I. Invocation

II. Call to Order and Roll:

Chairman Russ Campbell called the meeting to order and advised that a quorum was established.

Present
Russ Campbell, Chairman
Mike Wissman, Mayor
Don Hinkle
Oscar Brooks, Alderman
Tommy White
Glen Bascom, Secretary

Others Present
Angela Reeder, Town Planner
Gerald Lawson, Town Attorney
Jason Allen, Town Engineer
Catherine Durant, Town Administrator
Mary Helen Carmack, Planning Clerk

Absent
Al Johnson, Excused

III. Approval of Minutes from July 17, 2017 Meeting:

Chairman Campbell called for a motion on the June minutes.

Motion: Alderman Brooks made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2017 meeting. Mayor Wissman seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Comments from Citizens

Chairman Campbell invited anyone wishing to address the Commission to please come forward and state his/her name and address for the record. He noted also that they could speak now or hold their comments until the item in which they wish to be heard has a Public Hearing. There were no comments at this time.

V. Old Business:

A. Other as Properly Presented

There was no Old Business
VI. New Business:

A. **Forrest Lake PD, Phase 2 - Final Plat - North side of Forrest Street, West of Cambridge Manor**

   PD – Angela Reeder, Town Planner, presented the staff report for the project (on file). The applicant is requesting approval of a Final Plat for Phase 2 of the Forrest Lake PD incorporating 30.92 acres including the northern lake. It is located on the north side of Forrest Street, north of Phase 1. This will create 38 single-family residential lots and 1 common open space. Lots in Phase 2 range in size from 10,000 to 18,973 square feet.

   The lot layout and phasing is consistent with the approved PD, meeting the minimum lot size, dimension and access requirements set forth in the PD.

   The applicant will next finalize plans that address all engineering comments, receive a Development Agreement from the BMA and have a pre-construction meeting with staff.

   Ms. Reeder, noted that staff recommends approval of the applicant’s request, subject to the proposed conditions.

Discussion:

None

Main Motion: Don Hinkle made a motion to approve the Final Plat for Forrest Lake Phase 2 subject to staff conditions. Mayor Wissman seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

S-1. It is found that the application as presented, dated June 27, 2017, and with the conditions of approval meets the provisions of the Town of Arlington Subdivision Regulations, the Town of Arlington Zoning Ordinance and any other applicable regulations, and the project shall be constructed in accordance with those regulations.

S-2. Final Plat approval is effective for two (2) years from the date of approval by the Planning Commission. The applicant may request two (2) one-year extensions from the Planning Commission, per the Subdivision Regulations, if needed to record the Plat.

S-3. A completed Development Agreement shall be prepared and executed prior to construction of any infrastructure within the development.

S-4. Prior to recording the final plat, the developer shall furnish the Town of Arlington approved security, per the Subdivision Regulations, in order to ensure the work will be completed in accordance with approved drawings and applicable specifications.

S-5. The developer shall provide the Town with a copy of the Final Plat using state plane coordinate system with NAD – 27 or NAD – 83 datum on disk or CD in a generally accepted format at the time the Final Plat is presented for recording.

S-6. The applicant’s design professional shall address all Final Plat mark-ups prior to recording the Final Plat.

**PROJECT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:**

P-1. Approval of the Final Plat will be contingent upon approval of the Construction Plans.

P-2. All lots in Phase 2 must be incorporated into the HOA for the Forrest Lake PD, to ensure shared access and maintenance of HOA amenities. Proof that the community HOA is in good standing
with the State and documentation on how this Phase will be incorporated shall be provided to Town Staff for review and approval, and subsequently recorded, where necessary, prior to recording of the Final Plat.

P-3. All common open space in Phase 2 must be deeded to the HOA at the time of recording of the Final Plat.

P-4. Provide a pedestrian easement over the full length of the 8’ wide greenbelt trail, and coordinate the trail connection location on the west side with the approved Wilson’s Crossing Phase 3 plans.

P-5. Reroute the walking trail around the front of the parking spaces at Creekside Lake Dr. cul-de-sac to allow users to continue without walking in the road.

P-6. Identify all the required setbacks in either a note or a table on Sheet 1. Approved setbacks are: 25’ front, 20’ rear, and 5’ minimum side setback with a combined total of 15’.

P-7. Remove the rear setback line on corner lot 51 and identify it as a side setback similar to all other corner lots.

B. **Villages at White Oak 1st Addition PD, Phases 2-20 – Master Development Plan – East and west sides of Milton Wilson Boulevard, south of Kensington PD.**

Angela Reeder, Town Planner gave the staff report (on file). She explained the BMA approved a General Development Plan for the project on February 1, 2016, which covered 274 acres and included 567 homes and some commercial space. A Master Development Plan for Phase 1 was approved in August 2016. The applicant is now asking for approval of a Master Development Plan for the 269.5 acres remaining in the PD, Phases 2-20. The GDP for the 1st Phase was very detailed, therefore much of the current plan duplicates the previous approval.

The proposed uses include detached single-family, retail/office and common open space with 433 homes in Phases 2-20 (561 total for the PD.) This is six (6) fewer than the approved GDP but maintaining a density of 2.1 dwelling units per acre.

The general layout remains the same with the east side of Milton Wilson Boulevard including only single-family detached residential uses and Common Open Space. The west side includes roughly 6-acres of commercial uses and the remaining is designated open space.

Ms. Reeder explained Area 15 has been renamed *Lifestyle Community with Universal Design* as opposed to *Age Targeted*, as it is a name no longer used in the senior housing world.

The plan includes four (4) primary Common Areas totaling 47.9 acres. COS 1 on Milton Wilson was reduced in size with Phase 1, in order to match up with existing curb cuts on the street; COS 3 is larger. There are multiple smaller open areas interspersed throughout which may be used for detention/retention basins. The areas result in 22.8% open space (61.6 acres). The urban greenway is still proposed and the nature trail in COS 3 has been extended in a corridor between Areas 15 and 16.

The streetscape width along Milton Wilson Blvd. will continue to match the adjacent phases. The Design Review Committee will provide a final review of all landscaping and common open space amenities.

Ms. Reeder noted the proposal is consistent with the approved General Development Plan in lot sizes, building setbacks, and minimum home sizes with the exception of Area 15. The applicant noted a typo in the GDP said 7,500sf lots for 15, but the plan was drawn as 6,250 sf lots. As it was designed that way, while a reduced lot size is noted, the setbacks and number of senior lots has not changed.

Design Standards require a minimum of 50% brick façade of all buildings and matching the stated architectural styles.
No road improvements are required along Milton Wilson Blvd. All roadways will have a minimum right-of-way width of 50 feet, curb to curb width of 30 ft. Landscape plates are provided. Homes fronting Milton Wilson are required to provide a driveway pad that allows vehicles to turn around and exit the lot in a forward motion.

A request for a reduction of the distance from an intersection corner to a driveway has been requested. The Code currently requires 50’ from the end of turn radius to the center line of a driveway, and the applicant has proposed a minimum of 20’, 25’ and 30’ corner clearance, based on lot size. Ms. Reeder noted this requirement has not been strictly enforced in Town, and it has not resulted in an obvious problem. As such, staff sees the benefit of providing some flexibility from the 50’ requirement on interior subdivision streets only, which do not intersect a current or potential arterial or collector street. In situations where a proposed lot is at the corner of an interior local road and an arterial or collector, staff recommends a 50’ minimum corner clearance be maintained. A comparison to other local municipalities was performed and found Memphis and Collierville have a 20’ minimum corner clearance requirement, and Germantown states the corner should be as far from the radius as practicable.

The phasing schedule indicates the remaining 19 phases and 493 lots being developed over the next 14 years. The commercial lot (Area 3) is intended to develop at any time based on market demands. Phases 1A, 1B, and Area 17 were not included. Phases 1A and 1B are currently under construction. Area 17 is a 2-acre area intended to be provided to the adjacent Villages of White Oak HOA for open space. Staff recommended the temporary cul-de-sac be re-constructed to permanent street standards, with curb, gutter and sidewalk, and that Right of Way be dedicated to the Town for this cul-de-sac.

The applicant proposes to utilize a decorative street light with LED fixture, as opposed to the standard 30’ concrete cobrahead from MLGW. The plan notes a specific pole or Town approved equal be installed by the applicant. An exhibit of the 12-foot-tall metal pole and fixture is included and is not equivalent to any design currently available from MLGW. The lights would be in the right-of-way and electricity for the lights will be billed to the Town, similar to current lighting.

Any required maintenance of street lights is currently performed by MLGW and paid for by the Town. The PD’s proposal would require the Town to enter into a contract with an outside company to perform maintenance on an as-needed basis. If pursued, staff recommends the developer provide 1 additional fixture complete with pole for every 5 fixtures installed, and an extended manufacturer’s full warranty. Staff would require engineer certified lighting plans for each phase to confirm it meets IES standards.

Ms. Reeder noted staff sees the advantages of using an LED fixture, and the quality aesthetics of the proposed fixture. There are reservations about switching from MLGW to a third-party maintenance provider, such as: maintenance costs are known with MLGW but there are unknown from a third-party vendor, will this set a precedence for all future developments, staff will have to compile and track a new maintenance contract, and will MLGW provide service to privately installed lighting. Staff is willing to look further into these outstanding items. However, given the existing unknowns, it is recommended the PD utilize the standard MLGW lighting used by the Town for now. If follow-up research identifies the alternate proposal is feasible, the PD should then be brought back for an amendment to include the alternate development with an attention to detail of all aspects of design throughout. Finding the Master Development Plan consistent with the approved GDP and Code requirements for such a plan, staff recommended approval of the Master Development Plan for Phases 2-20 subject to the proposed conditions.

**Motion:** Chairman Campbell called for a motion to suspend the Planning Commission Meeting and open the Public Hearing. Don Hinkle made the motion and Alderman Brooks seconded the motion.

**Vote on Motion:** The motion carried unanimously. Open Public Hearing
Chairman Campbell noted that the public hearing was published in the Commercial Appeal on August 5, 2017. He asked anyone wishing to speak for or against the request to stand and be recognized by stating his/her name and address for the record.

**Citizen comments:**
Ben Knoernschild, 12570 Bonsai Bend Drive, asked for clarification of when the dedication of the 2 acres would take place. He also noted an observation/complaint about the current construction traffic. The equipment is using the streets and alleys of the current phase of White Oak and leaving dirt and sediment in these areas as well as causing erosion in the alleys. Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation would want it cleaner. The pond in Kensington is still brown from the last rain event.

Hearing no other public comments, Chairman Campbell called for a motion to close the Public Hearing.

**Motion:** Tommy White made a motion to close the Public Hearing and resume the Planning Commission Meeting. Alderman Brooks seconded the motion.

**Vote on Motion:** The motion carried unanimously. Public Hearing was closed.

**Discussion continued:**
Planning Commission Secretary, Glen Bascom, stated he has been getting calls about Area 17. Chairman Campbell asked the Developer to address the issues Mr. Knoernschild had raised.

Keith Grant, 177 Crescent Dr., Collierville, TN, said the dedication of Area 17 is anticipated to be in the next two years, but could be later as it is intended to be graded and stabilized at the same time as the adjacent phase. Mr. Bascom stated the current residents have no open space and felt we should have a more defined timeline. He then asked if each of the proposed phases meets the 20% COS as stand-alone phases. Ms. Reeder stated the PD offered over 20% overall, with more in some areas than others. The goal is to maintain 20% total as the phases develop. Town Attorney, Gerald Lawson stated the applicant offered to donate area 17 previously, but legally the Town cannot force the giving of common open space. Mr. Bascom said he still felt people are being strung out with Area 17 tied to the third phase, which may not develop in order. Mr. Bascom then asked who would pay for the street lights and stated he is against the proposed lights. Mr. Grant stated he would pay for lights and installation.

Mayor Wissman asked about the senior housing naming. Mr. Lawson said this was discussed at the public Work Session and *Age Targeted* was not clearly defined in the GDP. He noted with *Lifestyle Community Universal Design*, there would be no covenants restricting how they are sold, recorded, or deeded. Chairman Campbell asked Mr. Grant to explain the new language. Mr. Grant explained a consulting group in Oxford who provides guidance on the senior development informed his team that *Age Targeted* is a term no longer in use, and *Lifestyle Community with Universal Design* has replaced that title. Mr. Grant explained that Universal Designs has the elements such as: the master bedroom on the ground floor, wider doors, shower size, lower thresholds, electrical outlet placement, switch placement, and all lawn care maintenance provided by the HOA. Chairman Campbell asked what phase this is in and its timeline. Mr. Reeder noted it was a later phase and expected 11+ years out. Chairman Campbell also asked if since they are the smallest lots and smallest square footage, wouldn’t the cost per sq. ft. increase and the HOA fees be higher. Mr. Grant stated that yes, the cost per square foot is higher in smaller lots and homes and the HOA fee would definitely be higher. Chairman Campbell wanted to know if Mr. Grant felt this product would be desirable with the higher cost and fees, since it is targeting a different market. Mayor Wissman questioned if this could become an area used as starter homes and if there would be age restrictions? Mr. Grant stated there could be a restricted covenant which allows some discrimination based on age, as the HOPA Act allows sections of housing with at least one person 55 and over in 80% of the households by survey every 2 years.
Chairman Campbell said he liked the street lights and noted we’ve looked for better lights in the past, but they did not meet our design guidelines. He asked if staff felt like they would have time to research the topic in time. He agreed with using the current standard until such time that staff feels comfortable. Ms. Reeder stated that her goal is to get responses to those details as soon as possible. Mr. Grant said he could provide contacts for 2-3 bids on installation and maintenance costs to assist staff. He estimated that process should take about a month or so to get the information. Alderman Brooks noted that since the Town of Arlington would own all of the infrastructure, the annual costs, aging and operating expenses need to be priced as well. They discussed the timing of obtaining this information, as two phases are currently under construction. It was determined that if it could be settled before any lights were installed, then it could be considered; however, the entire development would need to use the same lights. Mr. Grant agreed he would want that as well. Mr. Grant asked to only have to go before the BMA for a change to use the lights, for timing. The Attorney noted an amendment would typically require both boards approval, and that a change to the lights would be similar to making a change to our Subdivision Regulations, which the Planning Commission regulates. Chairman Campbell said he wasn’t willing to pass along their responsibility to the BMA. Mr. Lawson recommended it come back to both boards for review and approval, and agreed since this item has been fully discussed, it could be considered as a project option and be heard without a public notice for each.

Alderman Brooks asked if the reduced corner clearance was measured to the edge of the driveway or to the center. Mr. Allen noted that typically it is measured to the center, but an engineering condition noted that the minimum distance allowed would be 20 feet measured to the nearest edge of the driveway. Mr. Grant said he had not understood that to be the case and asked it be measured to center line. The Commission discussed the item and determined that they would defer to the Town Engineers for an item such as this, and maintain that the minimum corner clearance be 20 feet, to the nearest edge of a driveway. Mr. White asked for clarification that anything intersecting Milton Wilson would keep the 50-foot clearance, and Ms. Reeder said that was their recommendation.

Mayor Wissman asked if there was any way to tie a date of transfer for Area 17, such as before any future plats are recorded. Mr. Lawson recommended against putting it in the PUD, as it is not an obligation to donate to a third party but rather a show of good faith from the applicant. Mr. Bascom said if Phase 3 doesn’t move forward now, it could be years before it is deeded. Mr. Grant said the two acres was intended to help them meet their 20% requirement. He noted his company will have to buy the property before giving it to the HOA. He offered to deed Area 17 (graded, stabilized and seeded, as well as with a final surface on the cul-de-sac), in conjunction with recording the plat of one of the next two phases, regardless of what number they are, to give some surety when the land would be provided. The Commission agreed that was acceptable and it was added as a condition.

Mr. Bascom then asked when landscaping on Milton Wilson would be installed. He noted that the plan was to install median landscaping with adjacent phases. It was pointed out that the center phases adjacent to the median were much later. Mr. White asked if they would be irrigated. Mr. White asked if the landscaping would mirror existing White Oak. Ms. Reeder said it would be the same trees, but would be spaced closer to the Kensington PD to the north for the health of the trees. Ms. Reeder noted the plan says the medians will be planted in four phases and suggested it be revised to state the “first” four phases. Mr. Grant agreed, as did the Commission.

Mr. White asked if the applicant if he had any concerns about engineering conditions. Mr. Grant said he was ok with all but one item regarding installing full improvements at the cul-de-sac in Area 17. Mr. Grant said did not recall offering full improvements and a dedication. The Commission remembered needing the radius for turning, but not requiring full improvements. The Commission discussed the merits of donating the cul-de-sac to the HOA as a turnaround and parking, as opposed to dedicating it to the Town, and noted they did not want to burden the HOA with that added cost of maintenance. Mr. Lawson noted the property would have to be deeded to the HOA, then from the HOA to the Town as public right-of-way, if they so choose. It was agreed that Area 17 would be donated to the HOA with a final wearing surface.
Main Motion: Don Hinkle made a motion to approve Master Development Plan for Phases 2-20 of the Villages at White Oak 1st Addition Planned Development subject to staff conditions and the added conditions by the Planning Commission. Mayor Wissman seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Conditions of Approval
1. The Master Development Plan, dated August 4, 2017, if approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, may be subject to revisions as a result of engineering design and Town technical specification considerations. The Town’s Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, Stormwater Regulations and Technical Specifications Manual shall govern development of the Subject Property unless specifically modified as part of the approved General and Master Development Plans.

2. Upon approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, the Planned Development shall be recorded with the Shelby County Register of Deeds.

3. The site plan submitted, showing the locations of roads, lots, open space, and detention areas is subject to final review and approval of the various Boards, Commissions and Committees with the applications for final plats, construction plans, and all the required documents of those applications.

4. A Development Agreement, representing a binding agreement between the Developer and the Town of Arlington pertaining to all conditions of approval, including the submitted Master Development Plan (as amended), shall be required prior to beginning work on any and all phases of this development.

5. All open space proposed as part of the Master Development Plan shall be privately owned and maintained by a homeowners association.

6. Revise the Master Development Plan document to:
   a. Revise language in IX. Water Service/Utilities to note all street lighting shall be the MLG&W approved fixture as required by the Town of Arlington, Subdivision Regulations, or, by the approval of the Planning Commission and the Mayor and Board of Alderman for the Holophane Dunwoody Aluminum Pole with Granville II LED (see E8) throughout all phases of The Villages at White Oak 1st Addition including 1A and 1B.
   b. Add language to Section V Landscaping, Screening and Open Space to describe the white 3-rail fence to be used in COS areas to distinguish them in the neighborhood.
   c. Delete item Q in section V. Landscaping, Screening and Open Space, which is currently an incomplete sentence, and appears to repeat Item A.
   d. Remove language specifically referencing T.C.A. § 13-4-310. The Town is bound to follow state law and strives to do so.
   e. Add language to Section C regarding Area 17 and when the common open space will be dedicated to the adjacent Villages of White Oak HOA, as well as installation of a final wearing surface before the property is deeded to the HOA.
   f. Address all engineering comments throughout, which include but are not limited to minimum corner clearance requirements.
   g. Add language to Section C regarding Area 17 that the two-acre lot will be deeded to the Village of White Oak HOA from the Village at White Oak 1st Addition with the recording of the plat of one of the next two phases.
h. Item “N” in Landscaping and Open Space section of the Master Development Plan revised to read, “must be installed with the first 4 phases.”

C. City Enterprises PD – General Development Plan – northwest corner of Highway 64 and State Route 385

Planning Commission Secretary, Glen Bascom, recused himself prior to the presentation, noting he has represented the owners in this transaction.

Angela Reeder, Town Planner presented the staff report (on file). The applicant is asking for consideration of a General Development Plan for a roughly 70-acre project on the north side of Highway 64 and the west side of State Route 385. This is a gateway location for Arlington and is for Regional Commercial use per the Future Land Use Plan. Development is currently limited due to a lack of sewer availability. Zoning is E: Estate, which allows for agriculture and large lot residential. Applicant’s PD is intended to provide for some limited development of the site using septic. The proposal is to develop the site with a wholesale auto auction as the primary user on the northern 50 acres and a retail auto sales lot and convenience store along Highway 64. In an attempt to not box in the site too much, the PD proposes a wide variety of other retail and warehouse uses. The plan proposes most uses in the B2: General Commercial with the addition of some wholesale uses including businesses that were low water users and could operate from a septic system.

Staff feels that in an attempt to manage this large site approval should limit the uses to only those few proposed on the site now, and possibly an accessory use that may be seen in a C-store (such as a donut, ice cream, or sandwich shop). If a separate user were to show interest the PD can and should be amended to address that situation at that time.

The PD proposes to follow all bulk regulations of B2: General Commercial zoning. Staff notes that the primary use requested, wholesale sales, is considered Industrial use by our Land Use Code. Staff would recommend the rear portion of the site be subject to M-1: Light Industrial bulk regulations.

TDOT approval for access from 64, and Shelby County Health Department approval for septic systems, are both accurate in this area. Town Staff would also be involved in the approval process for access from 64. BZA approval should not be required. A Planned Development cannot remove this land-use permitting requirement, and any standard entitlement process would still be required.

No unique architectural design guidelines have been proposed with the GDP, so the project will be subject to the Town’s Design Guidelines for all improvements. The application did include a possible elevation, the initially proposed metal siding would not be acceptable per our Design Guidelines.

Access to the site is limited to two driveways on Highway 64.

The applicant states that they are open M-F, and will be receiving deliveries of vehicles continually. Each week, on Auction day, they expect 300-400 dealers to attend and those that purchase several vehicles will often have a car carrier to pick up the vehicles. General traffic information projected for this site only has been provided. Staff would require a complete traffic Impact Study be provided analyzing existing and projected traffic volumes on both Highway 64 and SR385. Signal timing of the traffic signal at SR385 would be analyzed, with the anticipated delay for vehicles entering and exiting this site for all turning movements under peak traffic conditions.

Stormwater detention facilities to conform to Town regulations will be required which is especially important on a lot this large with so much impervious surface. Areas reserved for detention on the northermost end of the site appear to be shared for the entire site. Detention for this project has not been evaluated and will be at the time construction plans are submitted. Areas shows as “Reserved for Detention” are general in nature and shown only as a place holder.
The plan states it will meet the Town’s 30% open space requirement across the entire site.

No conceptual Landscape Plan is included at this time. MDP would need to include one and set streetscape requirements.

Applicant is requesting an exception from parking lot landscape requirements with the option to use painted islands in that area, claiming it is not a typical parking lot. The lot would be used for storage and they do not want tree litter falling on the cars. Consideration could be given to reducing the number of islands but staff does not support the removal of all landscape islands.

Town may grant approval for a Planned Development when it results in specific tangible benefits to the community. Ms. Reeder spelled out the specific objectives for the Town, residents, and the developer.

The General Development Plan for the City Enterprises PD accomplishes the objective of using interconnected access to serve a large site with limited driveway cuts, and flexibility with the parking lot landscaping for this unique use. Staff does not feel it meets the other objectives set forth. It doesn’t have architectural guidelines to result in exceptional design, it doesn’t preserve open space other than floodplain and a large MLGW easement, and it doesn’t seem to provide amenities or shopping opportunities we would see elsewhere.

A General Development Plan is an overall, schematic plan for a PD’s uses and the character of the development. While this could follow in Master Development Plan, staff is not convinced that it is a proposal that will result in a quality development that meets the ‘Regional Commercial’ intent of the Future Land Use Plan, that it would not create traffic concerns at this busy roadway, and that it would result in a quality development at the entrance to our town.

Staff does not recommend approval of the General Development Plan as proposed.

If the Planning Commission wishes to recommend approval, staff suggests it be subject to the following conditions, which will restrict the uses permitted, subject uses to Town guidelines and approval processes, require some landscaping of the large parking lot, and require proof that the traffic generated can be accommodated safely as proposed in this location.

**Motion:** Tommy White made a motion to suspend the Planning Commission Meeting and open the Public Hearing. Oscar Brooks seconded the motion.

**Vote on Motion:** The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Campbell noted that the public hearing was published in the Commercial Appeal on August 5, 2017. He asked anyone wishing to speak for or against the request to stand and be recognized by stating his/her name and address for the record.

**Citizen comments:**

Lorie Boyd, 12535 Harrell Rd., said she was not opposed to the use. However, she said this is a dangerous intersection and we should pay close attention to traffic movements, especially rush hour from 5:00-6:00pm.

**Motion:** Hearing no other public comments, Chairman Campbell made a motion to close the Public Hearing and resume the Planning Commission Meeting. Tommy White seconded the motion.

**Vote on Motion:** The motion carried unanimously. Public Hearing was closed.
Discussion continued:

Chairman Campbell invited the Developer to speak.

Cindy Reaves of SR Consulting, LLC, stated the site was chosen for its access and as an interim use. She noted the Town is only receiving $3,055 property taxes currently and this $1-20M project would increase property taxes. Once utilities are there, it can be developed as Commercial Regional Center. She asked if this is something the Town wants or not.

Mayor Wissman asked Ms. Reaves to define interim use. Ms. Reaves explained that this is something that could be easily relocated and then the site repurposed.

Ms. Reaves stated this lot was chosen because of its access and with the intent for their project to be an interim use. She said if the site was developed as currently zoned, as Estate Residential, it would not be interim and the Town would never be able to redevelop it later with commercial. She noted it would allow the Town to collect more property taxes, as it would be a large investment. She said the primary use will be auto sales through the auto auction, and that they chose to put the other two uses at the street to break up the site. She noted they originally began with a zone change, but was told to instead process a PD. Now they are just interested in whether the Town wants this use or not.

Mayor Wissman asked what was meant by interim. Ms. Reaves stated theirs would be an easier use to relocate, unlike a residential development. If sewer was available, then the auto sales could be relocated and the best use of the site as regional commercial could be developed. She said that is one reason they were asking for flexibility.

David Andrews, City Enterprises, added if the site had sewer service now, they couldn’t afford it. He said he expected a minimal impact from traffic, with only an influx of traffic on sales days from 9:00 a.m. to noon. He feels it would be much less than a large Home Depot or retail site. He mentioned he has a 57-acre site in Chattanooga near a neighborhood and has received no complaints from those neighbors. He mentioned the picture of the building that was shown is one designed for Huntsville and is nothing like what would be seen here.

Mayor Wissman said he understood added revenue, but had difficulty with so much asphalt, and that the generic design for the retail front was limited. Ms. Reaves stated the visibility on 385 would be limited because of existing vegetation and more would be added. Mayor Wissman said it’s difficult to envision their proposal. He said that while Ms. Reaves is calling it an interim site, it’s not guaranteed and he questioned what the area would look like 20 years down the road. Ms. Reaves said they are open to design suggestions.

Mr. Andrews said he wanted to put City Auto, a used car lot, on the front portion of the lot. He felt like the revenue from that use was something the Town would want, but he offered to bring in other uses if the Town desired. Mayor Wissman asked about fencing required for M-1 bulk regulations staff is recommending. Ms. Reeder stated fencing would be required for screening along street frontages including 385, even under industrial regulations. She noted the only major exceptions for fencing have to do with sports fields and municipal facilities. Mr. Andrews offered to put decorative fencing or wrought iron along the south side and by the wholesale building; however, he said with a site this large, decorative fencing is a problem and he didn’t see the site as being unsightly. He noted that once cars are bought, people generally take them rather quickly. He noted they would start with around 25 acres of the rear portion of the site. Ms. Reaves stated many more details would be provided and nailed down with the Master Development plan submittal.

Tommy White asked about an existing buffer on the east side. Ms. Reeder showed the aerial view and Ms. Durant, Town Administrator, noted it was not thick landscaping, but was more sporadic on the east side. Ms. Reaves stated they would not be taking any of that out, but would rather supplement it with extensive landscaping. Ms. Durant noted there were two ponds and 2 or 3 houses existing on the site.
Chairman Campbell asked for clarification for uses permitted. Ms. Reeder stated the proposed condition notes wholesale auto sales, retail auto sales, convenience stores and any ancillary uses typically be found in a convenience store, such as a deli or ice cream shop. Mayor Wissman asked about the next steps for the applicant after tonight. Ms. Reeder explained the PC recommendation would go to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, and if the General Development Plan was approved with the uses and bulk regulations, the applicant would have to come back with much more detailed plans in a Master Plan. Ms. Durant noted the BMA has also been known to send a project back to the PC for more discussion. Chairman Campbell clarified it is the applicant’s decision on whether they move forward to the BMA, regardless of the Planning Commission’s recommendation. Ms. Durant explained the concerns of staff for allowing too many uses on the 64 corridor without sewer service. She clarified that the wholesale side would not bring sales tax, while the retail side would have financial impacts.

Alderman Brooks said he felt most people did not want a giant asphalt parking lot. He prefers trees and feels they must be considerate of land around the site and the integrity of the site. Mr. Andrews said the perimeter would be well landscaped and he feels all of his sites operate in harmony with the communities where they’re located. Ms. Durant added that this would require extensive landscaping along 385.

Chairman Campbell asked about traffic flow an impact study. Jason Allen, Town Engineer, said the applicant provided some information, but a full study with signal timing, traffic numbers and driveway separation from the intersection would be needed. Staff expects car haulers, not just passenger cars, to be traveling through the site. Chairman Campbell reiterated his concern for safety issues, noting the Town needs assurances this is not dangerous. Mr. Allen noted there is congestion in that area during specific hours. Chairman Campbell said that staff had not assured him the short distance from off-ramp on 385 is safe. Ms. Reaves stated these driveway locations were only conceptual and would likely change with the Master Plan, to even include a deceleration or turn lane for traffic entering the site.

Chairman Campbell asked for any other discussion. Mr. Brooks reiterated that they need to be flexible, considerate of existing natural features on the site, and return with a tasteful proposal.

**Main Motion:** Don Hinkle made a motion to recommend approval of General Development Plan for the 70-acre project on the north side of Highway 64 and the west side of State Route 385 subject to staff conditions. Alderman Brooks seconded the motion.

**Vote on Motion:** Mayor Wissman abstained. The motion carried 4-0.

**Conditions of Approval:**

The General Development Plan dated July 12, 2017, if approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, may be subject to revisions as a result of engineering design and Town technical specification considerations. The Town’s Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, Stormwater Regulations and Technical Specifications Manual shall govern development of the Subject Property unless specifically modified as part of the approved General Development Plan.

A. Other as properly presented

There was no new business to come before the Commission.

**VI. Adjournment:**

**Motion:** Don Hinkle made a motion to adjourn. Oscar Brooks seconded the motion.
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