

**MINUTES**  
**HENDERSONVILLE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 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, Mark Bristol, Kee Bryant-McCormick, Bob Freudenthal, David Jenkins, Frank Pinson and Darlene Stringfellow (came in at 6:50 p.m.). Absent: Lori Atchley, Charles Lea and Bryant Millsaps. Also present: Fred D. Rogers, Jr., Planning Director; Timothy D. Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner; Will Hager, Senior Planner; Marshall Boyd, City Engineer; Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector; and Georgie Mathis, Administrative Secretary.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Chairman Freudenthal announced, for the benefit of the audience, the Public Hearing regarding Millstone Planned Development, Phase 12, has been withdrawn and will probably reappear on the January, 2016 agenda. No one is signed up on the actual form to speak at this Public Hearing. The Public Hearing nor the item will occur tonight on the agenda.

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

**Public Hearing Request** to add self storage as a use to Millstone PD, Phase 12, was deferred until January 5, 2016

**Public Hearing Request** to add indoor self storage as a use to Hazel Path Commons

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE:** None

**ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** None

## **MINUTES:**

MOTION BY Jenkins, seconded by Pinson, to approve the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting Public Hearing Minutes of November 3: Request by Randy Smith, Shute Lane. Ames, Bristol, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Abstain: Bryant-McCormick and Freudenthal. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

MOTION by Ames, seconded by Jenkins, to approve the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of November 3, 2015. Ames, Bristol, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Abstain: Bryant-McCormick and Freudenthal. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:**

**06-037-003: IMPERIAL POINTE – SITE PLAN RENEWAL:** MOTION by Pinson, seconded by Jenkins, to approve the Imperial Pointe – Site Plan Renewal for one year. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

**15-098-001: WATERFORD CROSSING, PHASE 2, SECTION 3, PRELIMINARY PLAT:** MOTION by Pinson, seconded by Jenkins, to approve Waterford Crossing, Phase 2, Section 3, Preliminary Plat with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

### **STAFF REPORT**

The attached preliminary plat would modify Waterford Crossing Phase 2, Section 2 in order to add two additional lots to the approved townhome phase. The alley, sidewalk, curb and gutter and street would be extended to the south. Construction plans for this phase will need to be modified accordingly prior to approval of a final plat.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

#### Planning Department

1. Remove or modify note 12 to allow for encroachments into the build-to lines as allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.

2. Modify construction plans for Waterford Crossing Phase 2, Section 2 to reflect the extension of the ingress/egress alley easement, sidewalk, curb and gutter, and two additional lots.

Submitted by Will Hager, AICP, Senior Planner (November 25, 2015)

Public Works Department

1. No Policy Issues

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 24, 2015)

Utility District

1. Make sure water and sewer taps are installed for the two new lots.

Submitted by David Brigance (November 12, 2015)

**FINAL PLATS:** None

**PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS:**

**15-084-001: SHUTE LANE OFFICE DEVELOPMENT, PDP REVISION:**

Timothy Whitten: We have before us the third plan which contains all the changes that were offered by the developer at our last meeting which included all buildings have been reduced from 4 stories to 2 stories. Building square footage – overall building square footage has been reduced from 341,250 square feet to 250,000 square feet. The parking garage has been removed altogether. A 6 foot tall wood privacy fence has been added to the buffer screening adjacent to Riverchase. The developer has agreed to make all the improvements suggested by their traffic study.

Marshall Boyd: I have contacted TDOT and there was a drainage study conducted by TDOT in 2010 for that area of the Bypass. They've added a pond I believe south of the Bypass to help alleviate some of those drainage problems in Waterford. I have sent that information to the engineer to incorporate into his plan so he could have information and that's to help alleviate any future problems, he will have all the information he needs to do that.

Brett Creasman, Kimley Horn: I have spoken with Mr. Boyd about drainage. I am aware that it's a concern of residents. Where we are at this point, the design process, we have not gotten into any detailed design with any sort of drainage. However, we are aware of the issues and the concerns. Mr. Boyd forwarded some very useful information this afternoon that we will be able to incorporate into whatever kind of improvements we have for this site. We are aware that there's maybe been some flow going into back yards and kind of heard stories and we will be able to incorporate all of that into our design in order to hopefully alleviate some of those existing problems.

Fred Rogers: The Neighborhood Association has been very concerned about the extra traffic that would be generated by this development. They've reviewed the traffic study that was performed by Kimley Horn and Associates and they have hired their own traffic engineer to do what we call a third party review and I received a memo on the findings of the traffic engineer who is Dyan Damron and I emailed that to the Planning Commission last night. I also forwarded it to Mr. Creasman and you also have a printed copy of this review before you (copy attached). Starting on the second page, you will note that that is where Ms. Damron provides some suggestions – a total of 8 bullet points or suggestions. In summary, as you can see here that she has concurred with the Kimley Horn traffic study, however, she did provide these 8 suggestions.

The first bullet point is a suggestion that the shoulder be widened by 2 feet on each side. As you may recall, the developer has already agreed to that. Now I need to point out that, that probably needs to remain fluid through the development process. Typically we require curb and gutter in lieu of the shoulder so that's something we probably ought to discuss but just understand that it would either be shoulder or curb and gutter. And again, they've agreed to that.

They also agreed to the suggestion that the 10 foot lanes be widened to 12 feet for a total of 24 feet. Now that 2 feet of widening on their side along all of their frontage would be required anyway. Typically you would not require widening on the other side of the road unless the traffic study dictated that. And, of course, their traffic study did not dictate that. So that would be over and above what's normally required and again they've agreed to do that. The suggestion from Ms. Damron was that those improvements extend not only along this property's frontage on Shute Lane but also extend northward to Highway 31, but they do not feel like there's enough room to squeeze the extra 2 lanes under the bridge and to Highway 31. Now this extra widening on the east side is subject to there being sufficient right-of-way. Now keep in mind, to provide the turn lanes that have been previously specified may require that they acquire additional right-of-way. If they do then that would be their dime to acquire that right-of-way or to otherwise shift the road over to their side and squeeze it in within the existing right-of-way and any additional right-of-way they might dedicate on their side of the road. With Phase 1, they would be providing this southbound right turn lane into the new street. As they provide that right turn

lane, they would also be providing the 2 feet of extra pavement all the way down their frontage and then all the way up to the bridge. And then the widening of the east side would be done in Phase 2 which is the time when the northbound left turn lane would be constructed.

Bullet point 2 – they do agree to extend sidewalk to Devonshire. One of the suggestions mentions bike facilities. Our bike plan does not call for any bike facilities along this street so that leaves us with sidewalk. Normally they are required to do sidewalk anyway all along their side of the street for their entire frontage and likewise our regulations give us the authority to require a connector down to an existing sidewalk and this case it would require the connector from this point on down to Devonshire where there is a sidewalk along the south side of Devonshire. So they've agreed to do that. Now when we get into the details of all of this we'll take a look at where this sidewalk can go. It may be that there's no place for that sidewalk to go when it gets to the bridge. It may be too narrow to get a sidewalk under there. If that's the case, we'll probably want a "payment in-lieu-of" for the sidewalk from the entrance street up to the north property line.

Number 3 – they disagree with this suggestion to increase the storage lane from 100 feet to 150 feet. The second point of bullet number 3 is that they agree that there would be no driveway within 250 feet of Shute Lane. In other words, there would be no driveway along the first 250 feet of the access road.

Number 4 – both traffic engineers agree that's appropriate.

Number 5 – again, they disagree with the longer storage lane for the northbound left turn lane. The second part of Number 5 – they disagree with constructing the turn lane with Phase 1. Their traffic study says it would not be needed until Phase 2.

Number 6 – they agree with that suggestion.

Number 7 – they agree with that suggestion.

Number 8 – they disagree with this which suggests that if possible that there be a right-turn lane constructed on Shute Lane on Main Street. Kimley Horn believes that it is not feasible based on the conditions on the ground.

Bob Freudenthal: Mr. Boyd, do you have anything to add.

Marshall Boyd: No, I don't. I agree with what Fred said.

Brett Creasman: Our traffic study and the improvements that we've committed ourselves to making are all based on the previously presented plan of 341,000 square feet. So, not only were our original estimates conservative, they became more conservative when we reduced the total square footage for our plan.

Bob Freudenthal: With respect to whether it should be curb and gutter or shoulder, I am personally of the opinion that's probably going to have to stay shoulder because of the transition from a state highway.

Marshall Boyd: Yes, I think our preference would be to have the shoulder versus the curb and gutter.

Don Ames: I want to make sure I understand the fence we are talking about is going to go the entire length of that line – the southern line of the property or just in a certain area.

Brett Creasman: With Phase 1 construction, we will go ahead and construct that fence from the right-of-way of Shute's Lane to the drainage channel that runs through the middle of the property. As Phase 2 construction begins, we will pick up where we left off. We will take that fence to the western most property line.

Don Ames: Is there an option at all to the wooden fence? I am concerned about maintenance of that fence and your responsibility or the owners responsibility for the upkeep of that fence as wooden fence tends to deteriorate pretty rapidly as a rule.

Brett Creasman: We can work through the details with staff. It's our request to have a wood fence that we would be responsible for maintaining.

Bob Freudenthal: I would suggest you work with staff and try to come up with something before you get to Board of Mayor and Aldermen. (Brett Creasman: Yes sir).

MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Bryant-McCormick, to recommend approval to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen Shute Lane Office Development, PDP Revision, with all staff comments including those comments related to the traffic impact review. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## STAFF REPORT

This item was deferred from the last Planning Commission meeting, which was a deferral from the previous meeting. The last deferral was made to give the applicant opportunity to address several questions that were raised by the Commission and citizens.

To briefly summarize what has happened thus far, the first submittal was for four buildings and a parking structure, each four stories tall. Total proposed building square footage was 319,000. A traffic study was also submitted. It called for improvements to be made to Shute Lane in conjunction with each phase. Phase 1 improvements were to consist of a southbound right-turn lane constructed along Shute Lane for traffic coming from East Main Street. Phase 2 improvements would require the addition of a northbound left-turn lane on Shute Lane at the entrance to the development, as well as a traffic signal on Shute Lane at the entrance to the development. The first submittal was deferred at the request of the applicant.

The second submittal consisted of the same layout with the same 4-story buildings, except that the building closest to Shute Lane was reduced to 2 stories. Total building square footage remained the same. The traffic report and the recommended road improvements remained unchanged. During that meeting, the applicant declared his intent to reduce all buildings to 2 stories, and to reduce the total building square footage to 250,000. He also stated that the commitment to make the recommended traffic improvements would remain unchanged. The second submittal was deferred by the Planning Commission to give the applicant an opportunity to revise the plan to reflect the discussed changes and to address other questions that had been raised.

Before you tonight is the revised plan. As discussed, it shows all buildings to be 2 stories. Total building square footage has been reduced to 250,000 sf. The layout remains unchanged. Building locations, orientations and footprints are the same as before.

	<b>Current Plan</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Plan</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Plan</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Plan</b>
<b># of buildings</b>	11	4 (5 with parking structure)	4	4
<b>Building height</b>	1 & 2 story/35 feet	4 story/75 feet	3 & 4 story/75 feet	2 story/35 feet
<b>Sq.ft. of retail</b>	54,550	22,250	22,250	22,250
<b>Sq.ft. of office</b>	82,500	319,000	319,000	227,750
<b>Total Bldg. Sq.Ft</b>	137,050	341,250	341,250	250,000

At the last meeting there were three principle questions raised: Will the road be public or private? Where will the construction entrance be located? Could the proposed internal road be moved further away from River Chase? Mr. Creaseman has addressed these questions in the attached letter.

Other questions raised at the last meeting are as follows:

1. What is the increase in parking from the 2007 plan to the latest proposed plan? The 2007 plan shows 760 parking spaces. The latest plan shows 922 spaces.
2. Could a privacy wall be added that would absorb noise and provide privacy? The applicant has proposed a 6 foot tall fence on top of the proposed berm. The fence would provide security for the proposed development as well as River Chase, while providing additional barrier to light trespass from car headlights within the parking lots. The fence would not provide any additional noise buffering.

The viewshed analysis has been updated to reflect 2-story buildings, and to show the addition of the privacy fence on top of the berm. One of staff's comments is to increase the height of the evergreen trees to about 14 feet at planting. This has been agreed to, but the increased height is not reflected in the views provided. The greater height would decrease the extent of the building visible to adjacent homes.

The River Chase neighborhood has hired a traffic engineer to conduct a third-party review of the traffic study. The engineer is expected present her findings to the Planning Commission at the meeting.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

##### Planning Department

1. Show required building setbacks along proposed internal public street.
2. Increase evergreen trees to 14' ht. at planting.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (November 25, 2015)

##### Public Works

1. The timing and limits of improvements required on Shute Lane outside of those required in the Traffic Study will be coordinated with Public Works staff.

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

##### Fire Department

1. No Comments at this time.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 25, 2015)

##### Utility District

1. WHUD water and sewer.

Submitted by David Brigance, (October 28, 2015)

**15-101-001: MILLSTONE PD, PHASE 12 – FDP AND TO ADD A USE (SELF-STORAGE):** DEFERRED by applicant until January 5, 2016.

**15-100-001: HAZEL PATH SHOPPING CENTER – FDP REVISION:** MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Bryant-McCormick, to recommend approval to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen Hazel Path Shopping Center – FDP Revision, with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## STAFF REPORT

Hazel Path Shopping Center is located at Bonita Parkway and East Main Street. It is zoned GC-PD. Sears Outlet, which is located in the center, is not expected to renew their lease. The owner is requesting to add interior (i.e. no external overhead doors) Self-Storage Facility to the list of allowed uses, along with these other additional uses: Firing Range, Indoor; Social Club or Lodge; Call Center; Brewery Tap Room and Retail Sales; Banquet Hall; Equipment Repair; Funeral Home; Medical Rehabilitation Facility, Residential; Research and Development Facility; Taxidermy; Utility, Private; Reupholstery/Custom Home Textiles. All of these uses are allowable in the current GC zone, however, staff recommends removal of some of these uses. See staff comment #1 below.

The owner is also proposing to add two outlots or outbuildings in front of the self-storage facility, adjacent to Bonita Parkway. A reduced parking demand for the self-storage portion of the shopping center would free up space for these additional buildings. The third outbuilding nearest Main Street is shown on the current master plan, so it does not represent a change from the currently approved plan. The 25,000 square foot future building shown at the south end of the shopping center is shown on the current master plan, so it also is not a change. A future building in between and in-line with Sears Outlet and the remainder of the shopping center is also per the current approved master plan. Until this building develops, the existing false wall would be removed and a lawn area with potential outdoor dining or seating area would be installed.

The owner is committing to upgrade the Sears Outlet portion of the shopping center if and when a storage facility locates there. Other allowed uses locating in that space would not trigger building upgrades. The upgrades can be seen on sheet A1.1. They include a new entry using brick, stone and EIFS, a stone watertable along the Bonita and Main Street sides of the building, new areas of brick inset or applied to the existing CMU walls, and removal of the chainlink fencing, metal canopy and overhead doors facing Main Street.

The owner is also committing to upgrade the landscaping in the entire parking lot if and when a storage facility locates in the center. This would include new trees in all the landscape islands, new street trees along Bonita and Main, new shrubs along the perimeter of the parking lot, and new foundation planting beds along the front and Main Street sides of the building.

## STAFF COMMENTS

### Planning Department

1. Remove the following from the list of allowed uses:
  - Firing Range, Indoor
  - Brewery Tap room and Retail Sales
  - Equipment Repair
  - Funeral Home
  - Medical Rehabilitation Facility, Residential
  - Utility, Private

- Taxidermy
2. Add “indoor only” after “Live Entertainment” in the use table.
  3. Add “not to exceed 10,000sf” after “Printing Shop” in the use table.
  4. Add “not to exceed 5,000sf” after “Reupholstery/Custom Home Textiles” in the use table.
  5. Removal of existing trees along Main Street is subject to further study and discussion with Planning Staff.
  6. With the amount of new plant material being proposed, an automatic irrigation system is recommended, especially for new shrub beds.

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (November 25, 2015)

Public Works

1. No Policy Issues

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase. Water supply to be addressed during the site plan approval process.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 24, 2015)

Utility District

1. Ok for planning. Need to submit detailed drawings and review fee to HUD for approval for any water or sewer extensions.

Submitted by David Brigance, (November 12, 2015)

**SITE PLANS:**

**15-099-001: PRIMROSE SCHOOL OF HENDERSONVILLE ADDITION SITE PLAN:** MOTION by Ames, seconded by Stringfellow, to approve Primrose School of Hendersonville Addition Site Plan, with requested waiver of nine (9) parking spaces and with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

## STAFF REPORT

Primrose School is a daycare/pre-K school located on Springhouse Court behind City Hall. It is zoned GC-PD.

Primrose is proposing to add a 1,784 square foot addition on to their existing 8,473 square foot building, for a total of 10,257 square feet. The architecture and materials of the addition will be in keeping with the existing building.

When Primrose was first approved, they requested and obtained a parking waiver which allowed them to have fewer than the required number of parking spaces. As a condition of the waiver, they supplied an alternate parking plan showing where they could build the additional spaces should the City determine they were needed. With this new addition, they will be licensed for a larger number of students and employees. Required parking is based on the number of students and employees rather than gross building square footage. The number of students will go up by 22, and the number of employees will go up by 5. The ordinance requires 43 parking spaces. There are 34 spaces existing, with no new parking spaces being proposed. Primrose is requesting a waiver of 9 spaces. They have provided the same alternative parking plan that was provided with the first approval, showing 10 spaces around the cul-de-sac of Springhouse Court. See the attached letter from Primrose explaining the waiver request.

## STAFF COMMENTS

### Planning Department

1. No Staff Comments

Submitted by Timothy Whitten, Landscape Architect/Planner (November 25, 2015)

### Public Works Department

1. No Policy Issues

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

### Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 24, 2015)

Utility District

1. Will owe capacity fees for any facility units added.

Submitted by David Brigance (November 12, 2015)

**SKETCH PLATS:** None

**PRELIMINARY PLATS:**

**15-095-001: LAKE HARBOR, SECTION 3, PRELIMINARY PLAT:** MOTION by Jenkins, seconded by Bristol, to approve Lake Harbor, Section 3, Preliminary Plat, with all staff comments as listed below. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT

The attached preliminary plat is for Section 3 of the Lake Harbor subdivision. Lake Harbor was originally developed as a “cluster” or alternative open space subdivision as allowed by the 1985 zoning ordinance. Two sections of the development have been completed, as well as open space amenities and a community dock. Halo Builders is now in control of the development and has submitted preliminary plats for sections 3 and 4. Section 3 is located along the east side of Lake Harbor Drive as you enter the subdivision. This section would create 7 lots. The preliminary plat for Section 3 conforms to the approved site development plan.

STAFF COMMENTS

Planning Department

1. No Comments.

Submitted by Will Hager, AICP, Senior Planner (November 25, 2015)

Public Works Department

1. Public Works staff will work with developer to determine the location for off-site improvements instead of installing sidewalk as shown on the plat.
2. Street lights must be light emitting diode (L.E.D.)

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 24, 2015)

Utility District

1. Ok for planning. Need to submit detailed drawings and review fee to HUD for approval for any water or sewer extensions.

Submitted by David Brigance (November 12, 2015)

**15-097-001: LAKE HARBOR, SECTION 4, PRELIMINARY PLAT:** MOTION by Bristol, seconded by Pinson, to approve Lake Harbor, Section 4, Preliminary Plat including coordination with Public Works to define an alternative location for off-site improvements and with all staff comments as listed below.

**STAFF REPORT**

The attached preliminary plat is for Section 4 of Lake Harbor. Section 4 would create 9 single-family residential lots and extend Circle Drive to an intersection with Lake Harbor Drive. The lots are in substantial compliance to the approved site development plan with a few exceptions. The first exception relates to lots 6, 7 and 41 as shown. The site development plan called for lots 6 and 7 to be smaller and the land shown as lot 41 was not included as part of Lake Harbor. However, the preliminary plat calls for these lots to be larger than originally proposed. In fact, these lots meet the SR-1 minimum lot size of 12,500 s.f. instead of the smaller lots the site development plan might allow. In addition, a 20' buffer easement is being proposed around the perimeter of this section of Lake Harbor. Vegetation within this buffer is to be left undisturbed and buildings would not be permitted within it. The second exception to the approved site development plan is elimination of a narrow open space access strip that was previously shown east of lot 10. This access was not proposed to be improved with any kind of trail or walkway and would have offered little benefit in terms of accessing the tennis and basketball court amenities. The open space will be easily accessed as proposed.

No sidewalks are currently built within the Lake Harbor development. This preliminary plat shows a sidewalk along the south side of Circle Drive. This sidewalk would not connect to an existing sidewalk network of any kind. Staff suggests that the developer work with the Public Works Department to determine off-site improvements that may be of greater benefit to the area. Walton Ferry Elementary is nearby and could benefit from additional pedestrian improvements for students.

## STAFF COMMENTS

### Planning Department

1. Change “Buffer Yard” to “Buffer Easement” in order to clarify that no structure shall be permitted in this area.
2. Coordinate with public works to identify an alternative pedestrian facility that allows you to meet the intent of the development plan while constructing a more beneficial improvement.

Submitted by Will Hager, AICP, Senior Planner (November 25, 2015)

### Public Works Department

1. Public Works staff will work with developer to determine the location for off-site improvements instead of installing sidewalk as shown on the plat.
2. Street lights must be light emitting diode (L.E.D.)

Submitted by Marshall Boyd, City Engineer (November 25, 2015)

### Fire Department

1. No comments at this phase; all previous comments were addressed.

Submitted by Shelley Burwell, Fire Inspector (November 24, 2015)

### Utility District

1. Ok for planning. Need to submit detailed drawings and review fee to HUD for approval for any water or sewer extensions.

Submitted by David Brigance (November 12, 2015)

**REZONING REQUEST:** None

**STAFF APPROVED PROJECTS:**

**15-096-001: RESUB LOT 3 OF F.G. DEVELOPMENT CO. – FINAL PLAT:** The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission acknowledged staff approval of Resub Lot 3 of F.G. Development Co. – Final Plat.

**OTHER:**

Fred Rogers reported on the Sumner County Planning Commission Training on Monday, November 30, 2015 in White House. It was a good session and good training and hopefully will receive the Powerpoint presentations for those who were not able to make it and will forward to those not in attendance.

The Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Annual Meeting will be held on December 15, 2015, at Sopapilla's at 6:30 p.m. The staff will send out details on this soon.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION by Pinson, seconded by Ames, to adjourn the Hendersonville Regional Planning Commission Meeting at 7:42 p.m. Ames, Bristol, Bryant-McCormick, Freudenthal, Jenkins, Pinson and Stringfellow voted aye. Nay: None. Absent: Atchley, Lea and Millsaps. Motion carried.

---

DON AMES, Assistant Secretary

---

BOB FREUDENTHAL, Chairman

---

FRED D. ROGERS, JR., Planning Director

# memo

## Traffic Engineering Services

To: Riverchase Homeowners' Association  
From: Dyan Damron, Traffic Engineer/Transportation Planner  
Date: 11/29/2015  
Re: Review of Shute Lane Traffic Impact Analysis

---

Comments: I have reviewed the August 2015 Kimley-Horn Traffic Impact Analysis. In general, I agree with the methodology, approach, and conclusions contained within this report. In other traffic reports I have reviewed, there are a few specific elements that could be up for debate. However, in this Kimley-Horn report, I am in complete agreement. These elements are as follows:

- The traffic counts were conducted on a typical weekday in August. School had just started, so traffic counts were likely conservative, as it is typical for school traffic to lessen slightly as the school year progresses.
- The trip generation numbers, which represent the amount of traffic expected to drive to and from the site, are very close to what I calculated for the proposed land uses. The internal rate (the number of cars that will go from the office to the retail within the site without actually ever leaving the property) and the pass-by rate (the number of cars that are already on the road which will simply stop by the site and continue on their way) are all very reasonable.
- The trip distribution (where new cars will be coming from and going to along the roadway network) is a reasonable assumption based on the land uses and nearby highways.
- The capacity analyses (determines how well a signal functions based on delays, queues, laneage, and operation of signal/sign) were conducted using Synchro. This a widely accepted method of analyses and one I would use myself if conducting a traffic study. Within the capacity analyses, there are settings and controls that can be adjusted. For example, the Peak Hour Factor (an adjustment that can be made when the traffic is either steady throughout the entire hour or when the majority of the traffic is focused during a 15 or 30 minute period within the hour) was adjusted to represent what is actually happening. Since an elementary school is nearby, it can be assumed that there will be a higher concentration of traffic within a 15 or 30 minute period as everyone arrives to drop off students just before the school start time.
- The property has very limited access options due to the land and highway constraints. The only logical access is on Shute Lane along the site's frontage, as shown on the site plan. The Kimley-Horn report

does state that a service/emergency access will be provided between the site and the existing STR site on Main Street west of Vietnam Veterans Parkway. I agree that I would not recommend full access between these properties. The existing STR property and access is not equipped to handle much additional traffic. Furthermore, the STR access on Main Street is only approximately 200 feet from the Vietnam Veterans Parkway ramp. Increasing traffic volumes so close to the interchange is not advisable.

While I do agree with the methodology and findings in the Kimley-Horn report, I do have a few additional items to note as well as a few suggestions that may be worthwhile discussing with the City of Hendersonville and/or the developer of the project. These items are as follows:

1. Agree to shoulder. • Shute Lane is a very narrow road. The width is about 20 feet (10 feet for each travel lane) and no shoulder. I could not find the Major Street Plan online, but I would assume Shute Lane would be classified as a collector route. Based on the design standards within the Subdivision Regulations, Shute Lane should have 12-foot travel lanes and a minimum of a 2-foot shoulder or curb-and-gutter. I recommend that the developer improve Shute Lane to these standards from the southern edge of the property to Highway 31. 2.4'
- Agree to 2 ft of prvnt. on west side with Ph 1. East side with Ph 2. To bridge only - not to 31. Subject to sufficient R.O.W.
2. Agree to extend sidewalk to Devonshire. • While there are no pedestrian or bicycle facilities within the area, as tis property is developed and as growth across Shute Lane develops, there may be opportunity for people to access the site from the surrounding area without adding a vehicle to the roadway network. I recommend that the developer consider adding sidewalks and/or multi-use paths between the existing STR property, the Riverchase neighborhood, and future development across Shute Lane.
3. Disagree with longer storage lane. • The Kimley-Horn report recommends two exiting lanes for the access to the proposed development, with a right turn lane storage of 100 feet. I recommend extending the right turn lane to 150 feet. Furthermore, I recommend that the throat length of the access be clear of any outlet to the parking area along the north side for at least 250 feet. This will help provide free flow at the intersection with Shute Lane. Otherwise, as vehicles attempt to access parking so close to Shute Lane, it may cause backup onto Shute Lane, and potentially affecting the signalized intersection with Highway 31.
- Agrees with no driveway within 250 ft. of Shute Ln.
4. Agree • The Kimley-Horn report recommends a southbound right turn lane on Shute Lane at the proposed access with a storage of 150 feet. I agree with this recommendation and the timing of construction with Phase I.
5. Disagree with longer storage • The Kimley-Horn report recommends a northbound left turn lane on Shute Lane at the proposed access with a storage of 150 feet. I recommend that this left turn lane be extended to 250 feet to allow adequate space for queued vehicles. If this left turn lane is not

Disagrees with constructing turn lane with phase I.

6. Agree

7. Agree

8. Disagree ; Not Feasible.

adequate, it will affect traffic on Shute Lane traveling north to Highway 31. Furthermore, I recommend that this left turn lane be constructed with Phase I rather than waiting until Phase II. Construction will already be underway to install the southbound right turn lane, so it should actually be less construction costs/disturbance in the long-run.

- The Kimley-Horn report recommends the installation of a traffic signal with Phase II. I do not recommend the installation of a traffic signal unless it is actually warranted based on traffic volumes. Citizens often have the impression that a traffic signal will only improve traffic operations and reduce delay. However, this is not always the case, especially when traffic volumes are not high enough to warrant a signal. A traffic signal could actually increase delay for through traffic and could potentially increase crashes. I recommend that periodic traffic counts and a signal warrant study be conducted upon completion of Phase II. Should the counts warrant a traffic signal, only then should one be installed.
- If a traffic signal is warranted and installed at Shute Lane and the proposed access, the Kimley-Horn report recommends that it be coordinated with the signal at Highway 31. While this is something I recommend, it should be noted that coordination in an effort to improve flow is meant for a network of signals along a roadway. Since Shute Lane ends at Highway 31, coordination among these two signals is unlikely to do much to improve capacity, delays, or flow of traffic.
- The capacity analyses worksheets provided in the Kimley-Horn report do not include the queue analysis for the signal of Shute Lane and Highway 31. I recommend that these be requested and reviewed. There may be an opportunity to adjust signal timing at this intersection as traffic volumes increase in an effort to minimize queues. Also, based on my review, widening Shute Lane at Highway 31 may be restricted due to elevation issues. However, if the shoulders are wide enough, there may be a way to add a short northbound right turn lane so that there are two full lanes dedicated for northbound left turns. This is just a potential idea for future traffic volumes.

As previously discussed, I do generally agree with the methodology and findings in the Kimley-Horn report. The ideas, suggestions, and recommendations included in this memo are meant for discussion purposes among the Riverchase HOA and City of Hendersonville staff. I am happy to answer any questions, but please keep in mind that I am a third-party objective reviewer providing insight and comments.