

CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- MINUTES -

January 26, 2021

2:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ROOM  
329 MAIN STREET

I. CALL TO ORDER/QUORUM CHECK:

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

- Director of Planning, Jeff Tyndall
- J. Stan Williams, RPC Transportation Planning Coordinator
- Ruth C. Russell, RPC Planner/Address Manager
- Brad Parker, RPC Subdivision Coordinator/Planner
- Brent Clemmons, RPC GIS Manager
- John Spainhoward, RPC Planner/Zoning Coordinator
- RPC GIS Planner
- Angela Latta, RPC Planning Tech
- LaDonna Marshall, RPC Office Manager / Jackey Jones, Administrative Support Cler
- Greg Stewart (Patrick Chesney), Garth Branch, Mark Riggins City Gas & Water Dept.
- David Shepherd, City Street Department
- Chris Cowan / Eric Salmon, City Street Department
- David Smith, City Building & Codes Department
- Jeff Bryant, County Highway Department
- Rod Streeter/John Doss/David Roan, County Zoning Enforcement Office
- Freddie Montgomery (Jobe Moore), Clarksville Fire Department
- Norm Brumblay, Millard House, CMCSS

Mr. Swift made a statement about the Governor's Executive Order regarding holding open meetings in a forum other than in the open and in public. He stated that the Planning Commission body determined that meeting electronically is necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens due to the Covid-19 crisis.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 12/30/2020

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of December 30, 2020. Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Mr. Tyndall announced that cases S-105-202 and S-119-2020 had been withdrawn and that case S-4-2021 was deferred. There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

Mr. Tyndall announced that cases Z-6-2021 and Z-10-2021 were being deferred. There being no more discussion, Mr.

Garrett moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocconi and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER Z - 1 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Mark A Davis  
Shannon Or William

REQUEST: M2 General Industrial District  
to C2 General Commercial District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the southern side of Wilma Rudolph Blvd, 660+/- feet east of the intersection of Old Trenton Road and Wilma Rudolph Blvd.

TAX MAP(S): 056 PARCEL(S): 071.00 ACREAGE: .94 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: The buildings will be rented out in individual office spaces. There will be a joint kitchen , conference room and restrooms.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The C-2 General Commercial District is more compatible with the surrounding uses than the current M-2 General Industrial District & the existing structure does not lend itself to most industrial operation facilities. This area of Wilma Rudolph corridor is an appropriate location for commercial properties & mixed use potential. Adequate infrastructure serves the site and no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern relative to this application. He stated that the impact on surrounding development is minimal. He stated that C-2 does allow for multifamily residential use. He stated that this is accessed by Wilma Rudolph Boulevard.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there is an email in the file regarding the agent.

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER Z - 2 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Richard Collins  
Richard Garrett

REQUEST: RM-1 Single-Family Mobile Home Residential District  
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the west side of Columbia Street, 240 +/- feet south of the Batts Lane and Columbia Street intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 030I PARCEL(S): H 003.00, H 002.01, ACREAGE: 1.74 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3  
H 004.00  
H 002.00

REASON FOR REQUEST: Applicant currently owns adjacent parcels located at 1909 Batts Lane, 1911 Batts Lane, 1903 Batts Lane and 1882 Columbia St that are already zoned R-4. Seeking to rezone to additional parcels R-4 so that the whole area can be developed into apartments.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The adopted Land Use Plan states that it is encouraged to maintain a desirable mixture of housing types throughout the community and the request is an extension of the R-4 Multi-Family Residential district north and west. Market changes relative to the mobile home industry has limited the viability of RM -1 zoned property. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site and no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that page 10 of the staff report showed the department comments that were received, one of which was from the School System. He stated that the impact would be increased multifamily residential density. He stated that this is accessible by Batts Lane and the historical estimates are listed. He stated that this is in the Lafayette Planning Area.

He stated that there was a public comment taken by phone on page 15 and emails that were received on pages 16 through 18 expressing opposition to this case.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval as this is an extension of the R-4 in the surrounding area. The motion was seconded by Mt. Powers and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Garrett abstaining.

\*\*\*\*\*

IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:

CASE NUMBER Z - 3 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Charles Nichols Credit Shelter Trust

James Maynard

REQUEST: C-1, R-1 Neighborhood Commercial District Single-Family Residential

AG Agricultural District

to R-1A Single-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property is located in the southeast corner of Tobacco Road and Nussbaumber Road

TAX MAP(S): 019 PARCEL(S): 016.02 ACREAGE: 40 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

REASON FOR REQUEST: To extend adjoining subdivision

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The proposed R-1A Single Family Residential District is not out of character with the surrounding properties. The applicant is aware that construction within the Airport Clearzone is not permitted. Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Airport Planning Area. He stated that the department comments that were received, in reference to the application, are on page 20 of the staff report. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. He stated that this is served by City Gas and Water, accessible by Tobacco Road and Nussbaumer Road and historical estimates are listed. He stated that a portion of the property is in the clear zone of the Airport, which is directly north of this property. He stated that Mr. Patterson, the Airport Manager for Outlaw Field, has stated that they do not object to the development. He stated that there is an understanding that the developer cannot develop in the clear zone area. He stated that they did request an airport noise disclosure on the plat once it is developed. He stated that the School System's comments are also listed.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there is a copy of an email on page 26 of the staff report. He stated that there was question about a potential buffer along Nussbaumer Road. He stated that there has been a preliminary plan show which does appear to accommodate that.

Mr. Jimmy Bagwell, engineer for this project, stated that if this was approved it would become an extension of the Woodland Springs Subdivision. He stated that currently they do not intend to connect to Nussbaumer Road. He stated that it would be accessed internally through their subdivision, so they could provide a buffer along Nussbaumer. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Billy Hadley, 160 Tobacco Road, stated that he felt all of his questions had been answered. He stated that his concern was a buffer along Nussbaumer Road. He stated that they are not opposed to the zone change and they were just going to request a buffer but Mr. Bagwell has already addressed that matter.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 4 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Guerrier Development

REQUEST: R-3 Three-Family Residential District  
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property sits on the corner of Blackman Street, Charlotte Street, and Lawn Street.

TAX MAP(S): 066 O PARCEL(S): B 015.00 ACREAGE: .33 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: To create a single family in-fill development

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The R-6 single family zoning classifications are not out of character with the surrounding area or established uses. Adequate infrastructure serves the site, including other residential-supportive uses such as, mass transit and retail services. Sidewalks will be required as part of the development as required per R-6 Single Family Zoning. No adverse environmental issues have been identified. He stated that this is in the South Clarksville Planning Area. He stated that the department comments that were received from the School System are on page 28 of the staff report. He stated that historical estimates are listed on page 29 and also indicates minimal impact with surrounding development.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no public comments received as of 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. Houston Smith, representing the developers, stated that they are looking to do an R-6 development, similar to some of the other developments that are nearby with single family houses. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 5 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Lalana Lee Gordon Lee  
Mark Holleman

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District  
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property is north of Paradise Hill Road, west of Highland Circle, 171 +/- feet west of the intersection of Highland Circle and Paradise Hill Road

TAX MAP(S): 080 A PARCEL(S): E 023.00 ACREAGE: .63 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: None given by applicant

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The R-6 single family zoning classifications are not out of character with the surrounding area or established uses. Adequate infrastructure serves the site, including other residential-supportive uses such as, mass transit and retail services. Sidewalks will be required as part of the development as required per R-6 Single Family Zoning. No adverse environmental issues have been identified. He stated that the department comments received from the School System are on page 35 of the staff report. He stated that there will be minimal impact with the proposed development. He stated that it would be served by City services. He stated that there have been two recent R-6 developments and the agent for this application is the one who sought approval on those and was granted. He stated that this request would be an extension of that same zoning classification.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no public comments logged as of 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. Mark Holleman, representing the owner of this property, stated that in the last couple of months these other parcels have been rezoned. He stated that this is just a small portion that would complete a rectangle shape and that is why they are requesting this.

Mr. Gordon Lee, the owner, stated that he is in favor of the rezoning. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval as no adverse environmental issues have been identified. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Rocconi abstaining.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER Z - 6 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Oscar Lee Hearn  
Eric Huneycutt

REQUEST: M-1 Light Industrial District &  
R-3 Three Family Residential District  
to CBD Central Business District

LOCATION: Property is south of Crossland Avenue, east of Bradley Street, and north and south of West High Street

TAX MAP(S): 066 O PARCEL(S): B 001.00 ACREAGE: 2.79 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: To bring it to more appropriate zoning

Request to defer 1 month at the request of the applicant.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 7 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Frank Bryant  
Albatross Partners

REQUEST: R-3 Three-Family Residential District &  
C-5 Highway & Arterial Commercial District  
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District &  
R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property is fronting on the north side of Golf Club Lane, 93 +/- feet east of the Colonial Court and Golf Club Lane intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 080 A PARCEL(S): D 001.00 ACREAGE: 2.95 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: To allow for a multifamily development

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The proposed R-4 Multi-Family Residential provides an appropriate transition to from the C-5 Commercial zoning to the east and the established residential district to the west. The adopted Land Use Plan states that it is encouraged to maintain a desirable mixture of housing types throughout the community. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Hilldale Planning Area and department comments received in reference to this application were listed on page 49. May require some water and sewer system upgrades and must meet access ordinance at the site plan phase. He stated that the School System's comment was listed. He stated that the impact would be increased multifamily residential density. City source for water and sewer. He stated that this is accessible from Colonial Court and Golf Club Lane. He stated that Colonial Court was deemed to be the likely access per the Access Ordinance. He stated that there is a pretty steep slope on the side of the property adjacent to Colonial Court. He stated that it also has access to Golf Club Lane.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that as of 9 o'clock this morning we had received no public comments regarding this application.

Mr. JR Miller, agent, stated that the reason for this application is to clean up zoning in the area and to develop townhomes. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Cal Burchett, engineer, stated that they will work on access with the City Street Department. He stated that Colonial is steep but they will work that out with the Street Department. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval as this provides a transition from the C-5 zoned property to the east. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 8 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Luke Baggett/ Bobby Wall  
Syd Hedrick

REQUEST: R-3 Three-Family Residential District  
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property fronts on the east side of Central Avenue, 173 +/- feet north of the Daniel Street and Central Avenue intersection

TAX MAP(S): 079 D PARCEL(S): B 025.00 ACREAGE: .41 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: We will divide it up to create 3-4 lots

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The R-6 single family zoning classifications are not out of character with the surrounding area or established uses. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site, including other residential-supportive uses such as, mass transit and retail services. Sidewalks will be required as part of the development as required per R-6 Single Family Zoning. No adverse environmental issues have been identified. He stated that this is in the South Clarksville Planning Area. He stated that the department comments received in reference to this case are listed on page 56 of the staff report. He stated that this will permit increased single family residential density. He stated the property would be accessible from Central Avenue.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no public comments received as of 9:30 a.m. He stated that we did receive a few phone calls in reference to this application with some questions.

Mr. Syd Hedrick stated that this property is currently R-3 and large enough to accommodate a triplex. He stated that the intent is to make it single family zoning, which is compatible with what is in the area, and do 3-4 residential homes of the R-6 zoning.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval as this is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kimbrough and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*



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

CASE NUMBER Z - 9 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Luke Baggett

Syd Hedrick

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District  
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property is on the east side Beech Drive, 410 +/- feet east of the Beechwood Drive and Beech Drive intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 055 O PARCEL(S): D 045.00 ACREAGE: .66 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: We are going to develop 3-4 lots.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. This area has a mixture of different housing styles & lies outside of the Emerald Hill Historic District. The property is currently bounded by properties with multi-family residential uses and zoning to the north & east. The proposed R-6 Single Family Residential district is not out of character with the current or futures uses in the area. The property to the north is currently under ownership by State of TN (APSU) and currently zoned R-4 Multi-Family Residential. Under ownership of APSU it may be used for many different uses that are associated for the University as they are exempt from local zoning. Adequate infrastructure serves the site, including other residential-supportive uses such as, mass transit and retail services. Sidewalks will be required as part of the development as required per R-6 Single Family Zoning. No adverse environmental issues have been identified. He stated that this is in the Red River Planning Area. He stated that the department comments received in reference to this application are listed on page 63 of the staff report. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. He stated this is served by City Gas and Water and accessible by Beech Drive.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that on page 68 there is a comment that was taken by phone from Ms. Nancy Wiseman and her husband Mr. Robert Van Dyke. He stated that page 69 was a letter that was provided from Mr. Luke Baggett who is the applicant. He stated that page 70 is the proposed layout for three lots, provided by Mr. Baggett with the letter. He stated that pages 71 through page 82 are emails and letters that were supplied to this office in opposition.

Mr. Syd Hedrick stated that they are aware of the neighborhood and their opinion . He stated that at this time they were going to ask for a deferral from the floor in order for the applicant to amend his application.

Ms. Shirley Buckler-Ciarrocchi, 749 Beech Drive, stated that she is very much against this as the road is almost impassible now. She stated that Mr. Baggett stated that he loved the community and she stated that one additional home is about all that they can stand. She stated that the people there are all in agreement and that they have all spoken. She stated that they ask one house only please.

Ms. Katie Klinghard, 536 York Street, stated that she and her husband and children also live in the area. She stated that she is a local attorney here in town. She stated that they are not against the development of their community and they understand it is a desirable place to live. She stated that they are protective of their very small neighborhood. She stated that in the Summer they cannot see their neighbors houses at all due to the trees. She stated that there is a lot of wildlife. She stated that the three houses that they are proposing on 0.66 acres would make those lots smaller than any in their community. She stated that it is difficult for two cars to pass on their road and they often have to stop to allow another car to pass. She stated that it will create a dangerous situation with more residents. She stated that traffic and construction will disrupt the wildlife. She stated that there is also a creek that runs on that property and she is assuming that is where they are going to put the sidewalk but she would like to see more on that. She stated that she suggests, as Ms. Shirley said, that one lot be developed, maybe two. She stated that a better use of this land would be two single family homes. She stated that they just want to keep the feel of their community. She stated that it is close to Downtown but you really cannot see anything as far as Austin Peay or anything large.

Mr. Syd Hedrick stated that the reason they are deferring is to amend the request to just do two homes.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend deferral. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:**

CASE NUMBER Z - 10 - 2021      APPLICANT(S): Charles Hand

Brad Martin ( Lyle, Cook,

REQUEST: E-1 Single-Family Estate District

to PUD-1 Planned Unit Development Residential District

LOCATION: Property fronts on the east side of the intersection of Cedarcroft Drive and Ussery Road

TAX MAP(S): 065 F      PARCEL(S): C 003.00      ACREAGE: 4.743      CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: The applicant would like to develop a 6-lot PUD for residential housing with two access points along Cedarcroft Drive and an interior private drive to access each residence.

Request to defer at the request of the applicant. No public hearing required based on meeting the minimum notice.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 25 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): J & N Enterprises Inc. Jonathan Ross, President

REQUEST: R-1 Single Family Residential District  
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property located north of Dover Rd. (US HWY 79) and east of N. Liberty Church Rd.

TAX MAP(S): 053 PARCEL(S): 037.01 p/o ACREAGE: 19.6 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8

REASON FOR REQUEST: This request is for the extension of current R-4 zoning to help supply the demand for multi family in Montgomery County, TN.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan and adopted Land Use Plan. The adopted Land Use Plan states that it is encouraged to maintain a desirable mixture of housing types throughout the community. The request is an extension of the R-4 zoning district to the south. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is located in the UBG and the Lafayette Planning Area. He stated that Clarksville Gas and Water will furnish the sewer only. He stated that the Woodlawn Utility District did meet and they are responsible for the water supply. He stated that they indicated that a 16 inch waterline has been approved for installation with a timeline of 15 to 18 months to completion and the applicants are aware of that. He stated that a traffic assessment was also submitted with this request. He stated this will allow for increased multifamily residential density. Water source is Woodlawn with sewer service the City of Clarksville. He stated that the property has frontage on South Liberty Church Road but in discussions with the applicant there is potential to possibly combine with the R-4 property to the south for a shared access arrangement. He stated that the historical estimates are listed.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that on page seven you will see comments from Mr. Ryan Par and Ms. Kathleen Chapman. He stated that we did receive a couple of other calls with questions in reference to this application. He stated that pages 8 through 11 contain emails in opposition to this application.

Mr. Vernon Weakley, agent for the applicant, stated that this is an extension of a zone and will have access to Dover Road. He asked for support of this request.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval based on the request being consistent with the Growth Plan and adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 26 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): M. Ireland L L C  
Vernon Weakley

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

LOCATION: Property located south of Dover Rd. (US HWY 79), west of S. Liberty Church Rd. & east of the Paul B. Huff Pkwy (SR 374) on ramp right of way.

TAX MAP(S): 053 PARCEL(S): 148.04 P/O ACREAGE: 102.81 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8

REASON FOR REQUEST: Requesting zone change to R-1 to develop a single-family residential subdivision, which currently, demand is greater than supply in Montgomery County.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan and adopted Land Use Plan. The request is an extension of the R-1 Single Family zoning district to the north. The adopted land use opinion map indicates single family residential in this area & the proposed R-1 district is not out of character with the surrounding area. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Planned Growth Area of the Growth Plan and in the Woodlawn Planning Area. He stated that page 13 lists the department comments that were received in reference to this application. He stated that Clarksville Gas and Water will furnish sewer only and Woodlawn Utility District is responsible for the water supply. The Utility District did meet and a 16 inch water line has been approved for installation with a timeline of 15 to 18 months to completion and the applicant is aware of this timeline. He stated that a traffic assessment was also submitted with this request and School System Comments were provided below as well as comments from the Sheriff's Department. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density with the historical estimates listed.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no public comments received as of 9 o'clock this morning. He stated that we did receive several phone calls with uestions.

Mr. Vernon Weakley, agent for the applicant, stated that this property is in a good location for single family development. He stated that the drainage will be taken care of and permitted through two bodies, the State of Tennessee and Montgomery County and both will require no additional drainage onto neighbors than the amount that currently exists. He stated that they will be adhering to that policy. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Dr. Jerry Ross, 848 South Liberty Church Road, stated that he lives adjacent to this and is concerned about the drainage and how it will affect their farm which is across Highway 79, which this would feed into. He stated that they want to make sure that it is properly addressed if this goes through and also the traffic. He stated that they do not want to lose anymore land for roads that have to be widened to accommodate extra traffic.

Mr. Weakley stated that he would address any questions the Commissioners have. Mr. Hadley asked if they cannot put more water on someone's land than what is going on it now? Mr. Weakley staaed that was correct. He staaed that is what the permits through the County and Tennessee will be looking for.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval as the R-1 is not out of character with the surrounding area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Kimbrough abstaining.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 1 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Felipe Martin  
Syd Hedrick

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

LOCATION: Property fronts on the southeast corner of Trough Springs Road and Granite Trail  
TAX MAP(S): 082 PARCEL(S): 030.03 ACREAGE: 1.08 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 5  
REASON FOR REQUEST: Single family houses

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan and adopted Land Use Plan. The request is an extension of the R-1 zoning classification to the west and is consistent with the surrounding development. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that there were no department comments of any concern listed. He stated that the impact of the proposed use on the surrounding development is minimal. He stated that infrastructure would be City water and sewer and the property is accessible from Trough Springs Road. He stated this is in the Sango Planning Area.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that we have received several phone calls in reference to this application but as of 9 o'clock this morning no one had chosen to leave public comments.

Mr. Syd Hedrick stated that he had been working with Ms. Martin for several years on this property. He stated that her husband passed away. A tenant had been put in this property and Ms. Martin lives out of state. He stated he has sold this property to BRM Homes and they intend to subdivide and develop for probably two single family homes or maybe three if they are able to purchase property from an adjoining neighbor.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Garrett moved to recommend approval as this is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER CZ - 2 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): John Daigle  
John Daigle

REQUEST: C-2 General Commercial District  
to E-1 Single-Family Estate District

LOCATION: Property is located at the southwest corner of Lylewood Road and John Taylor Road  
TAX MAP(S): 075 PARCEL(S): 047.05 ACREAGE: 1.4 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 9  
REASON FOR REQUEST: It is a home not a business

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with Growth Plan and adopted Land Use Plan. The proposed E-1 zoning classification will bring the existing single family residential use back into compliance with the Montgomery County Zoning Resolution. Adequate infrastructure will serve the site. No adverse environmental issues have been identified relative to this request. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern and the change would be minimal.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were several phone calls in reference to this application but no public comments were received.

Mr. John Daigle, owner, stated that he purchased this property in December and found out it was commercial. He stated that he could not understand why it was commercial as he has lived in the area for over 30 years and it has always been a home. He stated this is the reason for his application to get it back to E-1.

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

There being no more discussion, Ms. Jimenez moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocconi and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**IV. CITY & COUNTY ZONING CASES:**

CASE NUMBER CZO - 4 - 2020 APPLICANT(S): Regional Planning Commission

REQUEST: Text

to

LOCATION: Zoning Resolution Text Amendment

TAX MAP(S): PARCEL(S): ACREAGE: CIVIL DISTRICT(S):

REASON FOR REQUEST: Zoning Resolution text amendment relative to District Bulk Regulations/ Building Setbacks and Other Minor Updates

Mr. Spainhoward stated that we initiated these changes a few months ago.

Mr. Tyndall stated that we passed a similar Ordinance last month for the City. He stated that this addresses two parts of the County Zoning Resolution. He stated that it deals with setbacks of existing structures, when someone subdivides property, especially when they put a right-of-way next to someone's property that was not a part of the application . He stated that the exemption basically says that the road does not affect the front setback until the person who owns the property decides to further develop their property.

Mr. Tyndall stated that the other is to amend whether it is a staff level or minor level review of a site plan. He stated that we have clarified what that is and also made it consistent with the City language. He stated that it replaced 7-10 calendar days with 10 calendar days to let the applicant know the status.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocconi and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Hadley nonvoting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING COMMISSION SUBDIVISION ACTIONS:** Mr. Parker noted that case S-109-2020 was being pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action). Mr. Parker read the remaining cases on the consent agenda. There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Hadley nonvoting.

\*\*\*\*\*

## V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 109 - 2020      APPLICANT: Richard Tucker

REQUEST: Revised Preliminary Plat Approval of CONNECTOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Highway 76, south of the intersection of Anderson Road and Highway 76, west of and adjacent to Jones Road.

MAP: 081 PARCEL(S): 009.00 ACREAGE: 20.70

# OF LOTS: 5      CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

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

Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. He stated that it is the staff's opinion that a road stub should be provided to the Beech property. He stated this could provide future connectivity to Old Farmers Road. He stated that there was a preliminary plat approved in 2017, that has since expired, and it did show that connection.

Mr. Parker stated that page 11 of the Commissioner's packet is an email from Chris Cowan that states ST 76 and Memorial Extension they would prefer the connection still be possible to the west but not a requirement.

Mr. Parker then read the recommendation for disapproval from the staff report.

Disapproval due to the following:

1. Section 5.2 Subsection 32. of the Subdivision Regulations states that "Stubouts to adjacent tracts of land placed properly". The Street Department has stated that "we would prefer the connection still be possible to the west" (see attachment for full comment) and the Planning Commission staff agrees that this connection should be shown for future street connectivity.

\*\*\*The Plat may be reconsidered once the following step has been accomplished:

1. A road stub to the west is provided.

If approved (with or without the road stub connection to the west), the following conditions shall apply:

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

Mr. Hadley asked if the road width on Jones Road was an issue.

Mr. Cowan, City Street Department, stated that they would look into whether additional improvements would be necessary as part of their site review and grading permit.

Mr. Kimbrough asked if there was a signalization request on the cut through from the Memorial Drive Extension? Mr. Cowan stated that they have not submitted anything to the State for approval. He stated that he had talked with Mr. Jimmy Bagwell who had done a traffic study for this development previously. He stated that he had talked to him about the need to address their concern of traffic mobility in this area. He stated that it was figured that they would need to have some analysis decisions made on what improvements need to be made.

## V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

Mr. Powers asked if the email from the Street Department indicates that connection is not required, yet the staff is recommending disapproval based on needing that connection? Mr. Parker stated that it is not completely based on that. He stated that the Street Department is indicating that they prefer and we as a staff feel that the connection to Old Farmers Road is an important one. He stated that if the Planning Commission approves it, we understand that but from our perspective it is important.

Mr. Jimmy Bagwell, engineer for the developer, stated that he would like to provide a little history on the stub road to the west. He stated that a little over three years ago they came before this body with a preliminary plat that included a stub to the west. He stated that at that time they were in talks with the adjoining property owner to extend that road through their property. He stated that never materialized and those property owners are no longer interested in extending that road through their property. He stated that preliminary plat expired last year so we came back with a new plat that was basically a cul-de-sac into this property without connection to Jones Road and without a stub to the west. He stated that their reasoning for that was that the adjoining property owners were not interested in extended that stub and they needed that land to make their layouts within the development. He stated that through this process they have talked with the Street Department and the one requirement that the Street Department offered to them was that connection to Jones Road would be required. He stated they did not require them to provide a stub to the west. He stated that it is their understanding that TDOT is in the early stages of designing a light at this intersection. He stated that they still have to go through permitting and they would adhere to anything TDOT required.

Mr. Richard Tucker stated that he has been in negotiations with Mr. John Crabbe and he desires to build apartments on the back part of that property. He stated that if they have to put the road through there it will negate so much property, the apartment project is not feasible. He stated that he plans to build the very nice, three story, gated apartments like he has built out on Rossview Road and he is ready to start right away. He stated that if he has to put this road to the west, the property will then develop as commercial. He stated that he feels the R-4 makes this much more compatible with the surrounding property and kind of buffers the commercial that is on the front. He stated that the lot on the east side is sold to a group of doctors who are going to build a very impressive multistory building. Mr. Tucker stated that he is going to develop the lots on the west side probably in a medical fashion too. He stated that the finished product would have very well designed buildings on the front merged with upscale apartments on the back. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Tyndall stated that this property is currently zoned C-5 and doctor's offices would be appropriate but the apartments that Mr. Tucker speaks of would require a rezoning in the future.

Mr. Hal Mathews, 541 Jones Road, stated that he lives across the street from this project and he has some concerns. He stated that one concern is lot 5, which was not on the original plat, is a C-5 zoning but you can only access it through a residential area. He stated that Jones Road in front of his house is 18 feet wide, which based on subdivision guidelines is considered an alley. He stated that landowners to the east are not happy about the stub road either but if it is approved will someone make these streets adequate for commercial traffic. He stated that beyond his house Jones Road is approximately 20-22 feet wide. He stated that when he looked in our subdivision guidelines non-residential requires 28 feet curbed and guttered if I am interpreting it correctly.

Mr. Jimmy Bagwell stated that they will work with the Street Department however they need to address Jones Road in the construction planning process.

Mr. Tucker stated that with regards to the lot in the back corner, that was where he was going to build an office for himself. He stated that he had a nice looking pole building and two employees who work in that office. He stated that he is anticipating having to do a little improvement on Jones Road, if only on his side that he is affecting. He stated that they will leave Jones Road in better shape when they are done.

Mr. Tyndall stated that the staff has recommended disapproval for the reasons listed and the Planning Commission can either agree with staff and recommend disapproval or you can make a recommendation for conditional approval and state the conditions that were stated already.



## **SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):**

Mr. Powers stated that he understands Mr. Mathews concerns about Jones Road but he feels it is more likely that traffic will go from Jones Road onto this newly constructed road and out at the signal. He stated that the stub to the west sounds like a good idea but if you look at the property it narrows drastically as it goes west and that stub would most likely be very close to the intersection at Old Farmers and Highway 76. He stated that if the road is extended to the west and centered in that property as would be advantageous to the property owner, it is going to put almost conflicting intersections there.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval of the plat as submitted with the conditions listed and Mr. Parker read those once again which included:

1. Approval by the City Engineer's Office and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
2. Approval by the City Street Department of all road, drainage, grading, and erosion control plans before construction begins. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the approval of a grading, drainage, and erosion control plan.
3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site, as per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance. Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval with the conditions Mr. Parker just read. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

**V. SUBDIVISIONS:**

CASE NUMBER: S - 2 - 2021      APPLICANT: Joan Young  
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of JOAN YOUNG PROPERTY LOTS 1-5  
LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Rossvie Road approximately 730 feet east of the intersection of Jeffery Drive and Rossvie Road, north of and adjacent to Dana Court at the terminus of Dana Court.  
MAP: 041 PARCEL(S): 147.00    ACREAGE: 6.90  
# OF LOTS: 5    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: S - 3 - 2021      APPLICANT: Cherry Development Co.  
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of HARRIS RIDGE SECTION 1 (CLUSTER) & HARRIS RIDGE SECTION 2  
LOCATION: South of Rossvie Road and west of Interstate 24. More specifically, west of and adjacent to Powell Road, approximately 700 feet south of the intersection of Powell Road and Rossvie Road.  
MAP: 057 PARCEL(S): 023.00, 023.01, 103.00    ACREAGE: 45.3  
# OF LOTS: 62    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 6

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: S - 4 - 2021      APPLICANT: J & N ENTERPRISES  
REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of OLD SPEES ACRES  
LOCATION: East of and adjacent to North Liberty Church Road, south of Sunshine Drive, approximately 165 feet south and east of the intersection of North Liberty Church Road and Sunshine Drive.  
MAP: 044 PARCEL(S): 080.00, 080.01    ACREAGE: 3.38  
# OF LOTS: 8    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROJECT ENGINEER

\*\*\*\*\*

**SITE REVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS:** SR-1-2021 was pulled from the consent agenda (see that case for discussion and action). Ms. Russell read the remaining cases on the consent agenda.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VI. SITE REVIEWS AND/OR ABANDONMENTS:**

CASE NUMBER: SR - 52 - 2020 APPLICANT: RPG Development  
J Chris Fielder

DEVELOPMENT: PALOMAKI DEVELOPMENT

PROPOSED USE: Office Buildings

LOCATION:

MAP: 057, 056.00 & 056.03 ACREAGE: 16.50

CIVIL DIST.: 6

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 1 - 2021 APPLICANT: Aaron Klepzig  
Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: 510 GLENSTONE SPRINGS

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION:

MAP: 081-P-A-015.00 ACREAGE: 1.94

CIVIL DIST.: 11

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

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans and as built by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer, to include showing existing sewer main in a recorded PUDE.
  2. Approval of all grading, drainage and water quality plans by the City Street Department.
  3. Approval of a landscape plan.

Ms. Russell read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval.

Mr. Cal Burchett stated that he was here to answer any questions. He stated that he would like to point out that they meet the Zoning Ordinance and the staff has recommended approval.

Mr. Chris Middleton, 526 Glenstone Springs Drive, stated that he and his family just moved in back in June. He stated that it was just brought to their attention that there was a multifamily property being built directly behind their home. He stated that they have greenery and trees back there but it came as a surprise. He stated that this property is in the middle of a subdivision. He stated that they are all R-1 single family homes. He stated that they knew there would be building behind them at some point but they only expected it to be single family and not multifamily that close to them. He stated that they are concerned about the additional parking which he believes is 68 cars, it is a lot more traffic and they are concerned about the trees along their property. He stated that there is a lot of building going on and a lot of wildlife being displaced. He stated that they are also concerned about the impact to their property values having multifamily so close to their property. He stated that they are strongly opposed to the building. He stated that they are okay with single family housing on the lot behind them as well as the one across the street where the other 15 units are going

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers stated that since it does meet the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and it was previously zoned R-4 property, he moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 2 - 2021 APPLICANT: Aaron Klepzig  
Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: 511 GLENSTONE SPRINGS

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION:

MAP: 081-P-B-013.00 ACREAGE: 2.14

CIVIL DIST.: 11

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

- CONDITIONS:**
1. Approval of all utility plans by the Office of the Chief Utility Engineer.
  2. Approval of all grading, drainage and water quality plans by the City Street Department.
  3. Approval of a landscape plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. MONTHLY PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT: Mr. Tyndall presented the profit and loss statement. He stated that the revenues and filing fees are up over 200% for zoning and subdivisions and 300% including site reviews.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

B. ADOPT AMENDED 2020-2021 BUDGET: Mr. Tyndall stated that due to Covid, the City, County and Planning Commission froze salaries. He stated that this budget realizes the revenue that he spoke of. He stated that we also had to replace an HVAC system early this fiscal year. He stated we increased our repair budget by \$5500 and this also provides for employees a 3% cost of living increase retroactive to January 1, 2021 through the end of the fiscal year. He stated that the Executive Committee met two Fridays ago and after some discussion, the budget was settled on and this budget needs to be readopted by the Regional Planning Commission.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

C. AUDIT PRESENTATION: Mr. Tyndall presented the audit and stated that we have a clean, unaltered opinion again.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Rocconi moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

D. ADOPTION OF TIME OFF POLICY FOR COVID: Mr. Tyndall stated that the City, County and Planning Commission last year followed what is known as the Families First Coronavirus Response Act which expired on December 31st. He stated that it allowed us two weeks of leave, not to be counted against the employee in case of having to quarantine or being sick with Covid-19. He stated that the City and County have adopted similar policies through June 30, 2021 to allow one week. He stated that employees could have up to one week of paid leave for the purpose of seeking medical diagnosis, quarantining or taking care of a family member.

There being no more discussion, Ms. Jimenez moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

E. ROAD NAME CHANGE: Mr. Russell stated that there is a new tenant going into the Convergys call center. She stated that it will be changed from Convergys Way to Innovation Way.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously with a roll call vote.

F. UPDATES TO ADDRESSING MANUAL: Mr. Tyndall stated that the manual did not change but we added the last page that says procedures for addressing multiple parcels greater than five acres. He stated that, after speaking with a Planning Commission member, he would like to make an amendment from the floor. He stated in the first paragraph, the second sentence that starts with additionally, he would like to strike that from that paragraph and in the last sentence which starts the construction of any public utility may or any street, he would like to delete which means public or private access road, drive or lane and leave it as which requires plans to be platted through the RPC subdivision process.

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

G. FEE REDUCTION REQUESTS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD:

1. PROJECT HERTZ.
2. PROJECT ALICE.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he has letters from Mr. Frank Tate requesting this reduction for when those apply. He stated that they do not expire under those names and a 30% fee reduction when those happen.

Mr. Rocconi asked what was the rationale for the reduction? Mr. Tyndall stated that it is his understanding that this is part of the

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

incentive package that they do. He stated that he met with project Alice and a 30% reduction amounts to about \$7000. He stated that this is just part of the incentive that we agreed to help with the IDB. Mr. Rocconi stated that he feels our office could use it more.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Kimbrough moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried with a roll call vote with Mr. Rocconi opposing.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he would like to entertain a motion to further amend the Zoning Resolution and Zoning Ordinance as it applies to easements, driveways and rights-of-way. He stated that will allow us to potentially hear something in February.

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

**H. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Tyndall stated that we needed to elect Chairman and Vice Chairman. He stated that these can only come from one of the five citizens at large, being Mr. Swift, Mr. Powers, Ms. Jimenez, Mr. Spigner and Mr. Hadley. He stated that he will take any nominations from the floor. Mr. Hadley moved to nominate Mr. Swift as Chairman and Mr. Powers as Vice Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried with a roll call vote.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Swift, CHAIR