



TOWN OF ASHLAND CITY

Planning Commission Meeting

March 07, 2022 5:30 PM

Minutes

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Stratton called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Chairman Steven Stratton
Committee Member Vivian Foston
Committee Member Gerald Greer
Committee Member Michael Smith
Committee Member Mike Stuart

ABSENT

Committee Member Steve Allen

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Committee Member Stuart, seconded by Committee Member Greer, to approve the agenda. All approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 07, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Committee Member Foston, seconded by Committee Member Smith, to approve the February 07, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. All approved by voice vote.

CALL TO ORDER

A motion was made by Committee Member Greer, seconded by Committee Member Stuart, to defer this until the next meeting due to a vacancy on the board. All approved by voice vote.

PUBLIC FORUM

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Zoning and Future Growth Discussion

Committee Member Greer stated that he was concerned about how we could influence quality growth and how we could sell this town to get quality builders. He stated that the Town of Ashland City was mentioned in a recent article in the Nashville Business Journal and read a paragraph from the article to the board. Committee Member Smith stated that we could ask someone from the Nashville Business Journal to come out to tour Ashland City and run an article on just Ashland City. Committee Member Greer asked if we could get some type of zoning requirements that would prevent unwanted developments like triplexes and duplexes. He stated that we have to get control of what is being built and the quality of the builds. Mr. Gregory stated that we could, but we cannot control the unintended consequences that may come with it. He stated that he does not think our problem is zoning, but the requirements of the zoning. Mr. Gregory stated that it would be a policy change where when someone comes for a rezone request, they should expect it to be a PUD.

2. Plat Amendment Parcel 064-011.01

Mr. Hussaen Ismael stated that he was requesting a plat amendment for a 15,000 sq foot tract on this property that would allow for a single-family home. Committee Member Greer asked if this was in the flood zone. Mr. Ismael stated that the flood zone is scattered on the property and it is not an issue at the moment. Committee Member Greer asked what he planned to do with the rest of the property. Mr. Ismael stated that it was a townhome development zoned R4 PUD and it is in the works. Mr. Gregory stated that this is a two-part request. He stated that the first request is to divide the property and the second request is to rezone for the smaller lot to R3. Mr. Gregory stated that the rezone request will need to go before Council for approval. He stated that the plat references the 2010 flood map and that map has been updated. Committee Member Smith asked if we were voting to separate the tracts. Mr. Gregory stated that was correct and to approve the rezone to R3. Committee Member Smith asked if that only allows for single-family housing. Mr. Gregory stated that it permits for single-family, prefabricated, and duplexes, but there are thirteen (13) special exceptions it will allow for. After much discussion, a motion was made by Committee Member Stuart, seconded by Committee Member Greer, to defer the request. All approved by voice vote.

3. Minor Subdivision Application

Mr. Rick Johnson stated that he is trying to straighten out the lot lines. He stated that he has owned his property for years and is trying to divide the property. Committee Member Stuart asked if it was three existing properties. Mr. Johnson stated that it was and they meet all the setbacks. Mr. Gregory stated that the notes do not have anything about previous recordings, but he is sure the surveyor has a copy of the note. A motion was made by Committee Member Greer, seconded by Committee Member Foston, to approve the application with the note to be added. All approved by voice vote. Voting Yea: Chairman Stratton, Committee Member Foston, Committee Member Greer, Committee Member Smith, Committee Member Stuart.

4. Site Plan Approval 2437 Bell Street

Mr. John Rankin stated he was representing the owner and this was to get approval on a final site plan of six (6) additional units on Bell Street. He stated that these would be different than the existing new builds, but they would be the same style as the three (3) closest to Forrest Street. Chairman Stratton asked if this was part of the existing line of homes. Committee Member Foston asked if this was on the right of Poole Street. Mr. Rankin stated that it is on the corner of Poole and Bell. He stated that they are building a separate road next to Bell Street. Mr. Gregory stated that there is not much separation between Poole Street and that entrance and it does not look like a safe connection. He asked for that to be reconsidered. Mr. Rankin stated that they would be happy to delete that entrance. Committee Member Stratton asked they would accommodate emergency vehicles. Mr. Rankin stated that they would have to make a hammerhead at the end where they can make that turn. He stated that it had not been thought of prior to this moment and they would be happy to delete that entrance. Chairman Stratton stated that he was concerned with the lack of landscaping in this development including the other twenty-one (21) new builds. Mr. Rankin stated that they can make that a condition for all 27 units. A motion was made by Committee Member Stuart, seconded by Chairman Stratton, to approve the site plan with the condition that the entrance and exit at Poole Street are not allowed and all site plan requirements are part of the approval including the drainage issues, stormwater retention, and landscaping for all 27 units. Voting Yea: Chairman Stratton, Committee Member Foston, Committee Member Greer, Committee Member Smith, Committee Member Stuart.

5. Site Plan Approval 1209 Hwy 12S

Mr. Josh Lyon stated he was there on behalf of Klobner Engineering for a site plan approval and they are working through the engineering comments. He stated that they developed this site plan as a private development that will be managed by an HOA and there will be nothing public on it except the utilities such as the sewer and water that will cross through the site. Mr. Lyon stated that there are requests in the engineering comments to design the roadways to City

standards. He stated that because of site constraints they put the drainage down the middle and designed it as a private site plan like a parking lot. Mr. Lyon stated that the request came from the consulting engineer to construct the private drive as a roadway and they are here to request the roadways be allowed to be designed as a private entity that will be controlled by the HOA and never turned over to the City. Mr. Gregory asked if he could explain the difference between the two. Mr. Lyon stated that the City would require certain asphalt and aggregate thickness to be heavy duty because typically they would be turned over to the City and maintained by the developer for a year. He stated that City streets are crowned which means they are higher in the middle and slope to the curb. Mr. Lyon further stated that with their development they are asking for typical standards like you would have in an apartment complex parking lot. He stated that the roadways would slope to the middle to keep drainage away from the units and eliminates conflict of water and sewer. Mr. Gregory asked what the difference was in the paved thickness. Mr. Lyon stated that they would have an inch and one half of topping (1.5in), two inches of binder asphalt (2in), and six inches of aggregate compacted base. He stated that a city street would have a ten-inch stone base (10in), three inches of binder (3in), and two inches of topper (2in) which is much thicker than what is required of any typical parking lot. Mr. Lyon stated that it is a relief in thickness, but better for the infrastructure. Committee Member Smith asked who was requesting it to be held to the City standards. Mr. Lyon stated that the City's engineering consultant is requesting it. Ms. Amanda Bell stated that it is not the product they are wanting to provide. Committee Member Stuart declared a conflict on this particular agenda item. Mr. Gregory asked if there was room for compromise to blend the two. Mr. Lyon stated that drainage down the middle is of high importance. After much discussion, a motion was made by Committee Member Smith, seconded by Committee Member Greer, to approve the site plan with the City's required thickness and drainage down the middle. Voting Yea: Chairman Stratton, Committee Member Foston, Committee Member Greer, Committee Member Smith. Voting Abstaining: Committee Member Stuart.

6. Amend By-Laws and Rules of Procedure

Mr. Gregory stated that we need to amend our By-Laws because it currently reads that the body appoints members but should read that the Mayor appoints. A motion was made by Committee Member Stuart, seconded by Committee Member Greer, to approve the amendment of the By-Laws. Voting Yea: Chairman Stratton, Committee Member Foston, Committee Member Greer, Committee Member Smith, Committee Member Stuart.

OTHER

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Committee Member Stuart, seconded by Chairman Stratton, to adjourn the meeting. All approved by voice vote and the meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

CHAIRMAN STEVEN STRATTON

CITY RECORDER ALICIA MARTIN, CMFO