

CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- MINUTES -

April 27, 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 2:09 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

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
- Daniel Morris, RPC GIS Planner
- Angela Latta, RPC Planning Tech
- LaDonna Marshall, RPC Office Manager / Jackey Jones, Administrative Support Cler
- ~~Ben Browder/Patrick Chesney~~ Garth Branch, Mark Riggins City Gas & Water Dept.
- David Shepherd, City Street Department
- ~~Chris Cowan/Joe Green/Jerome Henderson~~ 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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF 3/23/2021

Mr. Swift asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of March 23, 2021. Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously.

III: ANNOUNCEMENTS/DEFERRALS

Mr. Tyndall announced the deferrals which included cases Z-18-2021, Z-21-2021, S-31-2021, and SR-22-2021. There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval of the deferrals. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously.

Mr. Tyndall stated that Thursday, May 6th, will be the City public hearing at 7:00 p.m. He stated that the Governor has ended the individual County mask mandate tonight at midnight. Mr. Tyndall stated that he is not sure how this will impact the City or County meeting. He stated that the City has required speakers to be pre-registered so if anyone wishes to speak at the City Council Meeting on May 6th at 7:00 p.m. they should contact the City Clerk, Sylvia Skinner. He stated that the County meeting will be Monday, May 3rd at 6:00 p.m. and they are doing in person meetings but are reducing the capacity in that building

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.

Mr. Tyndall read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The requested PUD zoning is consistent with the adopted land use plan and complies with the zoning ordinance. The proposed PUD zoning is not out of character with the existing E-1 Zoning in the area. Adequate infrastructure serves the site and no adverse environmental impacts were identified with this request. See attached PUD report for all details. Mr. Tyndall stated under department comments Gas and Water mentioned that there is no sewer available on site, however there are about three different connections nearby. He stated that the applicant will have to work that out prior to submitting the final PUD plan. He stated that Street and Drainage said grading permits required and interior road label as private and water quality will also be required. He stated that School System comments were also included regarding capacities of Moore, Rossvie and Rossvie High. He stated that this is in the Medical District. Mr. Tyndall stated that under the E-1 zoning they would be able to get 4 lots and if they had requested R-1 they could get 9 lots. He stated they are requesting 6 lots for the PUD. He stated that the City does not have E-1A zoning like the County does.

Mr. Brad Martin, agent for the project, stated that he is a neighbor to this property He stated that he calls this a leftover parcel because it has never been built on in the Evergreen Estates neighborhood. He stated that there are 100 to 105 houses in the neighborhood and the main road is Ussery Road coming off of Memorial Drive going all the way back to the Red River. He stated that something is going to happen on this property and he involved himself because if something is going to happen he wants to have something to do with it because he will have to look at it everyday. He stated that they looked at R-1 with 9 lots, they looked at 4 and 6 and 6 just seems to make sense and be in character with a lot of the neighborhood. He said the difference is those properties are a full acre. He stated that the PUD will have a shared driveway, shared common space, shared sidewalks and a pavilion that the neighborhood can share. He stated this will be a themed architectural aesthetic.

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 Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 13 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Hilldale United Methodist Church Inc  
Mark Holleman

REQUEST: R-1 Single-Family Residential District  
to C-2 General Commercial District

LOCATION: Property located at the northeast corner of the Madison St. & Tanglewood Dr. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 080 B PARCEL(S): A 009.00 ACREAGE: 2.3 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12

REASON FOR REQUEST: To bring it into compliance with what it has been used for the past 50 years.

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 C-2 Zoning request is consistent with the goals of the Madison Street Design Overlay Corridor. C-2 zoning permits the opportunity for general goods & services establishments with the additional opportunity for mixed use residential. The C-2 General Commercial District is not out of character with the existing uses in the area. No adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated the use is currently an existing event center, bed and breakfast restaurant establishment. He stated that this property is within the Medical District. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern. He stated that this request would allow them to expand potential commercial uses on the property. He stated that C-2 also allows for a multifamily use component. He stated that street accessibility is Madison Street and Tanglewood Drive.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there were no public comments logged. He stated we received phone calls in reference to this request with questions about what was taking place.

Mr. Mark Holleman, agent and purchaser of the property, stated that the only reason for rezoning is to bring this into compliance and conforming use. He stated Tanglewood will continue to be run as it has.

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 is bringing this into conformance with its existing use. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER Z - 15 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Reda Home Builders, Inc.

REQUEST: R-3 Three-Family Residential District  
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: Property located at the northwest corner of the Oak St. & Mann Circle intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 055H PARCEL(S): J 009.00 ACREAGE: 2.75 +/- CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 7

REASON FOR REQUEST: Future building opportunities

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for a one month deferral. The application needs an updated legal description.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval of the deferral. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 18 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): John M & James R Clark

Agent: Mark Holleman Houston Smith

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District &
C-2 General Commercial District
to R-4 Multiple-Family Residential District

LOCATION: A tract fronting on the north frontage of E. Boy Scout Rd. 1,450+/- feet west of the E. Boy Scout Rd. & Needmore Rd. intersection & a tract fronting on the south frontage of E. Boy Scout Rd. 2,025+/- west of

TAX MAP(S): 018 PARCEL(S): 023.00 ACREAGE: 11.83 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2
018 023.02

REASON FOR REQUEST: Best suited use is R-4 , to the right is 5 acres of C-5, behind it is R-4 and across the street is the race track.

Defer for 30 days at the request of the applicant.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER Z - 21 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Ava Homes L L C

REQUEST: R-2 Single-Family Residential District
to R-6 Single-Family District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Barker St., 1,225 +/- feet east of the S. Riverside Dr. & Barker St. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 079B PARCEL(S): B 012.00 ACREAGE: 2.36 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 12
B 013.00

REASON FOR REQUEST: To provide a more dense infill development

Defer for 30 days at the request of the applicant.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER Z - 22 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Henry Galvez Gutierrez Saul Ramos Chavez

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

LOCATION: A parcel fronting on the west frontage of Evans Rd., 145 +/- feet north of the Evans Rd. & Shaw Dr. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 029M PARCEL(S): A013.00 (P/O) ACREAGE: 1.03 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 3

REASON FOR REQUEST: We would like to build a single family home.

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-1 Single Family Residential District permits the owner to build a conventional built home. Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Lafayette Planning Area. He stated that there were no departmental comments of any concern relative to this application. He stated that the impact of this development would be minimal. He stated that historical estimates would be one lot.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that we have received no public comments in reference to this application. He stated that he spoke to one person on site with questions while he was taking photographs but they expressed on opposition.

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 23 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Jerry Trotter

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District  
to R-2 Single-Family Residential District

LOCATION: The tract of land is located at the southern terminus of Viewmont Dr. and north of Gibbs Lane.

TAX MAP(S): 032 PARCEL(S): 009.00 ACREAGE: 31.61 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

REASON FOR REQUEST: This request is for a residential S/D and is the extension of adjacent R-2 property.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. Request is an extension of an existing R-2 Single Family Residential zoning district to the north & west. The proposed R-2 zoning district is not out of character with the surrounding area. The adopted land use opinion map identifies this area for single family residential development. No adverse environmental issues have been identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Trenton Road Planning Area. He stated that a traffic assessment was reviewed and accepted by the Clarksville Street Department. He stated that no impacts were anticipated for development and there is no access anticipated to Gibbs Lane. He stated that there is a large ravine that runs parallel to Gibbs Lane and cuts north and south on this property. He stated that the School System capacity comments were Northeast Middle School. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. He stated that street accessibility is from Viewmont Drive. He stated this is anticipated to be an extension of the Broomfield Preliminary Subdivision. He stated that the applicant's estimate is 40 lots which matches our lot yield which has been adjusted for the steep topo and flood plain.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that as of 9 o'clock this morning no formal public comments have been logged in reference to this case. He stated that we have received phone calls with questions.

Mr. Vernon Weakley, representing purchaser of property, stated that he was available to answer any questions. He stated that upon completion of zoning they will be bringing in a revised preliminary to include additional lots.

Ms. Eleanore Schuyler, homeowner on Viewmont Drive, stated that she is at the end of the cul-de-sac on Viewmont Drive. She stated that her property will be very adversely affected by this development of 40 new homes. She stated that there will definitely be adverse environmental impacts. She stated that Trenton Road is very dangerous and there is almost a blind curve when you come out of Viewmont. She stated that she is very opposed to this development. She stated that she bought this property because she wanted peace and quiet with a farm behind her and wildlife. She stated that there are no sidewalks and children play on Viewmont Drive and children are in danger.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval as this is an extension of the R-2 district on the north, west and east and it conforms with the surrounding uses. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER Z - 24 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Satish Prabhu

Matt Ellis

REQUEST: C-4 Highway Interchange District  
to C-2 General Commercial District

LOCATION: Two parcels fronting on the east frontage of New South Dr., 395 +/- feet south of the Martin Luther King, Jr. / Highway 76 & New South Dr. intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 063P PARCEL(S): C006.00 ACREAGE: 2.26 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11  
C007.00

REASON FOR REQUEST: To facilitate the sale of the property currently under contract

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and noted that the agent notified us yesterday that they are wanting to amend their application to go from C-2 to R-4. He stated that they are asking for a one month deferral and we are in agreement with that one month deferral. He stated that we do need to open the floor up for public comment due to the lack of a 72 hour notice. He stated that the staff recommendation is a one month deferral.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that we have not received any public comment in reference to this application.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval of the deferral. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER CZ - 7 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Stephen T Oaks

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

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Trough Springs Rd., 470 +/- feet west of the Trough Springs Rd. & Mountain Way intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 082 PARCEL(S): 019.00 ACREAGE: 2 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: Looking to rezone from AG to R-1 so I can provide an additional lot for my parents to build a home next to us at current location.

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-1 Single Family Residential District permits the owner to divide the existing lot in half to construct an additional home. The proposal is not out of character with the surrounding single family development. Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that tis is in the Urban Growth Boundary and Sango Planning Area. He stated that page two of the staff report includes departmental comments that were received along with the School System comments referencing capacity for Sango Elementary, Richview Middle and Clarksville High. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density which would allow them to split the lot into two lots. He stated that it would be accessible to Trough Springs Road and currently served by septic.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that we have received several phone calls. He stated that there are actually two zoning requests, CZ-7-2021 and CZ-8-2021 are separate applications but they border one another. He stated that there were no public comments logged in reference to this application.

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER CZ - 8 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): Double J Partners

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

LOCATION: Property located south of Trough Springs Rd., east of Sango Rd., & north of the terminus of Waterfall Dr.

TAX MAP(S): 082 PARCEL(S): 013.00 ACREAGE: 140.17 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 11

REASON FOR REQUEST: This request is for the development of large residential lots that meet the growth plan.

Mr. Spainhoward read the case and gave the staff recommendation for approval. The proposed zoning request is consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan. Request is an extension of an existing R-1 Single Family Residential zoning district to the north, south & west. The proposed R-1 zoning district is not out of character with the surrounding area. The adopted land use opinion map identifies this area for single family residential development. Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that the County Highway Department and the City Street Department, due to the proximity of the City Limits abutting this property, requested a traffic assessment. He stated that the traffic assessment has been reviewed and accepted. He stated level of service at the main intersection would be a C and further evaluation would follow at the construction phase. He stated that there are also driveway access connection limitations from Trough Springs Road and Sango Road that would also be developed at subdivision and construction phase. He stated that the School System comments are also included relative to Sango Elementary, Richview Middle and Clarksville High capacities. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. Access to Trough Springs Road, Sango Road and Waterfall Drive which is south of this property. He stated our historical estimates indicate 268 lots but the note indicates that is likely high due to topo and the characteristics of the property with ponds and sinkholes. He stated that the applicant's estimate is 207 lots, which does appear to be accurate.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that there is an email in reference to this application and will be provided as part of the staff report.

Mr. Jeff Burkhart, one of the developers, stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Rebecca Perantoni, homeowner off of Trough Springs Road, stated that the current existing infrastructure cannot support 200 more houses. She stated that during school hours traffic backs up past her driveway from Sango. She stated that the intersection is very accident prone. She stated that her parents were rearended within the last 18 months at the Sango and Trough Springs intersection. She stated that it feels dangerous to be adding another 200 houses and 400 plus drivers. She stated that she is also concerned as to whether the water infrastructure is there or not. She stated that their water pressure can be questionable sometimes. She stated that there are no shoulders on Trough Springs and if a car were to be involved in an accident it could end up in someone's front yard.

Ms. Kimberly Schneck, 425 Trough Springs Road which is at the northwest corner of this property, stated that they have 4.8 acres there that they have owned since 1978. She stated that this property has been a family farm all of her life. She stated that she is aware of a sinkhole at the intersection that Ms. Rebecca just spoke about. She stated that she has watched the sinkhole grow throughout the decades. She stated that she has been on the phone with the Highway Department as well as the Street Department trying to get traffic counts to help support what Ms. Rebecca was talking about. She stated that traffic is an issue and lack of shoulder, lack of sidewalks. She stated that she is concerned about habitat loss. She stated that she is concerned about water runoff and light pollution. She stated that she is concerned about health and safety with regard to sinkholes. She stated that she had a geological expert tell her that it is illegal to disturb the sinkhole. She stated that she is also concerned about a conflict of interest with an engineering firm being co-owner of this property.

Mr. Spigner asked Mr. Spainhoward if he could explain, since traffic is a big concern to these neighbors, how the traffic study works and how that is applicable to the construction phases and site reviews. Mr. Spainhoward stated that he would defer to the engineer that wrote the traffic assessment and answer any questions you may have about that.

Mr. Vernon Weakley stated that Britt Little, an engineer at his firm, did the study. He stated that a traffic count was done at the intersection and then they looked at the amount of traffic that would increase and be projected in the future plus additional traffic that the new development will add to that. He stated that there are formulas that you go through to rate the intersection that includes right turns, left turns, straight through. He stated that the worst turning movement was rated a C at this intersection and several of them were Bs. He stated that there is a lot of traffic that goes through that four way but it is not rated bad as far as the International Traffic Manual. He stated that as far as sinkholes are concerned, TDEC, who they will have to get a permit from, will look at any endangered species, sinkholes and permits that they will have to have. He stated that they are in the County but are going to move forward with annexation request so it could be that they

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

will have City approval on the grading plans at that point. He stated that they are looking at large lots and not a very dense development that will be a cluster with a lot of open areas.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that it was his understanding on the traffic assessment, that while you have the ability to distribute trips multiple directions, a total volume of this was run through that intersection as a worst case scenario. Mr. Weakley stated that was correct.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he would also like to add that the traffic study was reviewed by the City and the County because this does border both. He stated that both the City and County said no new driveways onto Trough Springs or Sango Road so all the homes will access internal road system.

Mr. Spainhoward presented a copy of an email that was submitted in reference to this case.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval as this is an extension of the R-1 Single-Family Residential District to the north, south and west. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER CZ - 10 - 2021 APPLICANT(S): R & W Hall Properties, L L C

REQUEST: AG Agricultural District  
to E-1 Single-Family Estate District

LOCATION: Property fronting on the south frontage of Highway 76, south of the Port Royal Rd. & Highway 76 intersection.

TAX MAP(S): 061 PARCEL(S): 007.00 ACREAGE: 15.09 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 5

REASON FOR REQUEST: To develop a single family 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 small scale E-1 Single Family Residential development is not out of the character with the surrounding rural development pattern. Adequate infrastructure serves the site & no adverse environmental issues were identified relative to this request. He stated that this is in the Rural Area and the Sango Planning Area. He stated that the departmental comments are included on page 16 of the staff report, including the School System comments which reference capacities for Rossvie Middle and Rossvie High. He stated that the impact would be increased single family residential density. He stated that it would be served by East Montgomery Water and Utility District and septic. He stated it is accessible from Highway 76, likely through a private road off of Highway 76. He stated that historical estimates indicate this would yield 9 lots and the applicant's estimate is 10.

Mr. Spainhoward stated that as of 9:00 a.m. this morning there were no formal public comments made. He stated that he did receive a call just prior to lunch with someone asking questions and when he explained what was occurring they expressed on opposition.

Mr. Richard Hall, one of the owners, stated that he was here to answer any questions.

There was no one present to speak in opposition.

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING COMMISSION SUBDIVISION ACTIONS:** Mr. Parker stated that subdivisions are usually voted on a consent agenda, meaning they are voted on at one time, unless the staff or anyone from the audience would like to remove a particular item to discuss it. He stated that all but one of the consent agenda items need to be removed for consideration (see cases for discussion and action).

\*\*\*\*\*



## V. SUBDIVISIONS:

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: 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, water quality and erosion control plans. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling, or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the issuance of a grading and/or water quality permit.
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.
4. Before a final plat is submitted, there is a road built to City Street Standard, in width, road section, etc...

Note: A \$250 Deferral fee is required as a part of this application and has not been provided.

Mr. Parker read the case and gave the staff recommendation for disapproval. Mr. Parker stated that they have Old Spees Lane labeled as a public road but we have no records indicating that is a dedicated right-of-way. He stated that, at least a portion of that drive, is located on lots from the adjacent Belle Forest Subdivision. He stated that there were comments regarding concerns from the Street Department. Mr. Parker stated that the recommendation is disapproval due to the following 1. Section 4.1.1 Subsection 2. of the Subdivision Regulations states that: "Subdivisions along existing streets, roads or permanent easements of inadequate right-of way shall dedicate additional right-of-way or easement to meet at a minimum the width specified in these regulations." The Proposed Preliminary plat shows a 40' public right-of-way (ROW) that is partially located on adjacent private properties. No records have been found or provided to indicate that this ROW exists. There is a "25' Utility, Drainage & Roadway" Esmt" that a portion of the existing private access "drive" is located within the adjacent Belle Forest Subdivision lots. 2. Section 4.1.1 Subsection 3. of the Subdivision Regulations states that: "Subdivisions along existing streets, roads or permanent easements of inadequate pavement width may be required to provide additional pavement width to meet at a minimum the width specified in these regulations." The Proposed Preliminary plat is located along a very narrow private access "drive" of approximately 12 feet that serves 3 existing homes. This existing "drive" does not meet the minimum pavement width, and possibly other standards as is required in Table 4.1 of the Subdivision Regulations. The proposed Preliminary plat does not show any proposed improvements to this private drive other than a temporary turnaround which should be a permanent turnaround. 3. 3.2.4 Subsection 3. of the Subdivision Regulations states that: "The Regional Planning Commission shall not approve the subdivision of land if, from adequate investigations conducted by all public agencies concerned, it has been determined that in the best interest of the public the site is not suitable for platting and development purposes of the kind proposed." See attached comments from the Street Department "Need ROW Dedication", "Build Old Spees to City Standard" "including turnaround to approved Fire Department". \*\*\* A revised plat may be resubmitted and receive preliminary plat approval if said plat meets all of the requirements and regulations in effect at the time submittal, to include addressing the above comments.\*\*\* Note: A \$250 Deferral fee is required as a part of this application and has not been provided.

Mr. Garrett asked if the applicant had the option to defer and pay the \$250 or if we deny it here do they have to wait a year to bring it back. Mr. Parker stated they can submit at any point meeting those requirements. He stated that the fee would have to be paid before we could proceed with this application.

Mr. Spigner stated there is adequate real estate to build the road, could the road be moved. Mr. Parker stated that was one option that we discussed with the project engineer. Mr. Parker stated they could build what we now call a short cul-de-sac which reduces the pavement width and reduces some other requirements.

Mr. Marshall Ross stated this land was in the County, the road was in the County and there was no record of it ever being accepted. He stated that the County took care of the property. He stated that two letters were written stating that the County takes care of the road. He stated that when he brought this to the Planning Commission the first thing they wanted was to have this property annexed. He stated that he had it annexed just as the City wanted. He stated that they brought a letter of application for the Planning Commission asking that a few lots be approved so they can get rid of the property. He stated that they made a list of what they wanted done. He stated that no drainage on improvement shall be done until the City accepts it and tells him what to do. He stated that the City accepted it and

## V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

told him what they wanted done. He stated it was approval by the City Engineer's Office about utility plans including the water, fire hydrant, and the sewer. He stated that he put it all in. He stated they wanted a school bus and fire truck to be able to go down the road and turn around and he did all of that back in 2000. He stated that they approved it. He stated as far as the back of the lots being over the road, he cannot help that. He stated that Mr. Baggett put in the lots where they went to the back side of the road and across the road and the Planning Commission approved it. He stated that a Mr. Lawson, who died a few years ago, lived on the street and told Mr. Baggett he did not like the way the Planning Commission and Mr. Baggett did things and asked if he would help him get it corrected. He stated that he did not want to do that but wanted to give Mr. Lawson a \$3000 check and Mr. Lawson be happy. Mr. Ross stated that Mr. Lawson took the check and he showed it to Mr. Ross. Mr. Ross stated that he did not personally hear what was said between them but he saw the \$3000 check. Mr. Ross stated that this needs to be resolved and the only way he knows to resolve it is for the Planning Commission to abide by the 2000 decision by the Planning Commission, approve. He stated then the different departments can get involved and say what they want done.

Mr. Vernon Weakley stated that this case was brought before the Planning Commission in 2000 and was approved subject to four conditions. He stated that Mr. Ross has gone over a lot of those including annexation, do not work on the property until it is annexed, approval of utility plans and installation. He stated that thousands of dollars are spent based on this preliminary plat approval, based on the utility plans that were approved, installed and inspected by Gas and Water employees and accepted. He stated that they ended up with the final one which was approval by the City Street Department which has been the contentious thing. He stated that the only thing back then was if it was wide enough to handle eight additional lots. He stated that nothing was resolved on that and it has lay dormant for 20 years. He stated that Mr. Ross wanted to bring it back forward and this is the identical plat that was approved in 2000. Mr. Weakley stated that he was expecting one comment which is approval of the City Street Department. He stated that they occasionally have cases that require the widening of a road which is handled at the construction/plan end with the Street Department. He stated that if they decided a road needs widening the developer will work it out but it is never a reason for disapproval, it is just a condition of approval. He stated that the first thing for disapproval was the road itself and we have easement roads all over Montgomery County. He stated that North Liberty Church Road is an easement road that carries tons of traffic everyday. He stated that the proper course of action is to approve this preliminary that was approved 20 years ago with the stipulation of number 4, approval by the City Street Department of all roads and drainage plans which will include widening and any other shortcoming that they see with that existing road. He stated he was available to answer any questions. He stated that the letter from Doug was from before Mr. Ross annexed it and it was a gravel maintained road. Mr. Weakley stated that today it has stop signs, City Road names and it is paved.

Mr. Powers stated that Mr. Weakley referenced the easement road and he stated that he agrees but those were historical paths, horse paths and wagon trails turned into paved roads. He stated this is a little different because when that subdivision was there. He stated that if this was a public road when the subdivision to the north was platted right-of-way lines would have been established.

Mr. Weakley stated that if those rules had been adhered to, at the time of that plat, the lines would have been pulled back. He stated that just because it was gravel it was overlooked. Mr. Powers stated that assuming the interpretation was that it was a public road at that time but an interpretation could have been made that it was a private drive and therefore left it as an easement. He stated that the City did not agree with it because they have improved it and it is illegal for them to improve private property.

Mr. Powers stated that we are referencing a 2000 approval which expired two years after the approval. Mr. Parker stated he was not exactly sure what the rules were then but probably two. Mr. Tyndall stated that this was brought again in 2009 and in 2010 came for final and was withdrawn for unknown issues. Mr. Tyndall stated in 2009 it was a preliminary approval with four conditions and in 2010 they applied for final prematurely and after several deferrals it was withdrawn.

Mr. Powers asked if we could approve this subject to a road being built to City standards, solely on this property as a condition. Mr. Tyndall stated that he believes that has been staff's position all along. He stated that there is nothing wrong with the layout and the lots meet the size standards, just that the access to the lots using whether it is a private

## V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

easement or a short cul-de-sac, needs to be on their property and not utilizing these individuals rear yards. He stated this was labeled, prior to 2000, a roadway easement. He stated that there is not really an interpretation of what that means. He stated that we have no problem with this continuing to be the access for the two lots that are back there but when you start talking about platting the additional 8 total lots then you bring it up to a true City Street standards. He stated that we believe that needs to be on their property, developed on their property and not converting the rear of these other individuals properties into right-of-way. Mr. Powers asked if that is what the Street Department is asking for. Mr. Tyndall stated that the Street Department is asking for the minimum width to be obtained.

Mr. Stephen Blake, 1481 North Liberty Church Road, stated that he lives to the south of this property. He stated that the issue he has is water. He stated that the land is not flat and it is raised where they put the sewer in. He stated that there are no drains for City Streets out there when they incorporated that lot. He stated that everything drains off into that field and into his front yard where his septic system is located. He stated that he cannot take anymore water. He stated that on a two inch rain day he has 8-10 inches of water running through his front yard and going to the flood plain in the back which is now 5 feet deep when the Cumberland River is full. He stated that he has lived there 32 years and has a right not to lose his property to water. He stated that he is just asking that along with the street thing we get the storm water issue fixed. He stated that the corner where Spees Lane comes in, he knows of at least 7 people who have died in that curve and the road is not safe.

Mr. Nelson Bolden stated the he owns the property directly behind at the end of Spees Lane. He stated that this will make his property value go down and he will lose his privacy. He stated that he has a lot of stuff and if apartments go in it will create a risk of vandalism as he is gone 12 hours of the day. He stated that he has expensive cars. He stated that he sees where the fire hydrant was placed and a fire truck cannot turn around back there unless they turn and go onto the other piece of property and destroy some of his property. He stated that putting apartments here is totally unacceptable. He stated that he has been there 4 years and he has not seen anyone do anything to the road and as Mr. Blake had stated the turn is dangerous. Mr. Swift stated that this is single family, not apartments. Mr. Bolden stated that he owns several classic cars and a boat and he is just concerned about vandalism. He stated that a fire truck cannot turn without taking out some of his front yard so he is opposed.

Mr. Vernon Weakley stated that drainage and the road go together. He stated that in order to get past preliminary they go to the Street Department not only for the road but for the drainage plan to take care of what is going on out there. He stated that the turnaround is not right at the curve but at the end of the road.

Mr. Spigner stated that we know that water is dealt with as it cannot leave the site any faster or with anymore volume than it is at the present time. He stated that if that has been happening for the past 20 years, we have still got to take care of this gentleman's water problem. Mr. Weakley stated that the low point for this property is at the southeast corner and that is where they will be taking the water out.

Mr. Parker stated that we have a standard set of conditions that we use and he could read those. Mr. Spigner stated that he would like to hear what Brad's boilerplate conditions are. Mr. Parker stated that the standard conditions are the following: 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, water quality and erosion control plans. No excavating, stripping, filling or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the issuance of grading and water quality permit. 3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance.

Mr. Powers asked if we make a motion to approve it with those conditions, do we also need to add a condition specifically to a City Street to be constructed entirely on this property. He asked if that is how it needs to be done or leave it on the boilerplate and work it out with the Street Department? Mr. Tyndall stated that since we are in charge of platting he thinks it would be good to have that condition. Mr. Spigner asked how Spees Lane will be dealt with if we move in this way, will it be a street parallel to Spees Lane or will it be part of the street? Mr. Parker stated that

**V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):**

he would think it would be separate and parallel since a portion of that is located on private property. Mr. Parker stated that it may depend on how much of the existing is on the private property.

Mr. Powers stated that he thinks if we make a condition that gives them the latitude to buy that 25 foot back from those neighbors or have a court case that shows that it actually is in fact a public street. He stated that if you are all accepting of that we could make a motion that, at the end of the day, it has got to be to City standard width, road surface, all of that stuff. Mr. Powers stated that they could take this to Chancery Court and have it determined that this is in fact a public street and all they would need to do is add another 15 feet on their property.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval of the plat with the condition that, before final plat is submitted, there is a road there that is to City Street standard in width, road section, etc. as well as the standard conditions including 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, water quality and erosion control plans. No excavating, stripping, filling or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the issuance of grading and water quality permit. 3. Approval by the City Street Department of all driveway access locations to the public right-of-way before construction begins on site per City of Clarksville Driveway Access Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spigner and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

V. SUBDIVISIONS:

CASE NUMBER: S - 25 - 2021      APPLICANT: Batson East-Land Co.

REQUEST: Minor Plat Approval of BATSON PROPERTY NORTH EDGEWOOD PLACE LOTS  
1 & 2 (PREVIOUSLY CALLED NORTH EDGEWOOD  
PLACE)

LOCATION: North of an adjacent to N Edgewood Place, approximately 180 feet northwest of the intersection of  
Wilma Rudolph Boulevard and North Edgewood Place.

MAP: 032 PARCEL(S): 013.02 ACREAGE: 4.15

# OF LOTS: 2 CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 2

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL BY MINOR PLAT PROVISIONS

Mr. Chris Goodman 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. The motion was seconded by Mr.  
Hadley and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 29 - 2021      APPLICANT: M & H Development

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of GRANT FARMS

LOCATION: East of Old Highway 48, east of Chapel Hill Road, north of and adjacent to Southside Road, approximately 715 feet southeast of the intersection of Old Highway 48 and Southside Road.

MAP: 143    PARCEL(S): 040.01    ACREAGE: 65.86

# OF LOTS: 24    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 16/22

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

1. Approval by the County Highway Department of road and drainage plans, for drainage structures within the proposed rights-of-way, before construction begins on site.
2. Approval by the County Building and Codes Department of all drainage, grading, water quality and erosion control plans. No grading, excavating, stripping, filling or other disturbance of the natural ground cover shall take place prior to the issuance of a grading and/or water quality permit
3. Approval by the City Engineer's Office or the Utility District and the State Department of Environment and Conservation of all utility plans before construction of utilities begins.
4. Approval by the Division of Groundwater Protection for all subsurface sewage disposal system (SSDS) areas.

VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting two variances from the Subdivision Regulations.

1. Section 4.1.9.5 Subsection A. II. to allow a "short cul-de-sac" of approximately 840 feet, which exceeds the maximum allowed of 750 feet for the proposed "Road 2".
2. Section 4.1.9.5 Subsection A. II. to allow a "short cul-de-sac" of approximately 1,500 feet, which exceeds the maximum allowed of 750 feet for the proposed "Road 1". An intermediate turnaround is shown on the plans as is required when a cul-de-sac exceeds 1,000 feet.

Mr. Parker read the variance requests.

Mr. Vernon Weakley stated that this was one that was laid out with lots of flag lots. He stated that they chose to try this new method out and in doing so they had some violations of the cul-de-sac length but overall he thinks it is a much better product in the end.

There was no one present to speak in opposition of the variance requests.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval of the variances due to topographical issues. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously.

Mr. Rex Hawkins stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

V. SUBDIVISIONS (CONT.):

CASE NUMBER: S - 30 - 2021      APPLICANT: Mack Phillips  
 REQUEST: Preliminary Plat Approval of LYLEWOOD ESTATES  
 LOCATION: South of and adjacent to Lylewood Road, approximately 3,030 feet southwest of the intersection of John Taylor Road and Lylewood Road.  
 MAP: 075 PARCEL(S): 043.00 (P/O)    ACREAGE: 20.32  
 # OF LOTS: 12    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 9  
 STAFF RECOMMENDATION: PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED.  
 VARIANCES REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 4.1.9 Subsection 1. of the Subdivision Regulations to allow a cul-de-sac length for the proposed "Road A" of approximately 860 feet in length, which exceeds the maximum allowed of 750 feet.

Mr. Parker read the variance request.

Mr. Jimmy Bagwell, engineer for the property owner, stated that this particular road follows the ridge and the topography gets too steep so they are asking for roughly 110 foot variance. He stated that he was available to answer any questions.

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

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval of the variance due to steep topography. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

Mr. Swift stated that we need to vote on the case with the variances.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Powers and carried unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: S - 31 - 2021      APPLICANT: Chris Blackwell  
 REQUEST: Revised Preliminary Plat Approval of LIBERTY PARK 7 (CLUSTER) AND SECTION 8  
 LOCATION: West of Paul B Huff Memorial Parkway, north of and adjacent to Dover Road (Highway 79), approximately 300 feet northwest of the intersection of Freedom Drive and Highway 79.  
 MAP: 053 PARCEL(S): 003.00    ACREAGE: 89.86  
 # OF LOTS: 168    CIVIL DISTRICT(S): 8  
 STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DEFER FOR 30 DAYS

\*\*\*\*\*  
**PLANNING COMMISSION SITE REVIEW ACTIONS:** Ms. Russell noted that site review cases are heard on a consent agenda unless someone wishes to pull a case for further discussion.

Ms. Russell read the remaining cases on the consent agenda and gave the staff recommendation for approval.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval of the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried with Mr. Powers abstaining from SR-24-2021 and SR-26-2021.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 20 - 2021 APPLICANT: Josh Easterly  
Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: PROFESSIONAL PARK, LOT 2

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION: 821 Professional Park Drive

MAP: 040G C 018.00 ACREAGE: 4.13

CIVIL DIST.: 6

**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.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 21 - 2021 APPLICANT: Huneycutt LLC  
Cal Burchett

DEVELOPMENT: CIGAR HILL

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION: 40 West High Street

MAP: 066O B, 001.00 ACREAGE: 2.18

CIVIL DIST.: 12

**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.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 22 - 2021 APPLICANT: Mark Boles  
Britt Little

DEVELOPMENT: MARK BOLES PROPERTY

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION: Center Pointe Drive

MAP: 041, 059.00 ACREAGE: 2.95

CIVIL DIST.: 6

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** DEFERRAL, PENDING SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

\*\*\*\*\*



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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 23 - 2021 APPLICANT: Crabbe Homes  
Chris Goodman

DEVELOPMENT: SANGO RIDGE TOWNHOMES

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION: Trough Springs Road

MAP: 063, 078.00 (P/O) ACREAGE: 8.86

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 from the City Traffic Engineer.
  4. Approval of a landscape plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 24 - 2021 APPLICANT: Chad Byard  
Houston Smith

DEVELOPMENT: BYARD BUSINESS PARK

PROPOSED USE: Construction office/warehouses

LOCATION: Guthrie Hwy

MAP: 015, 003.02 ACREAGE: 15.0

CIVIL DIST.: 2

**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 and drainage plans by the County Building and Codes Department.
  3. Approval of a landscape buffer plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

CASE NUMBER: SR - 25 - 2021 APPLICANT: John Crane (TPA)  
Brian West, P.e.

DEVELOPMENT: PROJECT ALICE

PROPOSED USE: Distribution Facility

LOCATION: 3875 Guthrie Highway

MAP: 016, 009.00 ACREAGE: 159.00

CIVIL DIST.: 2

**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 and drainage plans by the County Building and Codes Department.
  3. Approval from the County Highway Department.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

CASE NUMBER: SR - 26 - 2021 APPLICANT: Holly Point, LLC  
Houston Smith

DEVELOPMENT: SUMMERFIELD TOWNHOMES, PHASE 2

PROPOSED USE: Multifamily

LOCATION: Fallow Drive

MAP: 008,004.05 ACREAGE: 1.7

CIVIL DIST.: 2

**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. HOA submitted and recorded.
  4. Approval of a landscape plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Mr. Tyndall stated that we need to initiate a Subdivision Regulation change to bring some items into conformance with State Laws as well as look at bonding and other things that have come out with the recent easements passed last month.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Powers moved to recommend approval of initiation of Subdivision Regulation updates. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

B. APPROVE BUDGET FY 2021-2022: Mr. Tyndall stated that we presented the budget last Friday for you. He stated that no additional changes have been made. He stated that the County has preliminarily approved it and we go to the City this Friday to present it to them. He stated that we do need to approve it by the Planning Commission.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously.

### C. ACCEPTANCE OF LETTER OF CREDIT FOR FINAL PLAT

1. REYNOLDS ROW S-41-2021: Mr. Tyndall stated that in our Subdivision Regulations we really do not have a method to handle this. He stated that is part of what the Subdivision Regulation update is going to be. He stated that when things come in that are a little outside the normal, we will just bring it to the Planning Commission for approval. He stated that this is for a letter of credit to construct an alleyway for those five lots fronting on Reynolds Street. He stated that the estimate was brought to us at \$13,260, we are adding a 25% administration fee on it. He stated that this will allow them to final plat the lots prior to building the alley. He stated that in order to satisfy that they will have to get release from the bond in about a years period when they build the alley. He stated that we will go inspect it and then bring it back to you to release that bond. He stated that they will bring us a letter of credit in the amount of \$16, 515. He stated that the only thing being approved here is the acceptance of that total amount and to allow them to do it by letter of credit.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Hadley moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrett and carried unanimously.

D. MONTHLY PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT: Mr. Tyndall presented the monthly profit and loss statement.

There being no more discussion, Mr. Spigner moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jimenez and carried unanimously.

E. CONSIDER MONTGOMERY COUNTY FY 2021-2026 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN: Mr. Tyndall stated that we discussed this on Friday and he had one more discussion this morning with Jerry Allbert from Parks and Recreation. He did say that there is the intent for the Carmel Park to have a more active park there as Weakley Park is going to be a more passive park with trails and more open spaces. He stated that the Daniel Street property, they are just going to put a walking trail in there for now. He stated that the County does not intend to build more pocket parks unless they already own the property. He stated that a lot of it still has to go through studies and unless there are any comments from the floor here, we will present the Capital Improvement Plan as an approval from the Planning Commission to the County on Monday.

There being no more discussion, Ms. Jimenez moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hadley and carried unanimously.

F. PLAN OF SERVICE FOR A-1-2021: Mr. Tyndall stated that this is for 22 acres located off of Shaw Drive. He stated that it is two properties, maybe 40-50 homes when it is all said and done. He stated that the Planning Commission's role is not to approve the annexation but the plan of service. He stated that we received all of the comments that you see there. He stated that this is going from R-1 to R-1A if approved for the annexation. He stated that everything out there is R-1 or RM-1 as you saw today with an earlier zoning case. He stated that if we approve the plan of service, it will go forward to the City for annexation this Thursday.

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

## VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

ATTEST

  
Richard Swift, CHAIR