard Garrett
- Wade Hadley
- Mark Kelly
- Bill Kimbrough
- Larry Rocconi
- Maria Jimenez

OTHERS PRESENT:

- Director of Planning, Jeff Tyndall
- J. Stan Williams, RPC Transportation Planning Coordinator
- Ruth C. Russell, RPC Planner/Address Manager
- Brad Parker, RPC Subdivision Coordinator/Planner
- Brent Clemmons, RPC GIS Manager
- John Spainhoward, RPC Planner/Zoning Coordinator
- Sonny Emmert, RPC GIS Planner
- LaDonna Marshall, RPC Office Manager / Angela Latta, RPC Planning Tech
- Garth Branch, City Engineer's Office
- Greg Stewart/Patrick Chesney, Mark Riggins City Gas & Water Dept.
- David.Shepherd, City Street Department
- (Chris Cowan)Jeff Bryant/Eric Salmon, City Street Department
- David Smith, City Building & Codes Department
- Mike Frost, County Highway Department
- Rod Streete(John Doss)David Roan, County Zoning Enforcement Office
- Freddie Montgomery/Ray Williams/(Ricky Cumberland, Clarksville Fire Department
- Norm Brumblay, James Sumrell, Millard House, CMCSS

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 5/27/2020/ EXEC. COMMITTEE 4/22/2020 & 6/4/2020

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of May 27, 2020, Executive Committee 4/22/2020 and 6/4/2020. Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

Mr. Tyndall announced the passing of Mr. Mike Frost. He stated that we have a card going around from staff and the Commissioners and that a donation will be made, in his name, to the Alzheimer's Foundation, per his request. Mr. Tyndall then requested a moment of silence in his honor.

Mr. Tyndall read a statement regarding Race and the Role of Planners. Mr. Tyndall then provided an update on the Census and the importance of completing it, as well as certain portions of the County which were in need of increased Census participation.

III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Mr. Tyndall announced that case S-36-2020 was withdrawn but required no motion.

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER Z - 17 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Tupeno Partnership

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District

to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Martin Luther King, Jr. 1,200 +/- feet west of the Martin Luther King, Jr. & Old Farmers Rd. intersection & also fronting on the northern terminus of Wesson Dr.

TAX MAP(S): 081 PARCEL(S): 002.00 ACREAGE: 16.2 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: To allow for multifamily development.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The proposed R-2 zoning classification is not out of character with the surrounding area or established uses. Adequate infrastructure serves the site and no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. Mr. Spainhoward stated that this has no direct access to SR 76. He stated that this is in the Sango Planning Area.

Mr. Spainhoward read the School System's comment which stated that Richview Middle & Clarksville High are in the 3rd fastest growing region in Mont. County. Richview Middle is at 100% capacity and currently has 1 portable classroom, Clarksville High School is at 93% capacity. CMCSS has added an average of 10 portable classrooms each year for the last 4 years. This continued student growth necessitates additional action to address building capacity growth and school bus Transportation needs in Montgomery County. This development will contribute additional students and neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to address housing development in this region!

Mr. Spainhoward stated that the impact would be increased residential density. He stated that this is currently served by City water and City sewer. He stated that Street/Road accessibility is through Wesson Drive. He stated that historical lot yield would be 45 units, which may be high based on the topography of this property.

He stated that there were public comments received and that the emails were included in the file.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he should have announced that due to Governor Lee's executive order not being extended, the City of Clarksville and Montgomery County will revert back to normal public meeting procedures, although there may still be some precautions put in place. He suggested following up with the Mayor's Offices or clerks to know what their processes are going to be.

Mr. Cal McKay, McKay, Burchett and Company, engineer for the owner, stated that they are requesting R-2 single-family instead of R-4 multifamily. He stated that the property does have some topographical issues and the zone change would allow for fifteen to twenty more single family lots.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval as this is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kelly and carried with Mr. Rocconi abstaining.

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 19 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Hayes Property Of Clarksville Lp
Daniel Chambers (quiktrip Corporation)

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District &
R-1 Single-Family Residential District
to C-4 Highway Interchange District

LOCATION: Property located at the northwest corner of Interstate 24 & Rossvie Road (SR237)

TAX MAP(S): 057 PARCEL(S): 016.00 ACREAGE: 29.56 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

REASON FOR REQUEST: To allow for commercial development of property.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. This property is located at the northwest corner of Rossvie Road (SR 237) and I-24. The C-4 Highway Interchange Zoning District is intended for the areas adjacent or near the interstate interchanges. This location and lay of land makes this location prime for commercial development. The adopted Land Use Opinion Map identifies this area for commercial development. Adequate infrastructure serves the site and no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this would not be an extension of the zoning classification currently but the C-4 is the proper zone for this request. He stated that this property is in the Rossvie Planning Area.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that under departmental comments, no gravity sewer is available. He stated that a traffic assessment was required and that there are access limitations. He stated that we have discussed the Powell Road intersection in prior zoning cases recently. He stated that there are some traffic concerns in the immediate area. He stated that there are future improvements required. He stated that it would be anticipated if this property is developed that improvements would likely be necessitated. Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were School System comments but as this is C-4, with no residential component, he is not going to read those into the record but they are included in the packet. He stated that the impact would be an increase of traffic, light and noise.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that as of 10:30 this morning there were no public comments. He stated that he received two phone calls in reference to this case but there was no opposition.

Mr. Derek Ballbergen, Quiktrip stated he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval as the proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 20 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Carol Stevens

Agent: Derrick Stevens

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District
to R-3 Three Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the east frontage of West Thompkins Lane at the southern terminus of West Thompkins Lane.

TAX MAP(S): 080-H-E PARCEL(S): 008.00 ACREAGE: 0.967 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: Requesting a zone change to R-2D to construct duplex.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for deferral. The applicant has requested a month deferral of their application and the RPC staff is agreeable to their request. He stated that there is a need for a turnaround, and that would be required by the Fire Department and the Regional Planning Commission standards, with a higher intensity use. He stated that there is also some question about whether or not the existing right-of-way width can sustain the traffic that may be necessary to access the property. He stated that there were School comments provided. He stated that the impact would be increase in residential density. He stated that historically this would accommodate six additional units if this were to pass with sixteen persons. He stated that this is in the South Clarksville Planning Area.

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

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

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 21 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Faith Investments C/o Chris Blackwell

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property located on the east frontage of N. Whitfield Rd. 500 +/- feet north of the N. Whitfield Rd. & Needmore Rd. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 031 PARCEL(S): 017.00 ACREAGE: 2.48 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

REASON FOR REQUEST: To develop a small multifamily infill development. The size and shape of the property as well as access restrictions to Whitfield limits the feasibility of a single family development.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. The long range potential of this property appears to be multi-family, however existing roadway infrastructure at the N. Whitfield and Needmore Rd. intersection is currently inadequate. The submitted traffic assessment indicates the current level of service as being inadequate for the N. Whitfield and Needmore Rd. intersection. This proposed zoning should be delayed until the intersection improvements are completed. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. Mr. Spainhoward stated that under departmental comments it was stated that no gravity sewer is available. He stated that a traffic assessment was required and reviewed by the Clarksville Street Department. He read the School System comments which stated Glenellen Elementary, Northeast Middle & Northeast High are in the fastest growing region in Montgomery County. Glenellen Elem. is at 101% capacity & currently has 4 portable classrooms. Northeast Middle is at 109% capacity & currently has 9 portables & Northeast High is at 86% capacity. CMCSS has added an average of 10 portable classrooms each year for the last 4 years. This continued student growth necessitates additional action to address building capacity growth & school transportation needs. This development will contribute additional students & neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to address housing development in this region! Mr. Spainhoward stated that this is in the Trenton Road Planning Area.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that the impact of proposed use would be increased multi-family residential density. He stated that the property drains roughly to the east and accessibility would be from N. Whitfield Road. Mr. Spainhoward provided historical estimates which indicate 29 residential units and a population of 78 persons.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that our review of the traffic assessment submitted by the Clarksville Street Department, due to COVID-19, funding is not necessarily available for the roundabout improvement that has been mentioned for this. He stated that could change if the economy were to pick back up and the Street Department may be able to answer more. He stated that we do have somewhat of a safety concern with traffic stacking back into 101st at the North Whitfield connection. He stated that there is a copy of an e-mail from an adjoining property owner.

Mr. Chris Blackwell, one of the owners stated that they would like to build an infill townhome development, currently zoned AG and there is not much they can do with it. He stated that they are aware of the Whitfield Road project. He stated that they will wait to start until the road project is completed. He stated that they are willing to donate the right-of-way (inaudible).

Mr. Cal Burchett, McKay, Civil Engineer on the project, stated that he would just like to add one thing about the traffic. He stated that it is two and a half acres and you are looking at maybe thirty units, about two percent added to that intersection at Whitfield and Trenton. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

Mr. Powers asked if the site plan could be conditioned to not proceed until the road project is completed. Mr. Spainhoward stated that has never been researched that he is aware of and that once the zoning is in place, and the development is applied for, he was not sure that you could place restriction on the site plan. He stated that he did not think you could put an expiration or a delay date on a site review but that is not backed up by any attorney opinions. Mr. Powers asked if there was some way not to delay the rezoning and the expense that the applicant has already made. Mr. Spainhoward stated that there could be a deferral for one month and we could provide that information to you for next month's meeting.

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

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 22 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Chris Blackwell

REQUEST: R-2 Single-Family Residential District
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the west frontage of Edmondson Ferry Rd. 360 +/- feet south of the Edmondson Ferry Rd. & Edmondson Ferry Ct. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 079-K-B PARCEL(S): 024.00 ACREAGE: 4.54 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: To allow for a more dense single family infill development. Current zoning and plans allow for 18 homes. R-6 will allow for 10 additional homes with same amount of public maintained infrastructure.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Opinion Map as it indicates Single Family Residential for the area, however it is inconsistent with the adopted Land Use Plan based on the proposed SF density. The RPC staff feels that the proposed R-6 density and lot sizes are out of character with the established surrounding R-1 and R-2 density and lot sizes. The current R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning is the correct zoning designation for this property. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. Mr. Spainhoward stated that this is not an extension of the zoning classification. He stated that this is in the Southern Hills Planning Area. He stated that under departmental comments the City Engineer's Office with Gas and Water has stated that it may require water system upgrades. He stated that a sight distance assessment was required by the Street Department and was found to be adequate. Mr. Spainhoward then read the School System comments which stated Norman Smith Elem. is at 88% capacity and currently has 5 portable classrooms. Montgomery Central Middle is at 102% capacity and currently has 4 portable classrooms. Montgomery Central High School is currently at 79 % capacity. CMCSS has added an average of 10 portable classrooms each year for the last 4 years. This continued student growth necessitates additional action to address building capacity growth & school transportation needs. This development will contribute additional students & neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to address housing development in this region!

Mr. Spainhoward stated that the impact will be increased residential density and accessed by Edmondson Ferry Road. He stated that estimates from the applicant indicate twenty-eight lots and historical estimates for R-6 would be at thirty-four with a population of ninety-one persons. He stated that during review of this and discussion with the applicant's engineer, which was driven by Gas and Water's comment about low water pressure and some improvements would be needed. He stated that the properties surrounding this property are R-2 and R-1 and that is the primary zoning designation for the area. He stated that with R-6, the density is often equivalent to multifamily but with a residential single family ownership.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that he has received multiple phone calls in reference to this application. He stated that most of those expressed opposition but when asked to leave a name with a public comment, they chose not to do so.

Mr. Kelly (inaudible) unit yield is based on R-2. Mr. Spainhoward stated that the existing R-2, their development plan currently has eighteen lots. He stated that rezoning would increase the density to allow ten additional lots by their calculations, twenty-eight total. He stated that we have that number closer to thirty-four based on what has historically occurred with R-6.

Mr. Chris Blackwell stated that he feels that Mr. Spainhoward summed it up pretty well. He stated that they will be doing the same floor plan house either way. He stated he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Swift stated that the difference is just in the size of the lot. Mr. Blackwell stated that was correct.

Mr. Cal McKay, McKay, Burchett and Company Engineer, stated that they have a plan called West Winds (inaudible) start grading at any time. He stated that it is eighteen lots on a publicly maintained road with publicly maintained utilities and with the ten additional lots, none of that would change. He stated that it seems like a waste not to take an opportunity to pick up a few more property tax bills on the same amount of infrastructure. He stated that another thing is that R-6 is a relatively new zoning, so you are not going to find (inaudible) he stated that there is recently an R-6 subdivision on Ringgold Road (inaudible). He stated that it is not the entire reason, but the water system upgrade is causing a burden to the project. He stated that it is basically a private developer doing a City water line to the project.

Mr. Swift asked if these were similar to the houses off of Crossland. Mr. McKay stated that they were. (inaudible)

Mr. Garrett asked what was the price point at which they were looking to sell these. Mr. Blackwell stated that they planned to keep these as rentals in the \$1000 to \$1200 range.

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

Mr. Vasi, 260 Edmondson Ferry Road, stated that he has lived in multiple apartments and he knows that they increase trash along people's property line. He stated that multifamily causes increased crime which is why most people will not want it. He stated that there have been multiple accidents here with the hidden drive and is concerned about increased traffic. He stated that the whole area has low water pressure. His main concern is how he will stop someone from going on his property and how this will affect his resale value.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that these are single family detached structures. He stated that it does have higher density similar to multifamily but these are not town homes or apartments.

Mr. Blackwell stated that they will maintain the properties themselves and that they will not allow trash.

Mr. Spigner asked if the upgrades to the water system would affect the other neighbors positively.

Mr. Pat Chesney, Clarksville Gas and Water stated that it will help the whole area (inaudible).

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval based on there being no adverse environmental issues identified and this having a positive impact to the water supply. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried five to three with Mr. Rocconi, Ms. Jiminez, and Mr. Kelly opposing.

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 23 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): W.m. Hoosier

Agent: Todd Morris

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District
to R-1 Single-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property located at the western terminus of Prewitt Lane.

TAX MAP(S): 042 PARCEL(S): 015.00 ACREAGE: 54.32 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

REASON FOR REQUEST: Development of single family housing

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The proposed R-1 Single-Family zoning request is not out of character with the surrounding area. The adopted Land Use Opinion Map indicates residential use in the area. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. The terminus of Prewitt Lane appears to have an off site Right-of-Way encroachment. The applicant has identified an alternative access to the property. Mr. Spainhoward stated that this will require offsite water and sewer. He stated that a traffic assessment was required and reviewed by the Street Department Mr. Spainhoward then read the School System comments which state that Glenellen Elementary, Kenwood Middle, Kenwood High are in the fastest growing region of Montgomery County. Glenellen Elementary is at 101% capacity & has 3 portable classrooms, Kenwood middle is at 93% capacity, Kenwood High is at 76% capacity. This continued student growth necessitates additional acition to address building capacity growth & school bus transportation needs in Montgomery County. This development will contribute additional students & neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to address housing development in this region!

Mr. Spainhoward stated that this will be an increase in single family residential density, served by water and sewer. He stated that this is currently accessible by Prewitt Lane. He stated that the Prewitt Lane right-of-way extends and the pavement ends. He stated that there is a retaining wall and a fifth wheel camper that appear to be encroachments that are sitting within the existing right-of-way. He stated that the applicant was aware of that and that the Street Department is now aware of that, the Planning Commission is now aware of that and we will be working toward resolving that matter. He stated that we were provided with a proposal that shows just north, on the adjacent property that the applicant is under contract to acquire either 90 foot or 100 foot. He stated that they have mentioned that they prefer the 100 foot option to acquire future stub or street connection parallel to Prewitt Lane to address right-of-way improvements if they cannot work out the Prewitt Lane matter, but the engineer can address that further.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that historical estimates and the applicant's estimates are at 105 units with 280 persons. He stated that there were a few phone calls in reference to this from the sign that was on site but most people assumed that was already zoned for residential use so no one left any comments in opposition.

Mr. Spigner asked if the right-of-way was an adverse possession situation and why is it not just corrected? Mr. Spainhoward stated that he would defer to the Street Department as he was not sure what status that is currently. He stated that we are definitely aware of it and would address it at the development stage.

Mr. Houston Smith, representing Mr. Morris, stated that it sounds like the biggest concern was the road and as stated we do have another piece of property under contract. He stated that they do not exactly know the route that Prewitt Lane is going to take. He stated that they are not going to be able to do a section of road right beside of Prewitt Lane, most likely they are going to have Prewitt come to the right and extend it back beyond the apartments and the trailer park and then come back to the property. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Garrett moved to recommend approval as this is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried with Mr. Rocconi abstaining.

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 9 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Allensworth Farm Partner, Llc
John And Mary Allensworth 3862 Hampton Station Rd
Agent: Larry B Watson

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District
to M-2 General Industrial District

LOCATION: South of Guthrie Highway, east of International Blvd, north of Charles Bell Rd. & west of Hampton Station Rd.

TAX MAP(S): 016 PARCEL(S): 008.00 p/o ACREAGE: 552.66 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1 & 2
033 01001
00100

REASON FOR REQUEST: The Clarksville-Montgomery County IDB has entered into an option agreement to purchase the Allensworth Farm and surrounding parcels. The IDB has received considerable interest for fail-served sites 7-200 acres.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The M-2 zoning proposal is an extension of the existing M-2 zoning to the west and the proposal will permit the expansion of an established industrial park and area identified in the adopted Land Use Plan and Land Use Opinion Map. The submitted traffic assessment identifies the anticipated required improvements to Guthrie Hwy. and Charles Bell Road. A specific traffic study may be required at the development stage to determine the phases required for ROW improvements. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request and adequate infrastructure will serve the site. Mr. Spainhoward stated that this is in the rural area of the Growth Plan. He stated that under departmental comments there were none of any concern. He stated that, depending on the intensity of the development, improvements would be made at Guthrie Highway. He stated that accessibility is at Guthrie Highway, Charles Bell Road and Hampton Station Road. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern. He stated that a traffic assessment was submitted with this application and a traffic impact study may be required at the development phase depending on what those specific uses are. He stated that the engineer that prepared that report, I believe is in the audience and can answer specific questions, but it is anticipated in that traffic assessment, depending on the intensity of the development, that improvements would be made directly at Guthrie Highway, Charles Bell Road, and at this point it is not intended to have an intense connection to Hampton Station Road and it could be used as more of an emergency access if needed. He stated that they can elaborate more on that and that there are representatives from the IDB that can address questions as well.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that the impact would be increased traffic, light and noise, potential for heavy truck traffic and the increased intensity of industrial uses. He stated that this property has accessibility to Guthrie Highway, Charles Bell Road and Hampton Station. He stated that this is in the Rossview Road Planning Area.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there have been numerous calls, some in favor and some in opposition, but the most popular question that we have received involved the conditions of the roadways and why the roadways are not improved currently if we are going to request this zone. He stated that using examples, a data center does not have a lot of people working there and is not a huge traffic generator, so it would not make sense to make a large right-of-way improvement project. He stated that others have shift work with large amounts of people arriving and leaving at the same time or trucking traffic associated with them, which would require more improvements. He stated that the improvements would be required at the time of the development phase, specific to the development.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there was one public comment that was received by phone. He stated that several phone calls came in, most of which followed up with a written e-mail which are included in the Commissioner's packet. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he has read each of these comments and addressed the portions of the roadway infrastructure. He stated that there are some questions about drainage and he has asked a representative from the County Codes Department to be here if there are specific questions in reference to the drainage or development plan.

Mr. Kimbrough asked what was by SteelStock Road that appeared to be some sort of industry. Mr. Spainhoward stated that it was a TVA substation.

Mr. Larry Watson, Watson and Atkins Law Firm on Franklin Street, stated that he is representing the Allensworth's. He stated that you could not find a better piece of property to be changed to what we want it to be changed to. He stated that it has the railroad track that divides it and it has every component that you need in industrial. He stated that this is a perfect place for industrial development. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

Mr. J.C. Matthews, Clarksville Montgomery County Industrial Development Board, (inaudible) this would be a great opportunity for Clarksville.

Mr. Tyndall stated that this is one of the larger zoning cases that this Commission will probably see for a very long time, in terms of acres. He stated that Mr. Tate kind of explained that because of the size and that really it is three different parcels, and the rail line splits it, you have the opportunity for a couple of big users, multiple small users and there are a lot of different options right now and it really depends on what incentives the IDB is going to work with the company, and the State of Tennessee is also heavily involved with whoever would be able to come here.

Mr. Mathews stated that they have shown this property multiple times to many users, most of them manufacturing (inaudible) battery manufacturing. He stated that this shows well to many clients and the opportunity for rail through the middle of the site (inaudible). He stated that we do see this is a great opportunity for us and a great opportunity for the Allensworth's to get out of the business of farming. He stated that it is difficult to tell on the drainage right now because they do not know who the user is but once they come in the drainage will be based on the standards of the community (inaudible).

Mr. Tyndall stated that any site plan that comes in will still have to go through this Commission for approval and potentially TDEC or EPA depending on what the end user is. He stated that there will be multiple opportunities to get involved, either from an infrastructure perspective or an approval perspective.

Ms. Ashley Burnett, resident of Hartley Hills, stated that she has serious concerns as they have three small children and are concerned about pollution as well as negative impact on property values. She asked how would you feel if this was your family? She stated concern with the proximity to residents as the nearby subdivisions are filled with growing families. She is concerned that they will be exposed to harmful chemicals and exposed for the health of their children. She stated that another concern is about the infrastructure. She stated that the access roads are small two lane roads with no shoulder and commercial traffic greatly increases risk. She stated that runoff is also a concern. She stated that most of the runoff from the property flows directly into the seasonal pond. She stated that for at least a third of the year there is significant standing water there and she feels that this will only increase that.

Ms. Heather Agar, Boyer Farms, stated that her biggest concern is that on page 50 and 51 of the Zoning Ordinance they talk about what M-2 zoning means. She stated that the M-2 General Industrial District is established to provide areas in which principle uses of the land is for manufacturing and other heavy industrial uses that could possibly have an adverse effect on surrounding property. Such uses are not properly associated with nor compatible with residential, institutional, retail business or light industrial uses. As such these uses are intended to be confined to specific locations or areas (inaudible). She stated that this property is two tenths of a mile from homes in Hartley Hills. She stated that it is eight tenths of a mile, by driving, to her home with her four children and her concern is with the pollution. She stated that she is not sure that M-2 is the best choice for the families who live in the area.

Mr. Dan Locke, Boyer Farms, stated that he understands that this is an ideal property with the railroad, fire stations (inaudible) becomes undesirable. He stated that it will be hard for them to sell their homes because no one wants to live close to heavy manufacturing and he and his wife are totally against this. He stated that it will impact them greatly.

Mr. Watson stated that if you look at the map where SteelStock Road is, which is where the power junction is, you can see International Boulevard where it runs into the Industrial Park (inaudible). He stated that he does not think that the Government is going to allow anything that is going to pollute the area.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval as this is an extension of the existing M-2 zoning to the west. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 10 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Sunilkumar Aronagiri Kani Sunil

Agent: Joel D Ragland Goble & Yow, Plc

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District
to C-5 Highway & Arterial Commercial District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Highway 41-A South, 1600 +/- feet east of the Highway 41-A South & Quail Hollow Rd. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 082 PARCEL(S): 211.00 ACREAGE: 0.74 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: Property owner desires to utilize the front portion of the parcel for the construction and operation of a building for his dental practice.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The property is in an area that continues to be in transition both before & after the right of way improvements for 41-A South. Commercial interest remains along this corridor with a mixture of Commercial, multi-family & single family residential demand. This property has frontage along Highway 41-A South, which is an arterial highway near the signalized intersection of Highway 41-A South & Sango Dr./Mcadoo Creek Rd. The C-5 zoning designation is the Highway & Arterial Commercial district Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Sango Planning Area. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern received in reference to this application. He stated that it would be a potential increase in traffic, light and noise.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no comments or phone calls. He stated that if there is development on the back half of this property, we will coordinate with the owner of the property to make sure they leave legal road frontage.

Mr. Joel Ragland stated that his client is wanting to construct his dentist office on the front portion of this property. He stated that they feel it is compatible with the adjacent area and he is available to answer any questions.

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

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 11 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Christine Oliver

Agent: Dbs & Assoc Houston Smith

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District
to R-1

LOCATION: Property located at the southeast corner of the Kirkwood Road & Buck Road intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 034 PARCEL(S): 023.00 ACREAGE: 129.79 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 1

REASON FOR REQUEST: Development of single family housing

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for deferral. The applicant has requested a month deferral of their application and the RPC Staff is agreeable to their request. Mr. Spainhoward stated under department comments that this property will require offsite water and sewer. He then read the School System comment which states Oakland Elem., Rossvie Middle & Rossvie High are in the 2nd fastest growing region in Mont. County. Oakland Elem. is at 114% capacity and currently has 6 portable classrooms, Rossvie Middle is at 117% capacity and currently has 10 portable classrooms, Rossvie High is at 110% capacity and currently has 6 portables. CMCSS has added an average of 10 portables each year for the last 4 years. This continued student growth necessitates additional action to address building capacity growth and school bus Transportation needs in Mont. County. This development could contribute at least 35 additional students and neither infrastructure, funding, nor processes are in place at this time to address housing development in this region! In addition, Rossvie road transitions from 5 to 2 lanes at the Rossvie Campus, and traffic volume will only increase.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. He stated that the property has frontage on Buck Road and Kirkwood Road. Mr. Spainhoward stated that we will need to conduct a public hearing. He stated that the comments that were taken by phone are on page 31 of the Commissioner's packet. He stated that there is a copy of an e-mail that was submitted by an adjoining property owner.

Mr. Houston Smith, representing the owners, stated that they did request a deferral on Monday. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

(inaudible) kind of surreal to see your home (inaudible) Regional Planning Commission. He stated that he wanted to bring up several points in speaking in opposition of this (inaudible). He stated that there are nearly 2000 new residents that are due to go into Kirkwood Place and Fieldstone Village Apartments, which are on Dunlop Lane before you get to Kirkwood Road. He stated that more than likely traffic for this property will traverse that two lane highway. He stated that they have significant concerns as a community about the development going on in this area and the ability of this road to hold itself, as well as the point of time when you intersect Dunlop Lane and Kirkwood Road. He stated this is a very dangerous situation with the growth that is going to take place here. He stated that within a mile of this there is a dangerous railroad crossing which has three stoplights within fifty feet of each other. He stated that residents of this area will potentially be having to pass through that area as well. He stated that the Rollow Lane situation is absolutely out of control. He stated that this Body has allowed for unlimited growth it seems of commercial and residential in that area. He stated that Mr. House from CMCSS was very successful in defeating the latest zoning matter that came about where the School System themselves had asked for a moratorium of sorts on building in and around this area. He stated that the schools are all over 100% capacity. He stated that he would encourage everyone to listen to the numbers that Mr. Spainhoward read about the volume of people we are looking to bring in on this two lane road. He stated that he would ask this Body to fully defeat this.

Mr. Swift stated that he would like to state, as a reminder, that all we do is make recommendations that meet basic standards that we are guided by and then they go forward to the Governmental Bodies and they make the decision.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there was a typo on the report and that the number of new children would not be 400, it should be 35.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend 30 day deferral based on the applicant's request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

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

PLANNING COMMISSION SUBDIVISION ACTIONS: Mr. Swift stated that for subdivisions that are not withdrawn or deferred we vote on all the cases in one vote. He stated that if you have a case that you want withdrawn from the consent agenda for discussion, we will talk about it separately. He stated that otherwise it will be on a consent agenda and all cases will be approved at one time. Case S-47-2020 was pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action). Mr. Parker read the remaining cases on the consent agenda.

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

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 47 - 2020 APPLICANT: mainstreet investments, tn gp

REQUEST: Revised Preliminary Plat Approval of TIMBER SPRINGS SECTION 4 (REVISED PRELIMINARY) CLUSTER

LOCATION: South of Hazelwood Road, north of the 101st Airborne Division Parkway, west of Trenton Road, west of and adjacent to the current terminus of Timberdale Drive.

MAP: 017 PARCEL(S): 053.02 (portion) ACREAGE: 41.45

OF LOTS: 101 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

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

1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading, and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage, and erosion control plan.
3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.

Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. He stated that the biggest difference he will point out from the preliminary is that in the northwest corner you will see an additional road stub to the north. He stated that they have added approximately 21 lots from the preliminary plat.

Mr. Houston Smith stated that the owner could not be here so he is going to represent him. He stated that this is the same case that was approved a couple of months ago. He stated that there were no changes to the road configuration other than the new road stub, no change to the zoning. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Barry Stange, Timberdale Drive, stated that their main concerns have been water flowing as well as an issue that is running into the old section there, Section 3, with (inaudible) mailboxes (inaudible).

Mr. Houston Smith stated that it is really difficult to get a straight answer from the post office right now so they do have an area still available in this section. He stated that there are also other options. (inaudible)

Mr. Barry Stange, (inaudible) asked if they plan on tearing down all of the wooded area that surrounds that. He stated that they are already running into problems with the Cedar Springs Subdivision. He stated that they have cleared all of the trees there and (inaudible) concerned if they remove all the trees there, it will be worse. Mr. Houston Smith stated that it is always in the developer's interest (inaudible) few trees as necessary to develop the subdivision and (inaudible) Section 3 was one of the subdivisions that was developed and the mail thing happened where no one really knew what to do. He stated that this one we know so we are able to actually plan for it.

Mr. Tyndall suggested that Mr. Smith and Mr. Stange talk offline after the meeting.

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

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 49 - 2020 APPLICANT: CHARLES AND JOHNNY CLARDY

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of DUNBAR SECTION 4 (CLUSTER)

LOCATION: West of Interstate 24, south of Rossview Road, east of Basham Lane, north of and adjacent to Dunbar Cave Road, approximately 700 feet east of the intersection of Dunbar Cave Road and

MAP: 057 PARCEL(S): 074.00 & 074.01 ACREAGE: 16.32

OF LOTS: 41 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

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

1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading, and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage, and erosion control plan.
3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.

CASE NUMBER: S - 50 - 2020 APPLICANT: BRISTOL RIDGE APARTMENTS, LLC

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of NEPTUNE DRIVE RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION

LOCATION: South of Highway 76, west of N. Woodson Road, north of Interstate 24, approximately 1,200 feet east of the South Gateway Plaza Boulevard and Highway 76 intersection.

MAP: 063 PARCEL(S): 067.00 ACREAGE: 0.46

OF LOTS: 0 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

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

1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading, and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage, and erosion control plan.
3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.

PLANNING COMMISSION SITE REVIEW ACTIONS: Case SR-19-2020 was pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action). Ms. Russell read case SR-20-2020 and gave the staff recommendation for approval.

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

VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS:

CASE NUMBER: SR - 19 - 2020 APPLICANT: BILL BELEW

Agent: Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: BRISTOL RIDGE APARTMENTS, PHASES 2 & 3

PROPOSED USE: MULTIFAMILY

LOCATION: SOUTH GATEWAY PLAZA BLVD

MAP: 063,067.00 & 067.02 ACREAGE: 31.88

CIVIL DIST.: 11

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

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer to include as built.
 2. Approval of all grading, drainage and water quality plans by the City Street Department.
 3. Approval from the City Traffic Engineer.
 4. Approval from TVA.
 5. Approval of a landscape plan.

Ms. Russell read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. She stated that on page four of the Commissioner's packet are copies of e-mails received and our responses. Mr. Tyndall asked what we finally decided with the Fire Department. Ms. Russell stated that the Fire Marshal, Ricky Cumberland, stated that he is okay if they have the gates opening inward.

Fire Marshall Ricky Cumberland reiterated the importance of the gates opening inward.

Mr. McKay stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Lynn Saber stated that they moved in April on Lillian Grace Drive and they chose that area because they really truly liked it. (Inaudible) going to be kind of difficult, thinking in terms of building apartments where we are. She stated that they are located on the west side of the cul-de-sac. She stated that she is concerned about the noise of construction. She stated that she is also concerned about the families who have kids. She stated that is why she is opposed to this coming about, that the builders and contractors and owner of the property are going to be the ones that capitalize on this. She stated that she heard that the apartments are going to come about 100 feet from their fence and she is concerned about the closeness of it. She asked that this be reconsidered as many of the residents oppose.

Mr. Tyndall stated that the developer left a buffer and that R-4 apartments will also be required to have trees planted. He stated that there will be 50 feet of trees left between the actual property line and your property. He stated, that said, this is a project that has been going on for probably well over a year, probably a year and a half at this point. He stated that this was an area that was annexed in January, and has gone through rezoing prior to arriving here. He stated that once it reaches this phase, because we have rezoned it already, there is really not much we can do. He stated that they are meeting the minimum requirements, and probably exceeding them with that extra buffer. He stated that her concerns were not falling on deaf ears but legally we have to approve this thing since the zoning. He stated that the better chance would have been prior to buying the house to try to have the zoning denied. Mr. Tyndall discussed the road connections.

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

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 20 - 2020 APPLICANT: NICHOLAS CONSTRUCTION LLC

Agent: Houston Smith

DEVELOPMENT: 1216 FRANKLIN STREET WAREHOUSE

PROPOSED USE: WAREHOUSE/STORAGE

LOCATION: 1216 FRANKLIN STREET

MAP: 066-E-C-012.00 ACREAGE: 0.28

CIVIL DIST.: 11

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

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer to include as built.
 2. Approval of all grading and drainage plans by the City Street Department.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Tyndall introduced Maria Jimenez as the new Planning Commissioner who is taking over the unexpired term of Dr. Walker.

A. MONTHLY PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT: Mr. Tyndall presented the monthly profit and loss statement.

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

B. EXTEND STAFF APPROVAL OF FINAL SUBDIVISIONS THROUGH JULY: There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

C. UPDATE ON GUN RANGES IN M-2 ZONES: Mr. Tyndall stated that at the last County Commission meeting the County requested us to study putting a gun range in M-2 zoning as a use permitted upon review. Per Montgomery County Commission Resolution #20-6-9 "RPC study and prepare modification of the existing zoning regulations...to provide for quality assurance testing applications in regards to suppressed/unsuppressed activities in the M-2 zone and make recommendations...." Mr. Tyndall stated that outdoor testing is not permitted in any zone. He stated that personal shooting and shotgun ranges with conditions are allowed. He stated that we are looking into how would we accommodate this and then the vote would be, whether or not we want this, to approve this zoning text amendment. He stated that two weeks ago, to date, staff visited Fort Campbell and observed similar training at the machine gun and rifle ranges. He stated that we have consulted with a range GIS company that ran us some noise and safety models, not taking terrain into consideration but gave us basically the worst case scenarios. He stated that we have contacted Barrett Rifles and Beretta Handguns in Gallatin and we have talked to their planning staff. He stated that both of those facilities have indoor testing only. He stated that they do no outdoor shooting.

Mr. Tyndall stated that our next steps will be to draft a resolution next month and bring it back for you with a "use permitted upon review." He stated that we will provide conditions to protect existing residences and industries from surface danger or nuisance noises. He stated that if it is not deferred, we will present it back to County Commission in August 2020.

D. DISCUSSION ON SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS UPDATE: Mr. Tyndall stated that we are looking at doing a Subdivision Regulation update this summer and these are some of the topics we are discussing. He stated that he has also drafted a resolution for City and County to consider at their August meetings. He stated that there is a committee called the Residential Development Commission that was formed in the early 1990s to bounce off ideas that the Planning Commission had with some individuals. He stated that it is comprised of two City Council members, two County Commissioners, one member from the School Board and two developers. He stated that it is supposed to meet monthly but has not met for over a decade so he is proposing that we rescind that resolution or replace it with a group that he is calling the Land Development Adhoc Advisory Committee. He stated that there is no vote and they are just there to bounce off ideas and would be two City Council members, two County Commissioners, three developers, real estate agent or homebuilders, ex officio memberships from both Mayors, the Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Director of the Planning Commission. He stated that they would only meet as necessary, if approved. He stated that currently Mayor Pitts is on board.

He stated that the Martin Luther King overlay is still in limbo. He stated that Councilwoman Streetman does not want to vote on it until she can have an adequate public meeting with the concerned individuals out there. Due to COVID-19 she wants to keep holding it off.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

ATTEST:

Richard Swift, CHAIR