

OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
GOODLETTSVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

July 6, 2020  
5:01 p.m.

*Electronic-Remote Format*  
*City Hall Auditorium Closed*

Staff presented that the remote electronic format meeting was being completed through the ZOOM hosting site due the impacts of COVID-19 and the Governor's Order including extension to August 29<sup>th</sup> to permit the remote electronic meeting format. The intention of the remote electronic format is to protect the health and safety of the Planning Commissioners and Citizens of Goodlettsville while meeting the City's intention to continue the business of the City.

**Present:** Chairman Tony Espinosa, David Lynn, Scott Trew, Mayor Jeff Duncan, Grady McNeal, Judy Wheeler, Jeff Parnell, Bob Whitaker, Vice-Mayor Rusty Tinnin, and Jerry Garrett

Roll Call Vote-completed and Planning Commissioners stated that no one was in attendance with them at their remote meeting location other than family members that reside with them

**Absent:** Jim Hitt

**Also Present:** Addam McCormick, Russell Freeman, Mary Laine Hucks, Tim Ellis, and Rhonda Carson

Espinosa called the meeting to order and McNeal offered prayer

Garrett made a motion to approve the agenda, Tinnin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 10-0. Roll call vote completed

Trew made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2020 meeting, Lynn seconded the motion. Espinosa abstained since he was not present at the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. Motion approved 9-0. Roll call vote completed

Wheeler made the motion to suspend the Planning Commission's By-Laws to permit the remote meeting format and prior submitted public forum comments to be reviewed before the regular agenda items, Whitaker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 10-0. Roll call vote completed

**Public Forum on Planning Related Topics**

Espinosa stated that Mr. Greg Edrington is no longer with the City of Goodlettsville and he thanked him for his service to the city.

Staff summarized a public comment that was received prior to the meeting regarding making sure the audio is operating since at the previous meeting two (2) members were attending the meeting with remote format and the comment included that they were unable to hear the commissioners. The comment also addressed the need for transparency with the board to make sure all commissioners have ability to make comments and their comments be heard.

## AGENDA ITEMS

### **Item#1**

**Tru By Hilton/RK Patel Design/Planning LLC and Nafa Engineering, PLLC:** Request site plan approval for a four (4) story –ninety-eight (98) room -48,855 square feet hotel on 2.8 acres at 831 Conference Drive. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02600010300 and is zoned GOPUD, General Office Planned Unit Development. (#08-20) Property Owner: SHIV SAI HOSPITALITY GROUP, INC

**Item Representative:** Minal Patel, Property Representative

### **Staff Discussion:**

- History of project and prior approval of Best Western Hotel
- Site work permits issued for Best Western Hotel but worked stopped
- State vested rights and zoning use- since city after Best Western approved zoning ordinance amendment to remove hotels from the permitted uses in the GOPUD zoning district
- Site plan includes new hotel and site layout- similar to previous approved site plan including previous landscaping design
- Staff discussed approval stipulations- parking lot lighting along residential boundaries to include shields to reduce amount of lighting onto adjacent residential developments with lighting as shown, ADA front walk connection from public sidewalk to building to require handrails based on proposed design, landscaping along property line by retaining wall- since the area is not a pedestrian area

### **Planning Commission Discussion:**

- Duncan discussed being excited about the architectural renderings and the development
- Wheeler asked about fire truck access
- Staff showed the design is similar to Best Western including an area for fire department to access the side of the building
- Parnell discussed the storm water design will be costly to construct and the impervious parking areas could be reduced for a one-way drive with possible angled parking to reduce the area
- Parnell discussed the inefficient design
- Patel discussed that they would review the parking design
- Parnell asked about the fifteen (15') feet dimension along the north property line
- Staff discussed it was for landscaping and transitional buffer requirements
- Parnell asked what the deal with the city engineer was
- Ellis discussed the city will get a contract engineer to review plans and position cut due to budget issues and that previous city engineer reviewed these plans prior to leaving

### **Motion:**

Duncan made the motion to approve the request, seconded by Garrett. The motion passed unanimously 10-0. Roll call vote completed

**Item#2**                    **Storage Rentals of America/Randolph Architecture and Will Robinson and Associates: Request site plan approval for three (3) storage buildings -36,200 square feet on 4.52 acres at 719 Rivergate Parkway. Properties are referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcels# 02613002800 and 02613007000 and are zoned CSL, Commercial Services Limited. (#09-20) Property Owner: SROA 719 RIVERGATE TN, LLC**

**Item Representative:** Mr. Robertson, William Robertson and Associates and Ryan Smith, Randolph Architects, Mark Randolph-property representative

**Staff Discussion:**

- Existing project and proposal includes two (2) new buildings areas
- Proposal includes a variance request for building materials including front building meeting design guidelines except rear facing wall and back buildings lumped together-proposal is for all metal consistent with adjacent buildings
- Variance proposal based on limited visibility of walls and consistency with existing development design
- Meadow Lark Lane is maintained and signed by the city the section of street was included in a 1977 access easement granted to the city
- Development includes a sidewalk along their section of Meadow Lark Lane
- Property contains multiple overhead utility easements so landscaping limited to smaller plantings
- Storm water design includes per calculations minimum run-off increase since area contains existing gravel parking and drive areas being replaced with buildings and parking and removal of some gravel areas that are being replaced with grass
- Plans revised to include a twenty-four (24”) inch culvert upgrade under Meadow Lark Lane
- Staff discussed the following stipulations:
  - Fence along Meadow Lark Lane to be coated chain link black without woven wire at top so fence could be taller to match existing fence heights that include woven wire at the top,
  - Building roofs to be natural color instead of red primary colors shown,
  - Parking lot lighting pole heights to be reduced to twenty (20’) feet to be more in line with building heights
- Front Building#1 to meet the City’s Design Guidelines and due to limited visibility on rear wall of building- the minimum required may be relocated to the more street visible front and side walls
- Back Buildings#2 permitted to be consistent with adjacent rear storage buildings including metal exterior panels due to the location behind the existing building-colors of buildings#2 to be consistent with front building#1 and existing buildings
- Staff discussed the design variance requested process and how the variance was requested
- Smith discussed that staff described the items and project and no additional comments

**Planning Commission Discussion:**

- Espinosa discussed the variance process and possible concerns with request
- Trew discussed understood variance request since limited public view

- Duncan discussed variances not an issue but concern with flooding with upsizing of exiting culvert under Meadow Lark Lane and discussed new flood maps in the area
- Duncan discussed the drainage calculations for the project and on-site flooding issues
- Staff discussed not aware of any complaint on this property flooding
- Robinson discussed the drainage calculations and project includes removal of some of the existing gravel areas to grass areas as referenced in calculations
- Robinson discussed per drainage calculations submitted the pre and post run off rates are consistent with limited increase
- Robinson discussed the design includes a curb on edge of parking to direct drainage flow to pipe sections instead of existing cross lot drainage patterns
- Robinson discussed design should improve existing drainage issues- not ideal but good solution for property drainage design
- Parnell discussed concerns with the project design and calculations can be made to support any design and question the application of gravel versus asphalt run-off calculations
- Parnell and Duncan discussed storm water design options and infiltration swales possible and check dams and concern with making storm water worse with site development and front parking lot area development increasing storm water flows
- Parnell and Robinson discussed the rock soil conditions and if any soil reports were available
- Robinson discussed the flat site conditions and gravel and stone on the site development
- Robinson discussed the different parking areas at the front and back of site and existing viewed issues at adjacent property line
- Staff discussed the city's review was either a small on-site facility to handle the increased run-off or replacing and upsizing the culvert under Meadow Lark Lane to support 100-year design flows so if the Planning Commission does not feel comfortable with the staff option chosen then go back to on-site facility without upsizing and replacing existing culvert under Meadow Lark Lane
- Parnell asked if the Planning Commission is undoing any staff review with storm water discussion
- Staff stated the staff defined options including the culvert replacement is a recommendation the Planning Commission has over sight of process and if the Planning Commission is more comfortable with the other option for on-site facility that would be best
- Parnell discussed more concerned with smaller two (2) and ten (10) year storm frequencies and better options for an on-site facility
- Robinson discussed if an onsite facility is preferred by Commission just request the requirement be an approval contingency
  
- Wheeler asked if rear building would be metal building with matching colors of the existing buildings
- Staff stated that is correct
- McNeal asked if dumpster proposed on-site
- Staff stated existing site thought one already on-site but defer to development representative
- Randolph corrected that there was no dumpster on-site for their offices and stated the reason storage facilities typically don't have dumpsters is that the dumpsters get used instead of storage tenants dealing with their own trash and don't want to promote this and the property management on-site will handle their own office related trash needs
  
- Garrett discussed agreeing with engineers that on-site facility better and leave existing eighteen (18") inch pipe under Meadow Lark Lane

- Espinosa discussed the options for site plan approval with storm water on-site facility and keep maintain existing pipe
- Staff discussed a stipulation could be made and staff can bring back the revised design to report to the Planning Commission
- Espinosa reviewed the motion process
- Parnell asked about the front setback issue if forty (40') feet
- Staff discussed the front property line is actually at Rivergate Parkway and across street on other side of property since Meadow Lark Lane is within an easement and on private property
- Parnell discussed that the right side is the front elevation
- Staff stated front elevation is where minimum brick percentage could be transferred from back wall area if they want to use metal on back wall
- Staff discussed the building colors would match existing buildings and roof colors on new buildings to be a natural tone

**Motion:** Garrett made a motion including adding stipulation six (#6) to state to maintain existing eighteen (18") culvert under Meadow Lark Lane and include on-site storm water detention per city and engineering approval, seconded by Lynn. The motion passed unanimously 10-0. Roll call vote completed

Planning Commission stopped for a short break at 6:08 pm and returned at 6:14 pm.

**Item#3** Goodlettsville Hotel, LLC/ Barnett Design Studios: Request Design Guidelines Variance regarding exterior materials on the rear building wall for the approved five (5) story -67,560 square feet hotel at 555 Rivergate Parkway. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02609009200 and is zoned CSL, Commercial Services Limited within the Interstate Sign District. (9.1#07-20) Property Owner: Vishal A Banker

**Item Representative: John Barnett, John Barnett Design Studio**

**Staff Discussion:**

- Site Plan including elevations approved by Planning Commission at the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting with fifty (50%) percent brick on all elevations and remainder area EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems) and the Planning Commission requested the same design on rear accessory pool house
- Variance request is to remove brick off the back of the building due to cost and limited visibility due to elevation change from Rivergate Parkway
- Design Standards includes a provision to permit minimum material percentage to be relocated to more visible building elevations but same minimum material requirements would still be in place just relocated to other elevations that are more visible and staff stated that would be only thing that could be recommended relocating instead of removing minimum materials

**Planning Commission Discussion:**

- Barnett discussed request based on cost and low visibility to back of the building due to property elevations
- Trew asked what changing the materials do to the building design including colors and request not better for hotel appearance

- Staff discussed building colors could remain but if more brick required on front then brick colors could change to reflect current design
- Espinosa discussed request to drive down cost by not using as much brick versus relocating
- Barnett discussed request to keep cost down with no brick on the rear elevation and other walls remain as approved
- Tinnin asked what material would be proposed in place of brick on the back of the building
- Barnett confirmed it would be all EIFS on the back and the request is due to recent issues the hospitality industry has faced and the request was an effort to ensure the project is moving forward
- Duncan stated that the city has a lot of hotel including approved plans and has received comments from residents and wants to ensure hotels are high quality to ensure they will good for a long time and this issue is about quality of hotel so would not support a variance
- Garrett discussed leaving as approved
- McNeal discussed leaving as approved
- Lynn discussed leaving as approved
- Espinosa discussed agreeing to keep design as is

**Motion:**

Trew made the motion to deny the variance request, seconded by Wheeler. Whitaker voted to Deny. The motion passed to deny the variance request passed 9-1. Roll call vote completed

**Item#4                      Copper Creek 2-6, Meritage Homes, Performance Bond Extension**

**Item Representative:** N/A

**Staff Discussion:**

- Last house in this section is currently under construction
- Remaining items include top layer of asphalt at \$ 77,000
- Discussed with developer- agreed need to get this phase completed in six (6) months for acceptance request

**Planning Commission Discussion:**

- Parnell discussed how bonds are kept up with
- Staff discussed uses a spread sheet with calendar reminder- understand the need to maintain bonds since has seen what happens when the bonds expire

**Motion:**

Parnell made the motion to approve the request, seconded by Duncan. The motion passed unanimously 10-0. Roll call vote completed

**Item#5                      Northcreek Commons/Armed Services Mutual Benefits, Performance Bond Reduction**

**Item Representative:** N/A

**Staff Discussion:**

- Carter Howard, Developer/owner was previously on the zoom call but appears to no longer be available
- Planning Commission approved last month for a one-year extension at \$ 330,000
- Mr. Howard came back asking for reduction instead due to the amount of work already completed
- Revised bond reduction request is \$ 120,000
- Staff requested City’s consultant engineer for the Conference Drive signalization project to review Mr. Carter’s anticipated intersection signal and stripping changes- and the amount was \$ 51,000 per current bid but TDOT is requesting to re-bid to reduce costs
- Street improvements have not been accepted yet and the city would require a \$ 60,000 one-year maintenance bond at the time of acceptance and this amount of the required \$ 120,000 bond could be used for any storm water items that might come up before acceptance process but would want to make sure to keep performance bond in place to cover the developer’s share of intersection improvements and future maintenance bond amount
- Staff estimate for remaining improvement cost is \$ 101,000

**Motion:**

Wheeler made the motion to approve the request, seconded by Lynn, the motion passed unanimously 9-0. Whitaker vote not available. Roll call vote completed

**Item#6** Summerfield Apartments/ Summerfield Place LLC: Requests variance from the High Density Residential Planned Unit Development maximum three (3) story building requirement to reconstruct a fire destroyed building at four (4) stories at 452 Moss Trail. Property is referenced as Davidson County Tax Map/Parcel# 02609002200 and is zoned HDRPUD, High Density Residential Planned Unit Development.

**Item Representative:** Thomas Anderson and Jim Humphries, Architects with the project

**Staff Discussion:**

- Existing apartment building recently completely destroyed to fire – was a split two (2) and three (3) story building including office
- Property is HRDPUD zoning with three (3) story maximum height by Planning Commission services as Appeals Board for master plan revisions and building design
- Review based on limited visibility onto adjacent property due to property grade and limited visibly from main drive
- Proposal would allow a more modern design

**Planning Commission Discussion:**

- Anderson discussed proposal including maintaining forty-two (42) units and breezeway design with a three (3) and four (4) split story split for fire safety instead of the central corridor like the previous building
- Anderson discussed the fire safety design with new building including fire sprinklers

- Anderson discussed fire could have been a problem if it was not in the afternoon and manager banging on the unit doors to get everyone out
- Anderson presented elevations and interior layouts of a similar design for the new building
- Trew discussed liking design
- Wheeler asked about elevator design
- Anderson stated no elevator proposed
- McNeal asked about fire separations between individual units
- Anderson discussed one-hour separation with fire sprinklers
- Parnell asked about emergency access to hotel and what status was
- Staff discussed meeting with Fire Chief and both owners (apartment and hotel) and both verbally agreed. Mr. Banker, hotel property owner had his attorney prepare the agreement for the property owners
- Staff discussed the gated emergency drive connection is intended to be installed only with hotel construction

**Motion:**

McNeal made the motion to approve the request, seconded by Tinnin, the motion passed unanimously 9-0. Unable to record Whitaker vote. Roll call vote completed

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

**-Parkview Preserve Project Expansion**

- Staff discussed the original master plan and proposal to include seventy-two (72) more units
- Proposal change from three (3) to four (4) units per acre and reduce open space from 31.4% to 22.4 %
- Staff discussed Medium Density Residential Planned Unit Zoning maximum is three (3) units per acre and minimum 7% open space – Comprehensive Plan is a medium density residential that ranges from three (3) to six (6) units per acre
- Staff discussed the development would require rezoning or Zoning Ordinance amendment in the Medium Density Residential Planned Unit zoning which would be based on density of City’s comprehensive plan and does not recommend a rezoning to High Density Residential Planned Unit zoning classification
- Johnny Thoni and David Bushman- Developer Representative discussed the proposal including connection to back property future development, way more common area then required could be good addition to the project but wanted to see the thoughts of the Commission
- Bushman the project has connection at French and Harris Street and this proposal would include a third out the back to a future development
- Trew asked about traffic and was this discussed or reviewed regarding traffic and connection to additional property and concern with being able to access Main Street with more traffic
- Staff stated no the original project traffic study only focused on approved development the back property is the Voce development but no formal master plans have been submitted for the property development
- Duncan discussed the original approval process was a painful experience and surrounding property owners opposed would not be in favor but with the development of the back property and a connection could be reviewed in the future



- Wheeler asked about increased traffic with proposal
- Staff stated based on average traffic for townhouse which is less than typical single family home- 72-150 new residents and six (6) to eight (8) additional vehicle trips per unit.
- Tinnin discussed agreement with Duncan's comments
- Parnell discussed agreement since not part of original plan
- McNeal, Garrett, and Espinosa discussed agreement with Duncan's comments
- Trew discussed new owners in the area might not appreciate additional units and people
- Parnell discussed with intention of development and name of project that the proposal would not be with original development intention including tree line removal and park view
- Parnell and representative discussed design of proposed townhouses and views with one versus two (2) story units

**-Design Guidelines Exterior Materials**

- Staff discussed general summary on guidelines and asked about any thoughts or suggestions for any amendments. No comments received and Espinosa said Commissioners would need to consider
- Staff stated would include in future training session

**-Davidson County Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps**

- Staff discussed preliminary flood maps for Davidson County
- Staff expects notice from FEMA of preliminary review in a few months would notify owners and the maps are planned to be finalized for adoption in summer of 2021
- Staff stated the maps will have a big impact on Birdland Area since currently no flood designations currently on the properties going from no regulations to floodway will impact these properties and redevelopment
- Staff discussed the changes at Exit 98 interchange and old Kmart property
- Staff discussed FEMA develops these maps and the City is left to adopt them and enforce them and wanted property owners to know the City did not development the maps
- Staff has previously questioned FEMA on the maps and new designations are based on US Corp of Engineers Nashville study of the Gizzards Branch Tributary

**With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm.**

---

Tony Espinosa, Chairman

---

Addam McCormick, Planning Director