Planning Commission
August 20, 2018
6:30 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

I. Invocation – Secretary Brian Thompson delivered the invocation.

II. Call to Order and Roll:

Present:
Russ Campbell, Chairman
Brian Thompson, Secretary
Susan Payne
Glen Bascom
Larry Harmon, Alderman
Don Hinkle

Others Present
Angela Reeder, Town Planner
Gerald Lawson, Town Attorney
Mary Helen Carmack, Planning Clerk
Janet Lucci, Planning Admin. Assistant

Absent:
Tommy White – Resigned

III. Approval of Minutes from July 16, 2018 Meeting:

Chairman Russ Campbell called for a motion.

Motion: Glen Bascom made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2018 meeting.
Susan Payne seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Comments from Citizens

Chairman Russ Campbell invited anyone wishing to address the Commission on any matter other than the item for which a Public Hearing would take place later in the meeting, to please come forward and state his/her name and address for the record.

Citizen Comments: Fred Pellegra, 12350 Donelson Road, inquired about the Fire Department proposed next door to his property. He wanted to know why he was not informed about the proposal and about eminent domain.

Sally Pellegra, 12350 Donelson Road, stated the proposed fire station would be next to a residential neighborhood. There are topography problems. She does not feel the current fire station is located in a residential area and she objects to the new fire station being built by her home.

V. Old Business:
A. Arlington Trails, PD – Master Development Plan – on Brooks Branch Rd, at the southwest corner of the intersection of I-40 and Airline Road.
Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who presented the staff report for Arlington Trails Master Development Plan (on file) located on a 17.08-acre, undeveloped commercial site. This PD was considered at the July PC meeting. The applicant has revised the proposal in response to that conversation.

She noted the Master Development Plan goal is to create a “unified development.” The Plan proposes to divide the site into seven commercial lots ranging from 1.17 to 5 acres. The Plan includes the extension of Arlington Trails Rd west to Brooks Branch and the addition of a new road in the center of the site.

Ms. Reeder stated TDOT has plans to abandon and demolish the portion of Brooks Branch Rd within their current I-40 right-of-way. This would occur only after the new Arlington Trails connection is installed and open to residents.

The property, Ms. Reeder explained, is currently zoned SC (Shopping Center). Current permitted uses would continue to be allowed on Lots 1-2 and 4-7 except for twelve specific uses: gas stations, greenhouse/nurseries, liquor stores, auto repair, auto service, outdoor amusement, funeral homes, hospitals, misc. repair services, watchman dwellings, utility transmission facilities, and wireless communication facilities. The two hotels proposed on Lots 1 and 2 are the anchor developments and are permitted in the SC zone subject to Town guidelines for hotels.

Ms. Reeder further explained that Lot 3, with primary frontage on Arlington Trail, is proposed with a self-storage use subject to General Commercial guidelines. The PD restricts this lot by noting it must be built in a “fort configuration.” No other General Commercial uses would be permitted.

End users are proposed for Lots 1-3; Lots 4-7 will remain as outlots and be available for future commercial development. It is anticipated they will be complimentary uses such as restaurants, general retail, banks and offices.

The Project would follow all existing bulk regulations in accordance with the underlying SC zoning. One exception is requested to increase the max. building height to 50 feet on Lots 1 and 2 (from current 40’) to accommodate the proposed 4-story hotels.

Lot 3, the storage facility, would be subject to all B-2 bulk regulations. Ms. Reeder stated the PD proposes a 25-foot front yard setback, from current 30-foot. Staff encourages this as is would be consistent with remaining six lots. The rear yard is proposed as a minimum of 5-foot on the property line abutting Lot 2. No more side setback exceptions were requested. The minimum open space for Lot 3 is proposed at 21.7%. Thirty percent (30%) is the standard requirement on retail lots, however, the Code allows down to a minimum of 20% Open Space in PD’s. In addition, all other lots would meet or exceed the 30% standard.

The PD is still proposed in three primary phases: Phase 1 – infrastructure, Phase 2 – which is the Fairfield Inn and Suites and the storage, construction on Lots 2 and 3 and Phase 3 – Construction on the hotel on Lot 1. The remaining four (4) lots would be developed as market conditions allow.

Ms. Reeder noted the architectural design of the Master Plan is driven by the two hotels. The hotels will conform to Marriott’s designs while meeting Town material requirements. Proposed materials include brick veneer, stone veneer, EIFS, and architectural metal panels. The hotels will have pools in the courtyards enclosed with the same materials as the hotel. Each site will be
required to go before the DRC to confirm these details. The self-storage facility is proposed in a combination of red and gray brick, white stone and split face block. Staff noted that split face block is not an accepted exterior building material in this location so the applicant has agreed revise as necessary to meet percentage requirements for the DRC.

Remaining lots to be developed by future tenants will incorporate brick tones and patterns, stone colors and patterns, fencing, outdoor dining furniture and directional signage used on hotel signs. They are also required to utilize similar decorative metal fencing and walls on outdoor dining. Restaurant uses are specifically called out to utilize similar material to the first three buildings with decorative awnings and outdoor seating.

Staff recommends the four outlots support the design narrative of the primary lots.

Jason Allen, Town Engineer, stated there will be several road improvements with this project. Arlington Trails Road will be made west of Airline Road, with a 60’ right-of-way (ROW) section. Brooks Branch Road that falls within TDOT’s ROW will be demolished and reverted back to greenspace. The four (4) lots in Marriot Cove will be improved to the Town’s standard 50’ ROW. This cove will dead-end at the I-40 ROW. This public ROW would provide an avenue for Shelby County Sheriff’s Department and Code Enforcement to enforce No On-Street parking within the Cove. Marriot Cove is now proposed to have a 20’ radius raised brick accent circle in the center, in a herringbone pattern, which will match crosswalks within the development.

Mr. Allen said the portion of Airline Road adjacent to the proposed project will be widened to its ultimate width for their half of the roadway. The ultimate buildout of Airline Road will consist of a 5-lane section with bike lanes, curb & gutter, and sidewalk. The applicant is required to complete and install concurrently with the first Phase of the development. Additionally, all lots will be accessed by public ROW. Access plan identifies general locations for possible access points, no more than 1 per lot per frontage, and also provides for a right in/right out shared access for Lots 3 and 6 on Airline Road.

Pedestrian connectivity will be provided throughout. The applicant proposes sidewalks along Airline, Arlington Trails, and Marriot Cove. They have requested an exception to not install sidewalks around the end of the cul-de-sac on Marriot Cove (beyond the hotel driveways) and on the south side of Arlington Trails. The have proposed two (2) new walkways since last meeting.

He said a Traffic Impact Study was requested and will be provided to determine the developments impact to the Airline Rd/Arlington Trails intersection and the surrounding area. The applicant has hired an engineering consultant to perform the traffic counts. School started back last week which will impact the traffic study, so a study has not been completed for review. Although traffic study is not available, Mr. Allen recommended that a traffic signal be installed at the intersection of Airline Road and Arlington Trails. The traffic signal should be installed an operable before the issuance of a U&O Permit to the first hotel and storage facility.

Mr. Allen further noted that in accordance with the Town’s sewer master plan, this area is intended to be served by a sewer lift station. This development will be required to install this lift station and force main, and it will be sized to serve this development and the area south along Brooks Branch Road that fall within the same basin. This development will install gravity sewer lines to the southwest corner of the development at an elevation suitable to serve the adjoining properties. The installation of this gravity sewer system would allow for a future extension through the basin. However, the Town does not have any plans in the immediate future to extend sewer further south.
The PD provides for stormwater detention facilities to conform to Town regulations. The plan identifies three (3) locations where shared detention basins would be located within the PD.

Ms. Reeder said there are some minor amendments to the Landscape Plan and streetscape requirements along Airline Road, Arlington Trails Rd, and Marriott Cove. As recommended by the PC, landscaped walkways have been added alongside the two detention basins behind the hotels. This will allow visitors to walk the area. The PD now includes “dog care stations” and park benches and trash receptacles near the benches. Final details will be considered by the DRC. Additional landscaping and enhancements are also proposed at the two intersections on Arlington Trail. The self-storage facility is proposed to be softened through the use of evergreens and shrubs. At the direction of the PC, additional plantings have been added along the property lines abutting the existing Exxon station.

Site lighting was also added to the PC. It calls for uniformity in exterior lighting. The Plan notes a Comprehensive Sign Policy shall be created for DRC review. Staff expects the policy to outline sign types, colors, locations, and illumination standards to provide some consistency.

Ms. Reeder noted pursuant to Section 5.12 of the Arlington Zoning Ordinance, the Town may grant approval for a Planned Development. She noted the Master Development Plan accomplishes this by 1) incorporating quality architectural materials 2) cohesiveness across the site, 3) providing interconnected pedestrian and vehicular access to serve the development, and 4) creating shopping opportunities in a commercial area accessible to residents through a main transportation route.

Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

Main Motion: Don Hinkle made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Mayor and Alderman subject to the proposed conditions, and Brian Thompson seconded it.

Motion: Brian Thompson made a motion to suspend the Planning Commission Meeting and open the Public Hearing, Glen Bascom seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Campbell declared the Public Hearing open. Anyone wishing to speak for or against the request, please stand to be recognized. State your name and address for the record.

Citizen Comments: Bryan Smith, 12268 Chapel Meadow Lane, stated he is concerned about another mini storage in town. He doesn’t believe that we need another mini storage. We already have two mini storage facilities. Mr. Smith also expressed concerns about the hotels and how we can ensure they are well maintained and kept nice.

Lorenzo Brooks, Sr., 4750 Brooks Branch Road, stated he is concerned about the hotel turning into a motel and creating a traffic problem. He recommended instead of Arlington Trails Road, the extension be called Brooks Branch Road instead.

Jonathan Curlin, 12096 Hidden Trail, raised questions regarding the provisions for the trees and questioned if there are guidelines for the types and number of trees in a development. Additionally, he asked about the plan for the bridge over I-40, if we plan to turn Airline into a five-lane road. He said he has a huge concern about traffic issues and feels a light is needed. He is also concerned about property values and doesn’t feel he has a clear answer on that. Lastly, he
felt crime should be a concern due to the location being just off I-40. He would like to see studies related to this particular situation.

Seeing no additional citizens coming forward, Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

**Motion:** Brian Thompson made a motion to close the Public Hearing and resume the Planning Commission Meeting and Don Hinkle seconded it.

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

**Discussion:** Chairman Campbell inquired whether it was feasible to change the name of the road as Mr. Brooks had suggested. Mr. Allen replied he did not believe this was possible, as the two roads met at a 90 degree, stop-sign controlled intersection. Mr. Thompson commented that Brooks Branch Road was not going away, just stopping earlier. Mr. Hinkle inquired about the possibility of keeping the name Brooks Branch Road as he felt it is important to our history. Mr. Allen explained MLGW sets and approves the names of streets and anticipated MLGW will want this street to remain as Arlington Trails.

Mr. Thompson referred the issue of guidelines for trees and foliage to Ms. Reeder. Ms. Reeder responded yes, there are specific guidelines based on acreage developed and those requirements must be met.

Mr. Thompson agreed the hotels were a big change. He reiterated this was not the final step and the DRC reviews all plans to ensure quality. Mr. Hinkle and Mr. Thompson agreed that Marriot was a good chain and things will be done with quality in mind. Pools will be enclosed and there will be no exterior entrances to the hotel rooms. Mr. Wesley Wooldridge, engineer for the applicant, added that Marriot updates their interiors every 6 to 8 years. He said they also hold routine inspections, either quarterly or biannually, and he would not expect these hotels to fall into disrepair.

Cathy Durant noted the Town had petitioned TDOT for 5 years for improvements to the bridge across I-40. TDOT assessed that the bridge has 98% life span left. We are working with TDOT on a long-term plan. Mrs. Payne asking for confirmation that the east side of Airline. Road won’t be expanded until development is completed. Ms. Durant confirmed that other than TDOT’s planned work, expansion of Airline is development driven.

Mr. Harmon questioned whether the storage would be built first. Mr. Wooldridge responded yes, the storage would be built in phase 1, simultaneously with the hotel. Mr. Harmon noted hotels can be nice but was concerned about the storage facility. He did not feel this property was zoned properly for a storage facility and as it would be the first thing you see, it would ruin the image of Arlington. He feels the appearance, a fort like structure, is not pleasing and looks like a criminal institution. The applicant responded the storage was built in that configuration so the doors would not be visible. Mr. Harmon added he worried the storage facility will bring an increase of crime.

Chairman Campbell questioned how the proposed property is zoned. Ms. Reeder confirmed the property in question is zoned for a shopping center and it uses. Ms. Payne noted the mini storage facility is the basis of the site and likely what will make it work financially due to all the public improvements. She worried if we lose this opportunity, other hotels or motels will simply go down to exit 27 and build there and we lose any ability to control the conditions of the development.
Mr. Thompson raised the question to the applicant regarding the size of the remaining lots and what would fit on those lots. Applicant responded there was not a site plan for those lots yet, but the smaller ones could accommodate possibly a fast food restaurant. Mr. Thompson wanted to ensure that we won’t be too limited by choices of the types of business that would be able to develop there. Mr. Harmon agreed he would like flexibility. Ms. Reeder stated the 2 lots at the Marriot Cove intersection were each 1 ¼ - 1 ½ acres in size. In comparison, the site where Olympic Restaurant is going is a 2-acre site. Ms. Payne pointed out there are several other restaurants towards Town that would be in close proximity to the hotels.

Mr. Thompson wanted to make sure the development would all tie together to have the communal feel with the walking paths. Mr. Bascom wanted to make sure a gas station and/or a car wash would not be able to develop there. Ms. Reeder affirmed that development for a gas station and car wash had been removed from the plans.

Mr. Bascom also wanted clarification on the wet detention vs dry detention. The applicant explained it is a liability issue to have a wet detention and would require additional insurance for the HOA that would maintain the amenities. Ms. Payne inquired who would manage the HOA. Applicant responded each individual owner of the properties would form the HOA.

Mr. Bascom was concerned about overnight parking. Ms. Reeder stated that was already an ordinance. Mr. Bascom wondered about the possibility of making the street Marriot Cove private. Ms. Durant explained that Shelby County would not be able to enforce the overnight parking ordinance if the street were marked private. They can only enforce on a public street.

Mr. Bascom raised the issue of setback. Could the setback be 30 – 35 feet as opposed to the 25 feet currently proposed. He noted his concern is the visibility of a solid wall building at the front setback. Chairman Campbell questioned current setback. Ms. Reeder stated current SC setback of existing properties is 25 feet, and the General Commercial front setback is 30 feet. She stated the applicant proposed 25 feet to keep it the same. Mr. Hinkle requested another 5 feet be added to the proposed 25-foot setback. Ms. Payne asked if the change in setback would affect development. The applicant said they would agree to a 30-foot setback. Mr. Hinkle wondered if all lots could go to a 30-foot setback. Ms. Durant pointed out that a larger setback would restrict the size of the lots and they had already expressed concern about development on those lots. Mr. Thompson felt the other should stick with the agreed shopping center setback of 25 feet.

Motion to Amend: Glen Bascom made the motion to amend Lot 3 from a front setback of 25 feet to 30 feet, removing the requested exception and Susan Payne seconded it

Vote on Motion to Amend: The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hinkle and Mr. Bascom raised the issues of sidewalks, pathways and bike lanes. Mr. Allen said the right-of-way was wide enough to accommodate this on Arlington Trails. He will review the construction plans.

Chairman Campbell called for a vote on the Arlington Trails PD – Master Development Plan as amended.

Vote on Main Motion as Amended: The motion passed 5 – 1. Harmon voted no.
1. **Conditions of Approval.** The Arlington Trails Commercial PD dated August 7, 2018, 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 Master Development Plan.

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

3. After approval of the Master Development Plan, the applicant will be required to submit and receive standard approvals from the Planning Commission, the Design Review Committee, and/or Board of Mayor and Aldermen for each phase or lot therein.

4. All open space proposed as part of the Master Development Plan shall be privately owned and maintained by the individual property owners or an owners’ association.

5. A Comprehensive Sign Policy for the Arlington Trails Commercial PD shall be reviewed and approved by the DRC before any sign permit is approved within the PD.

6. A Traffic Impact Study shall be prepared by the Developer to assess the traffic impact of the development to the surrounding area.

7. A lift station must be installed with this development, which shall be sized to serve this development and the area south along Brooks Branch Road that falls within the same basin.

8. Revise the Master Development Plan document to address:
   a. All comments and “red-line” notes provided by the Town Engineer prior to final approval.
   b. Revise the architectural section to specifically call out Lots 4-7 to support the design narrative of the primary lots to provide clarity, similar to the way restaurants are called out. Any specifics on utilizing complimentary materials, specific color palettes, and complimentary design elements shall be added here.
   c. Correct any items necessary on the Site Plan and Site Data table to be consistent with the approved PD, with specific emphasis on parking.
   d. Note that ultimate driveway locations shall be considered and approved by the Town Engineer to ensure accurate driveway separation is achieved.
   e. Remove the exception for a reduced rear setback on Lot 3.

9. 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 phase of this development.

10. A full traffic signal installation using mast arm poles shall be installed with the first Phase of this project at the intersection of Airline Road and Arlington Trails Road.

VI. **New Business:**

A. **Rich Products Holding Tanks Expansion – Site Plan – 5885 Jetway Drive.**

Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who informed the PC that Rich Products had postponed until next month.
B. Gambrell Construction – Rezone Request – 10972 and 10982 Highway 64.

Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who presented the staff report for Gambrell Construction (on file). Ms. Reeder stated the applicant is requesting to rezone 1.4 acres located on the north side of Highway 64, just east of Chambers Chapel Road. The property currently consists of two parcels zoned E: Estate Residential, which are proposed to be rezoned to B-2: General Commercial. The site is currently improved with an older single-family home. The purpose of request is to allow future office/commercial development of the property. Ms. Reeder stated that any Zone Change request should take into consideration the intended Future Land Use of the area, existing nearby uses, and whether infrastructure can accommodate the proposal.

This site is assigned as Community Support Commercial by the Future Land Use Plan, which intends for community-service commercial development, and the proposal is consistent with the Land Use Plan. The existing E: Estate zoning allows single-family residential use and is not consistent.

Ms. Reeder explained the area is less developed, largely due to lack of sewer services. Nearby uses include single family homes, a church, and the Digger O’Dell Nursery. Ms. Reeder referenced the summary of the surrounding uses in the Surrounding Uses and Town Designations chart, found in the staff report. As referenced in the chart, uses along Highway 64 vary widely. Staff agrees the current proposed commercial use of the property would be consistent with the uses across Hwy 64.

All municipal services are accessible, except for sewer. The house on this site is currently served by septic and any future development would also have to be served by a County approved septic system on the lot. This requirement will place limitations on the development potential of the site. No public improvements are anticipated.

Ms. Reeder stated the amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use plan for the area and that the legal purpose for which zoning exists are not contravened. It was further determined that there was no adverse effect upon adjoining property and that no property owner or small group of property owners will benefit materially from the change to the detriment of the general public.

The Planning Commission’s recommendation for approval or denial will be forwarded to the BMA.

Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

Main Motion: Don Hinkle made the motion to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning. Alderman Larry Harmon seconded it.

Motion: Brain Thompson then made a motion to suspend the Planning Commission Meeting and open the Public Hearing. Don Hinkle seconded it.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Campbell declared the Public Hearing open and asked anyone wishing to speak for or against this request, please stand to be recognized and state their name and address for the record.

Citizen Comments: Dai Vu, 10960 Highway 64. Ms. Vu raised concerns about what was proposed and said she would like to see more details as her family is living right next door. She questions if it would be office or manufacturing.

Seeing no additional citizens coming forward, Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

Motion: Don Hinkle made a motion to close the Public Hearing and resume the Planning Commission Meeting. Brain Thompson seconded it.
Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Campbell declared the Public Hearing closed, the Planning Commission meeting open, and asked if anyone had any questions for staff or any comments.

Discussion: Mr. Bascom and Mr. Hinkle both questioned what the property would be used for. Ms. Reeder responded it would not be manufacturing, as the proposed zoning would be commercial. Mr. Gambrell, the applicant, said he would follow the B2 guidelines which included office buildings, and he plans to use it for his office and maybe a tenant. He anticipates very little increase in traffic. He would not have any type of storage of outside material on the property. He stated he has two businesses with one (1) Office Manager and 3-4 employees. His construction crews are subcontractors so he does not anticipate any increase in traffic from them. His mold removal employees report to work, pick up their assignments and then leave for the day. Mr. Harmon remarked that the traffic impact should be minimal.

Mr. Gambrell explained they had conducted soil mapping with regard to a septic system. The existing structure is so old they are not able to use. Mr. Thompson asked if they plan to tear down the old building and build new. Mr. Gambrell replied yes, the new structure will be an improvement. The old structure is a blight. They hope to improve the area and be good neighbors.

Mr. Campbell noted there are lots of driveways in the area and asked if they would be asked to line up with one across the road. Ms. Reeder explained it is a 5-lane road, divided highway, so it’s less of a concern but it would likely be close.

Mr. Hinkle questioned the plan for the mold removal business debris and asked what sort of chemicals are used. Mr. Gambrell explained that the mold, is not EPA regulated and construction debris mostly goes to the landfill. The debris is placed in black bags and then in a small dumpster, with no health hazard associated with it. As far as chemicals, they use EPA approved products to remove the mold. Those products are kept in a storage facility in a dedicated area. Mr. Harmon brought up the possibility of moving the driveway to the other side, away from the neighbor’s property. Mr. Gambrell indicated he would be open to that possibility. Mr. Campbell noted that would be in the site plans.

Chairman Campbell called for a vote to recommend approval to the Board of Mayor and Alderman.

Vote on Main Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

C. Myer’s Park PD – Master Development Plan – at the northeast corner of Memphis-Arlington Rd. and Gerber Rd.

Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who presented the staff report for a Master Development Plan for Myer’s Park (on file). Ms. Reeder stated this is a Mixed Use Planned Development and Master Development Plan for 38.5 acres on the northeast corner of Memphis-Arlington Rd and Gerber Rd. Currently the property is zoned as M-1: Light Industrial and is unimproved fields but is bordered by development on most sides.

Ms. Reeder explained the Town’s Future Lands Use Plan identifies this property as Mixed Use, which is intended to provide a mix of land uses designed with pedestrians in mind. Traditional neighborhood developments are strongly encouraged with a mix or residential and non-residential.
The proposed project, Ms. Reeder reported, is divided into sixteen different residential areas, one mixed use area, and ten common open space areas. Uses in the plan include front-loaded homes, rear-loaded homes, a mixed-use site/building and common open space. The applicant held a Work Session in January and a neighborhood meeting in June and the general layout has not significantly changed.

Ms. Reeder stated the primary use within the Master Plan is the single-family homes with 151 lots proposed. The proposed homes along Memphis-Arlington and Gerber Road will all front on the road and have rear access garages to reduce curb cuts on those roadways. The mixed-use building (Area1) is proposed along Memphis-Arlington and will include retail, office, institutional, and loft residential as permitted uses on this site. Staff has requested that these uses be further defined.

Common Open Spaces may include various neighborhood amenities, including pools, pavilions, playgrounds, lakes, etc. Ms. Reeder clarified that gas stations have been removed from the proposal.

This property is a transition between Industrial and Residential. Ms. Reeder stated the surrounding properties include Industrial uses, suburban residential developments and a recreational park complex. Ms. Reeder referenced the table detailing the area found in her staff report. The uses proposed in Myer’s Park are consistent with most of these existing uses, but would require a buffer along the north and eastern boundaries. The applicant has proposed a landscape buffer along the rear yards of all the lots on the east property line, and has included the 3+ acre detention pond COS at the north end of the site which provides an added buffer.

The homes that front Gerber Road would differ from most of the homes across the road in Arlington Station, where their side yards primarily face Gerber. However, the homes would not face the rear yards or a rear fence line across the street.

Ms. Reeder noted the plan consists of ten designated Common Areas totaling 9 acres or 23% of the site which meets the 20% Town requirement. Ms. Reeder summarized the COS lots the details of which can be found in the Staff report.

Additionally, Ms. Reeder stated the streetscape along Gerber Rd will include a 30-foot wide pedestrian greenway, with a sidewalk within a landscaped area similar to Forrest St. behind Kensington or Cambridge. Landscape plates are also included for streetscapes along Memphis-Arlington and all the internal roadways.

The Design Review Committee will provide a final review of all landscaping and common open space amenities. Similar to White Oak, the PD calls for use of a white, 3-rail fence along Memphis-Arlington and Gerber Roads to distinguish the neighborhood. If perimeter fencing is proposed on any internal COS lots, staff suggests that same white fencing be used there as well Ms. Reeder noted.

The proposal Ms. Reeder explained, incudes the four basic lot configurations: two front-loaded sizes and two rear-loaded sizes. Ms. Reeder referenced an exhibit in the Master Plan, found in
the staff report, identifying how each of the lot sizes are proposed within the development. In summary, there will be 73 rear-load lots and 78 front-load lots.

Ms. Reeder reviewed the proposed residential density. The proposed density is 3.92 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), which is consistent with the 4-8 du/ac Mixed Use density in the Future Land Use Plan. The Zoning Ordinance does not identify a specific density for Mixed Use PDs, but for comparison, the proposal would fall between an RS-13 (3.5 du/ac) and Detached Single-Family MF (4.35 du/ac).

Ms. Reeder noted this project is somewhat unique for Arlington. For comparison Ms. Reeder said it most closely matches The Preserve, a 43-lot development off Hayes Rd, and Hayes Place, a 32-lot development next door to The Preserve. The Preserve neighborhood has 50-52-foot-wide lots, with 15-foot front yards, 3.5 side yards, and 18-foot rear yards. The Hayes Place neighborhood has 56-70-foot-wide lots, with 15-foot front setbacks, 5-foot side setbacks, and 15-foot rear setbacks. The Preserve is a relatively established neighborhood with quality, desirable homes.

Ms. Reeder reviewed the architectural character of the PD. A large portion of the PD is devoted to the architectural styles of the homes proposed in the development. Design Standards require all buildings match the four stated architectural styles: Craftsman, Colonial Revival, English, and Farmhouse. Materials are restricted to high quality, including no vinyl siding or 3-TAB roofing tiles. Additionally, Ms. Reeder noted, front porches are highlighted as an important part of the development and must be a minimum of 6-feet wide by 8-feet deep.

Jason Allen, Town Engineer, noted there would be road improvements required along Memphis-Arlington Road and Gerber Drive. Gerber Drive will consist of the installation of curb and gutter, dedication of right-of-way (ROW) with a correction to a full 50’ ROW from the original 60’ ROW. Gerber will essentially be a 2-lane roadway complete with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The proposed sidewalk along Gerber will be 8’ wide to provide enough width for 2-way pedestrian traffic.

Memphis-Arlington Road improvements are currently under design by Fisher Arnold to install an on-street bike lane, curb, gutter, and sidewalk. This project is funded by TDOT and would be a continuation on the existing improvements at Milton Wilson Drive. Mr. Allen stated the Town is requesting a condition of this PD that the developer reimburse the Town for the portion of the Town’s cost to install these improvements. This reimbursement would be in lieu of the developer making the improvements.

Mr. Allen explained the applicant is proposing internal road improvements consist of mountable curb and narrower pavement width. Mountable curb is acceptable to Town Staff and has been used in other developments such as The Preserve on Hayes Road. The narrower pavement width, in conjunction with the proposed traffic circles, will serve as traffic calming measures.

The applicant if proposing rear load homes that will be served by alleys. Mr. Allen noted the alleys will be considered privately owned and maintained by the HOA. All alleys will be required to be installed to public road standards as it relates to the structural pavement section. As is common in alleys, curb and gutter will not be installed. The alleys will have a reverse crown
directing storm water to the center of the streets where it will be captured by a series of inlets.

The proposed development will be required to install curb inlets and underground drainage system. Mr. Allen stated the developer is proposing a single regional detention near the north end of the PD. The downstream drainage system will need to be verified to insure this development will not have an adverse effect or be impacted by any downstream drainage concerns. Mr. Allen confirmed the public gravity sanitary sewer is available on different sides of the development. The Town will work closely with the applicant to develop a solution to serve this property with a gravity sewer system that can gravity flow to the existing infrastructure.

Ms. Reeder confirmed the Master Development Plan is required to provide a phasing schedule. The proposal shows development constructed in five phases. The commercial lot (Area1) is not included in the phasing plan, and is intended to develop at any point based on market demands. Each phase will maintain a minimum of 20% open space and could be considered a “stand alone” project, as is guided by the Code.

Staff found the proposed Master Development Plan document very thorough. It provides adequate details and requirements to guide development within the future Phases, with attention to detail of all aspects of design throughout, and included the additional details required with a Master Development Plan. The minor amendments, recommended by Staff, to certain areas to meet Town goals or guidelines are attached in the staff report.

The Planning Commission’s recommendation of approval or denial of this request will be forwarded to the BMA, who will hold a public hearing on the request. Ms. Reeder noted that a Public Hearing notice was sent to all residents in the area.

Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

**Main Motion:** Don Hinkle made the motion to recommend approval of the Myer’s Park PD – Master Development Plan. Alderman Susan Payne seconded it.

**Applicant Presentation:** Chairman Campbell recognized Keith Grant with Grant Homes, 177 Crescent Drive, Collierville. Mr. Grant introduced Brad Shapiro with Shapiro and Company. (Presentation is available for review.)

Mr. Shapiro detailed the architectural design, the focus on the traditional neighborhood, and the walkability of the neighborhood with interconnected sidewalks. He indicated there would be a diversity in the fabric of the neighborhood with a mix and blending of the four architectural designs giving the overall neighborhood a village or hamlet feel. The four styles, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, English and Farmhouse, were discussed in detail. The goal was to make this an open, friendly place with an emphasis on quality of life.

Mr. Grant expanded in his presentation on the location of the project and detailed what is currently in the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Grant feels this development will have a positive impact on the neighborhood, and will add value to the existing home values in the area.

Mr. Grant reiterated the number of lots, 151, down from the original design of 163, and anticipated the selling price for these homes would be $300,000 and above. He emphasized again the four different architectural designs for the neighborhood; Craftsman, Colonial Revival,
English and Farmhouse and the specifics of each style.

Mr. Grant commented on the open spaces explaining the open spaces would have defined uses; pool, dog park and playgrounds, and will not be just empty space. There are plans to create a lake in the rear with a fountain and a gazebo that will be open to everyone. The neighborhood will be designed with the goal to encourage the use of outside spaces and walkability. In fact, the front porch will be designed to encourage use and invite owners outside to be part of the community.

Mr. Grant further explained the parking detailing the number of spots available with each lot and extra parking that will be provided throughout the neighborhood. In addition, the streets will be designed to encourage slow traffic and traffic circles will be constructed with the idea of creating natural speed barriers for vehicular traffic and enhancing the safety and walkability in the neighborhood.

Mr. Grant addressed the issue of alleys assuring the HOA would be well funded and financially secure enough to handle the maintenance of the alleys.

**Motion:** Brain Thompson made a motion to suspend the Planning Commission Meeting and open the Public Hearing. Don Hinkle seconded it.

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

Chairman Campbell declared the Public Hearing open and asked anyone wishing to speak for or against this request, please stand to be recognized and state their name and address for the record.

**Citizens Comments:** Sam Palmer, 11236 Memphis-Arlington Road. Mr. Palmer is concerned about the increased traffic the development will bring. Between the hours of 6-6:30 and 2-2:30 when school is in session the traffic is problematic. He sees car backed up all the way to 385 on Memhis-Arlington Road. The current road cannot handle an additional 150 homes, he believes.

He also raised safety concerns for the children in the area. Gerber Road is already used by a trucking company as a thru fare and additionally the sports fields do not currently have a fence surrounding them. This lack of fencing poses a danger to children playing in the field if, for example he said, they chase a ball into the street.

Mr. Palmer further questions what this will do to his home value. He is worried this development will bring an increase in crime, decrease the value of his home and increase traffic in the neighborhood.

Jim Voelker 6237 Queens College Drive. Mr. Palmer does not agree with the comparison of this development and The Preserve. He argues The Preserve is a small development with only 45 lots and homes over 3,000 square feet. This development is entirely different he stated.

Mr. Voelker believes the HOA owned rear-loading garage is a terrible design. For his example he pointed to White Oaks and the problems they have encountered.

Mr. Voelker also raised the issue that a dense development encounters drainage issues and then residents are left installing French drains.

Mr. Voelker does not agree with zero lot lines in developments. He stated that more green space is needed in this development. He referenced White Oaks again with their density problems of cars in the alley and not being able to drive through due to congestion. He felt it was a good design but was
just too dense.

Leisa Irwin, 11244 Wolf Woods Drive. Ms. Irwin raised concerns about the impact of increased traffic in the area. Specifically, as it relates to the Hayes Cemetery. Traffic and parking is already difficult during funerals and this will only increase the problem. Ms. Irwin is also concerned about the increase in crime in the area. She is not convinced that zero lot line developments are a good idea.

Lorie Boyd, 12535 Harrell Road. Ms. Boyd raised the issue of the density of the development. She referenced White Oaks as an example. There is no place for children to play, the yards and parks are not big enough so they play in the street. Ms. Boyd does not agree that the development has enough open space. Specifically, the dog park and the playground will not be large enough to accommodate the number of homes.

Ms. Boyd also believes that traffic concerns have not been addressed. The number of homes will bring so many additional cars to the area and this will create a problem accessing the Middle school which already has a traffic problem. She would like to see a bike lane on Gerber.

Robert Elliot, 1125 Ivy Drive. He complemented the design but feels there are too many people for this development. The side yards are so small you will be able to reach out and touch your neighbor’s home. Another concern Mr. Elliot raised is the lack of parking available to homeowners. He pointed out that if there is inadequate parking available to homeowners they will park with their cars blocking the sidewalks and this will force residents out into the streets which is a ticketable offense. Mr. Elliot agrees with Mr. Palmer that the middle school traffic is a problem.

He agrees it is a nice design and may increase the value of homes in the area but it is too tightly developed and there is no room for kids to play.

Leisa Irwin asked if the developer had considered that R&L Carriers begin work early in the morning? That will have a negative impact on living in that area Ms. Irwin stated.

Seeing no additional citizens coming forward, Chairman Campbell called for a motion.

Motion: Susan Payne made a motion to close the Public Hearing and resume the Planning Commission Meeting. Don Hinkle seconded it.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Campbell declared the Public Hearing closed, the Planning Commission meeting open, and asked if anyone had any questions for staff or any comments.

Discussion: Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Grant if the development will include both roundabouts and stop sign. Mr. Grant replied yes, there will be both stop signs and roundabouts.

Mr. Harmon noted the density of this development and agreed that citizens raised some valid concerns. With 150 homes in the development and 2 to 3 cars per home there will be an additional 300 to 450 additional cars in the neighborhood. This will increase traffic and the middle school already experiences problem with traffic. In addition to the trucking company using Gerber Road.

Mr. Harmon agreed the design is beautiful and the common areas are nice but not large enough.

Mr. Harmon is concerned about the alleys and the responsibility of the homeowners to maintain the alleys. He asked for confirmation that the Fire Department had approved the alleys. Ms. Reeder responded that the applicant was required to prove the Fire Department and their equipment can reach the homes. Mr. Harmon is raised the issue of the ability of Fire Fighters to fight a fire when houses
are in such close proximity. The homes are too close together, he feels, and doesn’t see this as a functional development.

Mr. Campbell asked what the subdivision across the street is. Ms. Durant replied that it is a straight subdivision, no open spaces with 8 feet of side yard setbacks. Ms. Reeder added it is $3.35 per acre. Mr. Campbell asked when the subdivision was approved. Ms. Durant replied Arlington Station was approved in 1998 had 207 lots. Arlington Downs had 300 lots.

Mr. Thompson asked the staff’s opinion of the traffic capability in the area. Mr. Allen replied that the area can handle the additional traffic. He noted that the developer was putting in more access points than was required. There should be ways for residents to navigate away from school traffic.

Mr. Campbell inquired about the drainage. He wanted verification that the water would drain into the one retention pond on the property. Ms. Durant confirmed that the water would flow downstream.

Tammy Mason added the need for a third lane on Memphis-Arlington Road for the middle school traffic. There was also a request to add a bike line to Memphis-Arlington Road.

Mr. Bascom commented that although the design of the houses are fantastic the overall vision of the site is not acceptable. He remarked that these lots are smaller than the lots in RS13 approved in 1998. That project created so many problems with traffic and parking it was agreed at the time never to do a project with small lots again. This current project has lots that are too small and will create similar problems. The proposal for small roads in the development will create traffic problems with cars parked along the street as is the case in the Kensington development. He fears the sidewalks will be blocked by parked cars and will not be usable for pedestrians so they will be forced to walk in the street.

Mr. Bascom does not feel that this project reflects a mixed-use development as indicated when in reality 99% of the development will be houses. He does not believe that is a true reflection of a mixed-use development.

Additionally, Mr. Bascom is not in favor of the mix of commercial and apartments/lofts concept in this area.

Ms. Payne responded that there seems to be a lack of available homes in the market today for under $400 thousand. The only way for developers to offer homebuyers homes in the $300 thousand range is to build a project with higher density. This proposal is designed to offer homes in the Arlington area for the first-time home buyer. Mr. Bascom addressed the issue of homes in Arlington around the $300 thousand mark and noted there are homes available at that price point that are not selling.

Mr. Hinkle referenced the homes near the Arlington Welcome/Visitors Center. He commented those homes are an eye soar for Arlington and further developments like that are not the right choice for the Town of Arlington.

Mr. Campbell addressed the proposed homes along Memphis-Arlington Road. He does not want to see fencing along the street. He is in favor of smaller roadways as this will decrease speed. He is in favor of smaller lots as he pointed out not everyone in the market for a home today wants a large lot to maintain. He feels the 2+ acres of common open space and the amenities seem appropriate.

Mr. Campbell noted he would rely on the recommendation of Staff, as they indicated that the current road infrastructure can handle the traffic patterns of the development. Mr. Campbell questioned the Jetway/Highway 70 intersection. Ms. Durant responded the current intersection has been evaluated and sent to the Federal Highway for completion however, they are about a year behind on their
estimated time of completion. There are plans to complete that project. Mr. Campbell noted residents would have an option to use that as an exit to the neighborhood and make a safe turn onto Highway 70.

Mr. Thompson raised the issue of degenerating an appropriate use of this property that is currently zoned industrial. It is difficult to find a project acceptable to everyone however the Town must decide on a long-term plan for the property. We have to be realistic as to what type of homes will sell in that area. Mr. Thompson likes the design of the neighborhood but it is not sure about the lot sizes and the layout of the lots. It comes down, Mr. Thompson feels, to density and traffic in the development.

Mr. Bascom wondered about other uses for this property. Perhaps a Church or a Park. Or if a project came in with the right density and mix of residential and commercial use.

Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Grant about the limited parking, specifically the fourth parking spot they had indicated during their presentation that did not seem like a viable option. Mr. Grant responded the fourth parking spot had not been included in the final parking count but they had added the spot as a possibility for another parking option if needed.

Ms. Payne asked the applicant to address the issue of density. Mr. Grant responded the site had been zoned as industrial when purchased. This had made the property more expensive. The property offered several challenges; it needed road improvements, the cost was higher than a normal residential lot, and the elevation of the site needed to be raised. The mix-use of the property approved by the BMA meets the zoning requirements.

Mr. Grant explained they chose not to build apartments on this property however the transition from industrial to residential is challenging. In order to make this development work they have to go with smaller lots which Mr. Grant noted, is a national trend. In order to maintain quality in the project they decided to go with elaborate, controlled architectural design. In short, density is what makes this project work. They are trying to provide quality homes and a quality product that will work for this area.

Ms. Payne remarked that this project would not be a repeat of the Arlington Trails development that has caused concern. This development is focusing on a first-time home buyer, dual professional family starting out with their first home who may have only one child or no children. Mr. Grant concurred these homes would likely appeal to buyers in their thirties looking for their first home.

Mr. Hinkle stated this development does not provide enough space to provide a quality of life to a family of four. He is concerned about the quality of life for children and does not feel this development will provide this.

Ms. Reeder noted that Arlington Trails does not offer any usable Common Space. The drainage ditch is just that with no access point or walking trails. There is no guest parking provided. In contrast Ms. Reeder stated this development offers guest parking, pull in parking in the common areas and 6 acres of common area.

Mr. Bascom is concerned that allowing this project to be considered a mix-use development is setting a precedence that other developers will take advantage of.

Charmian Campbell called for a roll call vote on the Myer's Park PD - Master Development Plan.

**Vote on Main Motion:** The motion failed, 4 - 2. Bascom, Thompson, Harmon and Hinkle - no. Payne and Campbell - yes.
D. Other as properly requested
There was no new business to come before the Commission.

VII. Adjournment:
Hearing no new business Chairman Campbell called for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Mr. Hinkle made the motion. Susan Payne seconded it.
Chairman Russ Campbell declared the meeting to be adjourned.

Russ Campbell, Chairman

Brian Thompson, Secretary
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