

MINUTES  
HENDERSONVILLE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015  
6:30 P.M. – CITY HALL MEETING ROOM

Chairman Bob Freudenthal called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Meeting Room, 101 Maple Drive North, Hendersonville, TN

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Don Ames, Lori Atchley, Kee Bryant-McCormick, Bob Freudenthal, David Jenkins, Charles Lea, Frank Pinson and Darlene Stringfellow. Absent: Mark Bristol and Bryant Millsaps. Also present: Fred D. Rogers, Jr., Planning Director; Timothy D. Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner; Marshall Boyd, City Engineer; Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector; and Georgie Mathis, Administrative Secretary.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**Public Hearing Request** to modify the Preliminary Development Plan for Shute Lane Office Development.

Timothy Whitten gave a presentation to explain the current plan as well as the proposed plan. This property is located between Shute Lane and Smith Travel Research. With the existing Master Plan, they could go out with site plan approval and build tomorrow. The zoning first of all is split zoned. It is GC (General Commercial) PD across the front portion of the property and transitions to Office PD across the back side. The 2 vacant lots is where the transition occurs. The existing plan has 11 buildings on it and the commercial section up front has the larger buildings close to Shute Lane, about 20,000 square feet directly adjacent to Shute Lane. All of those commercial buildings are 1 story product and then towards the back, the office section is 2 story office – those are about 7,000/8,000 square feet each. So the total amount of retail that they can have with the existing plan is 54,550 square feet and they are allowed to have 82,500 of office for a total of building square footage of 137,050 square feet.

The proposed plan has the same zoning districts. GC in the front – office in the back. They have gone from 11 buildings down to 4 buildings with the possibility of a 5th building being a parking garage towards the back of the property. The buildings could each be 4 stories tall. The amount of retail has been reduced to 22,250 square feet and the amount of office space has increased to 319,000 square feet for a total building square footage of 341,250. This chart compares the current plan with the proposed plan across the top – they have gone from 11 buildings to 4, possibly 5 – again current plan has 1-story across the front up to a max of 2 stories and the proposed plan goes up to 4 stories. Retail square footage goes down from 54,550 to 22,000 and office goes up quite a bit from 82,500 to 319,000 square feet.

A traffic study has been conducted and included with the Planning Commission packets.

Fred Rogers explained the proposed plan is 4 stories or 75 feet, normally 4 stories would be more like 12 feet per story, maybe 48, 50 or 55 feet in height as opposed to 75. Seventy-Five (75) is what that base zoning allows so the applicant needs to address/clarify if that is going to be less than 75 feet during their presentation.

Mr. Rogers explained the process required to modify the Preliminary Development Plan. This is the first of about five steps that would be required if each step is approved along the way.

Tonight, the Planning Commission would be in a position later on the agenda, following the Public Hearing, to make a recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to approve and if they do, then it goes to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in two weeks for first reading and then if it passes there, then it goes on to the third step which would be two weeks later before the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, there would be a second public hearing and a second reading and then if those are approved, then the new preliminary development plan is approved, and then they would come back with step four which would be the final development plan that would come to the Planning Commission and then again to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for one reading and if all of that is approved, the next step would be to subdivide the property and, if they are going to subdivide it, then the next step would be site plan approval and they would usually do that on a per building basis – perhaps start off with building one and then a few years later building two, building three, building four – again the applicants during their presentation later tonight can explain their expected time schedule for development.

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE:** None

**ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** None

**MINUTES:**

MOTION by Ames, seconded by Jenkins, to approve the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 1, 2015. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Abstain: Freudenthal. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Stringfellow, to approve the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 15, 2015. Ames, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Abstain: Atchley, Bryant-McCormick and Lea. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:**

**13-053-001: MAPCO – INDIAN LAKE CENTER – SITE PLAN RENEWAL: MOTION** by Jenkins, seconded by Stringfellow, to approve Mapco – Indian Lake Center – Site Plan Renewal for one year. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

**FINAL PLATS:** None

**PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS:**

**15-084-001: SHUTE LANE OFFICE DEVELOPMENT, PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:**

Brett Creasman, Kimley-Horne, representing the client and noting the applicant is going to ask for a deferral for this agenda item for tonight but would like to address questions regarding this development. The first concern was the four story building and the height of those buildings. We have been working with an architecture firm and the intent of these four buildings are Class A office space and a typical Class A office space in middle Tennessee is 14 foot ceiling with beams and mechanical and parapet walls – you can get up to 70 feet easily. We decided to leave it the max height on the applications since we were so close to it with our calculations.

As far as schedule, it is my clients wish to address the two buildings closest to Shute Lane with Phase 1. The two additional buildings as well as the potential parking garage would be Phase 2 and that would be really market driven and we would have a better idea of that schedule after the completion of Phase 1.

The way we have laid out this plan is to try to keep the buildings further from the residential, closer to the heavier road – Vietnam Veterans. The intent of pulling the road closer to the residential was actually to push the buildings further away. In addition to that, there are some water courses running through the property and strategically locating the crossings there, it makes sense to have that on the southern portion of the property. Right now, it is called out as a public roadway. We have been working with the Public Works Department and Marshall and I are weighing both options at this point.

Bob Freudenthal said that might come into play as far as the issue of street lighting, etc. as to whether it is public or private so you probably ought to resolve that before you come back with

that answer. What about the berm separation or barrier separation between the residential – existing residential and your proposed development?

Mr. Creasman said on the west end there is a very thick existing tree line which would remain in place. We've got 25 feet adjacent to the property where we would not remove those trees. If those trees do not meet the heavy buffer requirement, we have been working through that with the Planning Department, we would even supplement that existing tree line. To the eastern portion of the property, there is not as dense of a tree line in place and so we proposed a buffer area that would be a combination of berms and plantings and exceeds the heaviest buffer requirements.

Timothy Whitten said as far as the eastern part of the property, Phase 1, there aren't really any existing trees that could serve as a good buffer for Riverchase. I have asked them to look at adding a berm to that section. I have asked them to look at berms and, of course, they would have to provide evergreen plantings although, at planting, those would not screen a four story office building from those residences. That is something that we would shoot for with maturity.

Fred Rogers added in regard to the comment about concern about four story buildings towering over the residences, again the further away from the residences the buildings can be placed, the better. Perhaps they would consider moving the buildings further north, closer to the Bypass, further away from the homes and maybe doing some type of line of sight study. I have a feeling Phase 2 buildings, especially if they move them further back with those existing mature trees, they would not be readily visible from the homes. Now in Phase 1, it is a different question. Perhaps the building – the first building – could be placed on the other side of that street further away from homes. Perhaps they can address that now. Typically when we talk about a berm – let's say a berm along that south line where there are no trees – we would be talking about a berm of two or three feet tall and then some trees on top of that. About the tallest trees you can plant to begin with would be about 7 feet tall and it would take a few years for them to mature but perhaps we can look at widening that buffer which would give more room for a wider, taller buffer and that coupled with moving the buildings a little bit further away from the property line might achieve the buffering that is needed.

Mr. Creasman said we will continue to evaluate all those options as we continue this process. Regarding the driveway location, we put that in the same location as the current or previously approved plan. It is roughly equal distance between the Gallatin Road light and Devonshire.

Marshall Boyd outlined several improvements. The shoulder width along Shute Lane is not really sufficient for safe travel and, in addition to the improvements outlined in the traffic study, that is one more improvement being required for the applicant to make and that is to widen that shoulder and make it a little bit safer as you are going back to Gallatin Road.

Chris Rhodes, Kimley-Horn and Associates, addressed traffic issues. The project will warrant a southbound right turn lane into our development and then as you are exiting the development onto Shute Lane, an exclusive left turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane and then when you are headed up Shute Lane, a left turn lane in. So there will be some widening that will be

accomplished at the intersection. I will be more than comfortable with making shoulder improvements to meet current TDOT standards at this intersection.

Charles Lea noted that there is quite a bit more traffic on that road than the traffic study seems to indicate. I have a concern about where the third lane, the turning lanes, where they would begin. And my concern is that we are going to be creating a back up of traffic that could go even on to 31 or even back onto Shute Lane, particularly during times when our school is operating, Jack Anderson School, which is also a time that most offices are opening and people would be coming in and out of that area. What exacerbates this even more is the fact that we are increasing the size of the footprint of the office space and the total square footage of development by two and a half times and that's going to be a lot more people coming in and out of that facility at all times. Also, there is an indication that there would be a traffic light at some point in Phase 2 – I am not so sure that is not needed in Phase 1 because I just can't imagine people coming out at the end of a work day and then trying to get across Shute Lane to turn left to get back that it is not going to create havoc for everyone else that's trying to get home at that particular time or when a school is operating. Also, I just would point out and I am sure you are a very reputable traffic engineer but you are an engineer that's been hired by the developer and I am not so sure we don't need an independent third party traffic study and then we can compare the results of the two and then have some assurance that the things that are being recommended are as you suggest they are – I hope they are but those are my concerns.

Bob Freudenthal said with respect to your last comment, that's something we don't do. Independent traffic studies are at the expense of the City. This man's stamp and reputation of this firm is on line.

Mr. Rhodes addressed the concerns. The traffic study was done – traffic counts were performed. We made sure school was in session because that is not accurate at all to do counts in the summer when school is not operational. We think Shute Lane probably has between 5,000/8,000 vehicles per day. Two lane roads can operate upwards of 14,000 to 16,000 cars a day before they break down so Shute Lane is probably at about 33 to 50% of total capacity for the roadway. And you are correct in terms of the warrants study for the traffic signal. We don't get over the threshold to meet what the federal or the state requirements are for a traffic signal until buildings 3 or 4 are built.

Charles Lea said the Hunt Club development may exit on Shute Lane and would be adding additional traffic to Shute Lane that probably is not calculated anywhere in your study.

Mr. Rhodes said he identified two other pending, approved developments and we had to place that traffic on to our network, grow the background traffic and then add the traffic related to this development.

Marshall Boyd commented that Vaughan Street is the street in Hunt Club that is potentially going to connect into Shute Lane and tie into that signal.

Mr. Rhodes said so it will become the fourth leg to this T intersection and I think when the signal is designed, you make sure you accommodate that so you don't place poles where they conflict with that potential overlay.

Bob Freudenthal noted the second development you are referring to may in fact be Savannah. The question came up prior to that one was on State Routes you install signals at a certain given time after the demand already exist, is that the same policy of the City?

Marshall Boyd said the City would default to TDOT and with what they recommend.

David Jenkins stated the site plan is calling for 1,065 parking spaces – 1,065 cars, even at 500 or 600 cars, will make an impact at that intersection so I think that is something to think about. I've always thought that office zoning in between commercial and residential is a very good zoning. The four story bit, I think that depending on how you screen the first two stories around the office building makes it more palatable for residents. It could look very residential and have a good buffer but just to follow up on Dr. Lea's comments, I do note on the site plan that they are quoting 1,065 parking spaces.

Fred Rogers said he thinks the two existing approved developments that we spoke of would have been Hunt Club and Savannah. As you know Savannah is expanding and then for Hunt Club there's actually two connections that Hunt Club will make to Shutes Lane – one would be as stated earlier – an extension across the Goat Farm to tie in at the entrance to this street. There will also be a southerly extension of Hunt Club down to the east-west portion of Shute Lane. One thing that perhaps hasn't been addressed is the possibility of other development, like the Goat Farm that we affectionally refer to as the Goat Farm – the property on the east side of Shutes Lane. I wondered if that had been factored into the overall future traffic conditions.

Mr. Rhodes said the intersection for our proposed development has a signal,- and will have additional capacity to accommodate what may be generated from the fourth leg.

Bob Freudenthal said you had indicated that the requestor was asking for a deferral because a lot of these questions can be answered during that period. What length of time of deferral are you asking for?

Brett Creasman noted one month deferral.

Freudenthal noted the developer has requested for a 30-day deferral. Do I have a motion for such? MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Bryant-McCormick.

Don Ames asked if there will be another Public Hearing.

David Jenkins said I would like to amend my original motion that the developer be granted a deferral for 30 days and that also a provision be made for another public hearing that will not be

advertised in the newspaper but would certainly be told to all who are here tonight and those that might be interested. Bryant-McCormick seconded the amendment.

MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Bryant-McCormick, to approve the deferral requested by the developer for 30 days with another Public Hearing. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

Charles Lea expressed his concern about a four story office building in that area. I do appreciate the quality of the building. We are very familiar with the kind of development that the owner of this property is accustomed to doing. I was thinking about another building similar to the building that he has that fits so well into a residential area. A four story building is like the office building that is across from the new Library or the two Memorial office buildings which is right across from the YMCA and if the residents of our area begin to look at those types of structures being next to where they live, then it becomes something that is much, much less desirable and I think opposition to the project would increase tremendously so I would just urge you to find something that would fit more properly into that area.

**STAFF REPORT:**

This property is located along the south side of SR386. It extends from Smith Travel Research (STR) to Shute Lane. SR386 is on the north. The homes on Waterford Drive in River Chase subdivision back up to this property.

The property was purchased by Randy Smith, owner of STR, several years ago. At that time, it was zoned C-PUD-G (Commercial Planned Unit Development-General) and RM-1 (Residential Multi-family).

In 2007 the property was rezoned to General Commercial and Office Planned Unit Development. The development plan which was approved at that time and the proposed revisions are described and compared in the following table:

|                         | <b>Current Plan</b> | <b>Proposed Plan</b>         |
|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| <b># of buildings</b>   | 11                  | 4 (5 with parking structure) |
| <b>Building height</b>  | 2 story/35 feet     | 4 story/75 feet              |
| <b>Sq.ft. of retail</b> | 54,550              | 22,250                       |
| <b>Sq.ft. of office</b> | 82,500              | 319,000                      |

The proposed plan also includes a possible future 4 story parking garage.

Both plans require the preservation of existing trees along the Riverchase subdivision property line. Additional trees must be planted in the gaps.

Permitted uses are basically the same in both plans. The main difference is the new plan contains more office and less retail. See comparison above.

This property fronts on Shute Lane. The entrance will be about halfway between 31E and the entrance to River Chase subdivision (Devonshire Drive). Jack Anderson Elementary is located south of Devonshire.

A secondary emergency access will be through STR property which fronts on 31E.

A traffic study has been submitted to the City Engineer. It is very thick. Attached is the Title Page, Table of Contents, Section 1.0 Executive Summary, Section 7.0 Capacity Analysis, and Section 8.0 Recommendations. As can be seen from Sections 1.0 and 8.0, the developer will be required to make improvements to Shute Lane. In particular, a southbound right-turn lane must be constructed along Shute Lane for traffic coming from East Main Street. This lane must be constructed in conjunction with completion of Phase 1. Phase 2 will require the addition of a northbound left-turn lane on Shute Lane at the entrance to the development. Phase 2 will also require a traffic signal on Shute Lane at the entrance to the development.

The impact of this development on traffic on Shute Lane at the entrance and at Devonshire and at East Main Street is shown on Tables 10 and 11 on page 30 of Section 7.0 and is described in text on page 31. Table 10 states the impact during the AM Peak Hour and Table 11 during the PM Peak Hour. Impact is given for Phase 1 (Future 2017 Conditions) and Phase 2 (Future 2019 Conditions). The impact is stated for the three impacted intersections: Shute Lane at East Main, at the proposed driveway/entrance, and at Devonshire. Finally, impact is stated in terms of Level of Service (L.O.S.). L.O.S. is described on pages 27-29. L.O.S. A is the best and F is the worst. C and possibly D are generally considered acceptable whereas E and F are not. The projected Levels of Service, which are shown in Tables 10 and 11, assume that the specified street improvements have been completed.

You will note that the Level of Service will decrease for certain directions of travel. Most notable is Shute Lane at Devonshire. For the AM Peak Hour at the eastbound approach (traffic exiting River Chase Subdivision), the L.O.S. after Phase 1 will decrease from D to E and after Phase 2, to F. The "Control Delay" will increase from 33.4 seconds to 104.7.

The City Engineer and the developer's Traffic Engineer will be present at the meeting to answer questions.

#### STAFF COMMENTS:

##### Planning Department

1. Remove duplicate building setback notes from General Notes (setbacks are shown in bulk table).
2. Show 20' minimum setback line along proposed public street. Adjust building locations to conform.
3. Shown surface parking represents about 90% of the required spaces. Additional surface parking, structured parking, or a reduction in building square footage will be required.

4. A berm may be required along that portion of the property adjacent to River Chase (approximately the first eight residential lots on east end of Devonshire/Waterford Way) where there few or no existing trees.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (October 2, 2015)

Public Works

1. The proposed driveway is shown as public right of way. Further comments will be made regarding the driveway being public or private and even the possibility of the driveway being included as a part of the site plan. The parking layout (i.e. drive aisles) may change as a result of that decision. If preliminary development approved by Planning Commission, PW will work with owner's representative to address comments prior to final development plan submittal.

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (October 2, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (October 2, 2015)

Utility District

1. WHUD water and sewer.

Submitted by David Brigance, (October 2, 2015)

**15-089-001: INDIAN LAKE MARKET, LOTS DD, CC, BB, AA, R, T, U, V, X & Y –  
ADDITION OF USES TO FDP:**

Timothy Whitten said the Parrishes have requested that additional uses be added to the Indian Lake Market Final Development Plan. Indian Lake Market consists of Super Walmart, Home Depot, Shane's Rib Shack, Chop House, etc. They have a potential buyer for outlot DD which is across the street from the Ascend Credit Union, which the Site Plan was approved for a few months ago. The original master plan allowed only retail and restaurant uses. It does not allow Office. Since then, the Master Plan has been amended several times to allow additional uses on certain outlots. It was amended twice to allow medical office and once to allow General Personal Services.

Rather than keep having folks come back on a piecemeal basis, lot by lot, to get uses added, staff recommended that they request that these uses be added to the majority of the remainder of undeveloped outlots on Anderson Lane. The uses being requested are: Entertainment and Amusement Services, General Personal Services, and Professional Services (Medical and Non-Medical). Those are old use categories from the old ordinance. We didn't translate them to the new ordinance so they wouldn't have to go back and amend the whole Master Plan. Those are old uses but they would be in keeping with the area. The outlots on which the uses are to be allowed are: AA, BB, CC, DD, R, T, U, V, X and Y.

Entertainment and Amusement Services are things like bowling alley, theater, art gallery, cheerleading schools, tennis courts and things of that nature and these are from the old ordinance.

Fred Rogers noted this is a request the Planning Commission can approve.

MOTION by Atchley, seconded by Bryant-McCormick, to approve an amendment to the Final Development Plan for Indian Lake Market, Lots DD, CC, BB, AA, R, T, U, V, X & Y to add uses. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## **SITE PLANS:**

**15-078-002: SITE PLAN, DR. STEWART MEDICAL OFFICE FACILITY:** MOTION by Stringfellow, seconded by Atchley, to approve Site Plan, Dr. Stewart Medical Office Facility, with granting a waiver from the Site Design Standard that requires a landscape island every ten spaces, and granting a waiver to allow a run of 14 parking spaces and a parking run of 12 spaces, and with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## **STAFF REPORT:**

This site is located on the east side of New Shackle Island Road, in front of Dr. Carmack's office, and across the street from Walgreens and the Shell station. The south part of the site is in the Glen Oak planned development and is zoned GC-PD; the north part of the site is zoned Office. The proposed use is a medical office. Part of the building may be used for personal services (such as salon, dry cleaners, etc.) or other office.

The applicant is requesting a waiver from the requirement for landscape islands every ten spaces. He is requesting a parking run of 14 spaces and a run of 12 spaces.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Planning Department

1. Unless waived by the Planning Commission, provide landscape islands every ten parking spaces.
2. The parking ratio for a multi-use commercial center has not been met. An alternative is to determine parking requirements based on each individual use, but you may be restricted from having certain businesses based on available parking.
3. Provide a retaining wall block sample for review and approval.
4. Clarify where the gas tie-in to the building will be.
5. Tie building sidewalk into NSIR sidewalk.
6. Applicant is requesting to pay into the tree bank for 91 inches.
7. Show outlines of rooftop units on each building elevation. All units shall be screened from view by building parapet walls.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (October 2, 2015)

Public Works Department

1. Public Works will continue to work with the owner's representative concerning driveway accessibility and cross access easements. Public Works recommends site plan approval.

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (October 2, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (October 2, 2015)

Utility District

1. Needs to show irrigation tap and backflow.

Submitted by David Brigance (October 2, 2015)

**15-085-001: SITE PLAN, DRAKES CREEK MARINA, PHASE 1:** MOTION by Atchley, seconded by Ames, to approve Site Plan, Drakes Creek Marina, with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

The final development plan for Drakes Creek Marina was approved by the Planning Commission last month. The site plan has been designed in compliance with that plan.

The site plan has been split into two phases. The first phase, which is before you tonight, is for everything except the restaurant and its associated parking lot. The second phase will be the restaurant. The restaurant lot will remain undeveloped, with all existing trees and vegetation, until such time as the second phase is submitted and approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Planning Department

1. Any new electrical service must be underground.
2. Provide brick or stone dumpster enclosure.
3. Proposed light poles conflict with proposed trees. Resolve.
4. Provide parking lot perimeter shrubs adjacent to the south parking lot facing phase 2.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (October 2, 2015)

Public Works Department

1. No policy issues

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (October 2, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comment, all previous issues were addressed

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (October 2, 2015)

Utility District

1. Install 6 inch meter and backflow to make fire line private.
2. Install 2 inch backflow on 2 inch meter and ¾ inch backflows on both ¾ inch meters.

Submitted by David Brigance (October 2, 2015)

**15-086-001: SITE PLAN, ROGERS GROUP STOCKPILE EXPANSION AND ASPHALT RELOCATION: MOTION** by Jenkins, seconded by Bryant-McCormick, to approve Site Plan,

Rogers Group Stockpile Expansion and Asphalt Relocation with building the entire greenway from the railroad south along the creek to 31E, pending Corps of Engineers approval, with payment-in-lieu of being required for sidewalk, curb and gutter on Big Station Camp Creek Road along the frontage of parcel 13 if denied by the Corps of Engineers, and with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps. Motion carried.

#### STAFF REPORT:

Rogers Group is moving their existing asphalt plant, scale house and stockpiles from the west side of Lower Station Camp Creek Road to the east side. The site being left will be reclaimed and turned to grass. The new site backs up to the south side of the railroad track and the west side of Big Station Camp Creek Boulevard. Rogers Group currently uses the site for stockpiling of materials and other associated operations, so this will be an expanded use of the site.

Site lines studies have been conducted of views into the site from Big Station Camp Creek Boulevard, and screening has been proposed to help screen the proposed plant and associated stockpiles from view of the road.

Infrastructure upgrades (sidewalk, curb and gutter) are required along Big Station Camp Creek Boulevard. The City's Land Use and Transportation Plan also requires a greenway from the railroad track south to 31E. Rogers Group is only required to build the greenway across the portion of their property encompassed by the proposed project, which would be from the railroad down to the Rogers Group soccer fields. In lieu of making the required improvements to Big Station, Rogers Group is proposing to build the entire greenway from the railroad south along the creek to 31E. The majority of the greenway would run through Corps of Engineers property, and their permission will be required.

#### STAFF COMMENTS:

##### Planning Department

1. In the event the Corps of Engineers denies permission for the greenway, payment-in-lieu will be required for sidewalk, curb and gutter on Big Station Camp Creek Road along the frontage of parcel 13.
2. Provide a tree survey and tree replacement plan.
3. Shift buffer trees closer to Big Station Camp Creek Boulevard to increase the effectiveness of the screen. Trees should be at or close to the top of the slope. The height of some trees may need to be increased to 8-10 feet to improve screening.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (October 2, 2015)

Public Works Department

1. No policy issues.

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (October 2, 2015)

Fire Department

1. Add a hydrant on an 8" main at the exit road to the proposed asphalt plant.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (October 2, 2015)

Utility District

1. Needs to show irrigation tap and backflow.

Submitted by David Brigance (September 10, 2015)

**SKETCH PLATS:** None

**PRELIMINARY PLATS:** None

**REZONING REQUEST:** None

**STAFF APPROVED PROJECTS:**

**15-083-001: ELITE PROPERTIES ADDITION – SITE PLAN:** The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission acknowledged staff approval of Elite Properties Addition – Site Plan.

**15-087-001: LUTHER MCDOUGAL AND TENTEX RESUB COMMERCIAL LOT 2B – FINAL PLAT:** The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission acknowledged staff approval of Luther McDougal and Tentex Resub Commercial Lot 2B – Final Plat.

**15-091-001: LDS (LATTER DAY SAINTS) STOREHOUSE – SITE PLAN:** The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission acknowledged staff approval of LDS (Latter Day Saints) Storehouse – Site Plan.

**15-093-001: RE-SUB LOT 2 OF RAINTREE ESTATES – FINAL PLAT:** The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission acknowledged staff approval of Re-Sub Lot 2 of Raintree Estates – Final Plat.

**OTHER:** None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION by Pinson, seconded by Jenkins, to adjourn the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting at 7:18 p.m. Ames, Atchley, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Lea, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Bristol and Millsaps.

---

LORI ATCHLEY, Secretary

---

BOB FREUDENTHAL, Chairman

---

FRED D. ROGERS, JR., Planning Director