

**SUMNER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
MARCH 22, 2016  
5:00 P.M.**

**SUMNER COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
355 N. BELVEDERE DRIVE  
GALLATIN, TN. 37066**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**BILLY GEMINDEN, VICE-CHAIRMAN  
MIKE HONEYCUTT  
JIM WILLIAMS  
TOM TUCKER  
STEVE GRAVES  
BILL TAYLOR**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**LUTHER BRATTON, CHAIRMAN**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

**RODNEY JOYNER, COUNTY PLANNER  
LINDA McCULLOUGH, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT  
LEAH MAY DENNEN, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
ERIKA PORTER, STAFF ATTORNEY**

**MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA BY MR. GRAVES, SECONDED BY MR. WILLIAMS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 2016 MINUTES BY MR. GRAVES, SECONDED BY MR. WILLIAMS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 1. BLEDSOE CROSSINGS – PRELIMINARY PLAT – REPRESENTED BY RICHARD JONES – (3<sup>RD</sup> COMMISSION DISTRICT) – Applicant is requesting Preliminary Plat approval of 51 or 52 lots on Highway 25. Subject property is located on Tax Map 110 Parcel 012.00. Property is zoned Agricultural and R1A.**

Mr. Joyner opened the discussion with a summary of the above mentioned plat stating that the property is zoned Agricultural and R1A and there are only rear yard setbacks. This property is north of Hilton Lane and east of Greenfield Lane. This property is considered multi-category land meaning it is mostly rural with parks and some Historic structures and is in the Historic Overlay District. This applies only to non-resident development subdivision and should have no bearings on this

particular property. This will be a standard subdivision with only rear yard setback of around 5 feet. There are no urban growth boundaries for this property. Mr. Joyner stated that the only concern that he might see would be the extra traffic on Highway 25 and the speed of the vehicles on Highway 25, which could be addressed by Richard Jones.

Mr. Geminden opened the floor for discussion.

Richard Jones was present to represent Bledsoe Crossings and Mike Holland. Mr. Jones opened by stating that there will be 51 or 52 homes in the subdivision and could lose one or two homes depending on the property. No traffic study has been done but with 50-52 homes there will be approximately 100 vehicles for the subdivision and it is unlikely that all would be leaving at the same time each morning. Most traffic studies will require a left turn lane however Gallatin has a 250 resident development and did not require a traffic study for that development and usually doesn't unless it is a bad intersection.

Mr. Taylor asked about the trees in the fence row.

Mr. Jones stated that no one will bother the fence row and evergreens will be put in place as a buffer when older trees fall down.

Mr. Taylor asked if the lots would perk?

Mr. Jones stated that all lots had not been tested, but the property has good soil so there should not be a problem.

Mr. Taylor had concerns with the heavy traffic flow as this area develops and with traffic coming from Hartsville, could we just go ahead and put in a left turning lane?

Mr. Joyner stated that the county has very little control over a state highway whether or not a turning lane can be put in place. A traffic study would have to be done by the engineer of the development. If this was a county road, we would have more control over the road. Mr. Joyner returned to Mr. Taylors question about the fence row stating that he had rather see the natural screen that exists now with the trees, but there are areas that will have to have evergreen screens put in place, whether by private restrictions or as developed.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Joyner if it is necessary to contact the Historic Committee since the property borders the Historic overlay?

Mr. Joyner stated that there is a possibility that the Historic Committee may have to be contacted. If this was a school, church or a commercial building, it would go before the Committee.

Mr. Tucker stated that he had no problem for now, but that TDOT needs to look into this to see if a traffic study needs to be done in the future.

Mr. Taylor asked if TDOT dictates the turning lane to be put in?

Mr. Joyner stated that the engineer works with TDOT to get approval.

Mr. Jones stated that TDOT is limited on funds and that is not going to change. Mr. Jones talked to TDOT about this project, and they would not confirm a traffic study. They simply would not commit to a traffic study.

Mr. Taylor asked if TDOT would have to sign off on this project.

Mr. Jones stated that TDOT would sign off on the entrance only and received an entrance permit from them.

Mr. Graves is concerned that the morning traffic on Highway 25 would be a problem. Could there possibly be a second entrance?

Mr. Joyner stated that he would like to see a second entrance since this could become congested. Also stated that he thinks there needs to be a stub out, and if one of the 52 lots was lost, this could be the second entrance. If a second entrance is needed off of Highway 25, then it could be requested.

Mr. Taylor stated that a second entrance would be wise since this is a high traffic area.

Mr. Jones stated that a general rule is that if you do not have to wait over two minutes, then a traffic study is not necessary.

Mr. Joyner asked Mr. Jones if the connection to the north went away and connected at a different place, would the developer consider doing that?

Mr. Jones said that he would ask the developer but wasn't sure if it's needed at this time, yet he does see that there is only one entrance, and could use one of the lots for the second entrance.

Mr. Honeycutt stated that a lot of subdivisions have come before the Planning Commission and there have been two entrances requested in the past. There is also a concern for emergency vehicles coming in and out, that with one entrance, it may cause a delay in getting proper emergency treatment.

Mr. Jones replied by stating that the entrance off of Highway 25 could be widened into three lanes so emergency vehicles would have adequate room.

Mr. Honeycutt asked Mr. Jones if this subdivision would be in more than one phase.

Mr. Jones answered that there would only be one phase.

Mr. Honeycutt would like to see two entrances at the start of the development and one of the entrances could be used as a construction entrance.

Mr. Jones proposed that the developer would work with the Planning Commission to do a traffic study to see if a second entrance is needed.

Mr. Tucker stated that a traffic study is needed.

Mr. Taylor stated that by doing a traffic study that it would set a precedent for other developments that would be developed in the near future.

Mr. Graves stated that there was a lot of traffic off of Hilton Lane, as it is a cut through between Harsh Lane and Highway 25.

Mr. Joyner stated that a traffic study would never be turned down and he believes that the entrance off of Highway 25 needs to be larger.

Mr. Kirby ask if Lot 30 could be used as the second entrance because it faces Highway 25.

Mr. Jones stated that going east, the land drops off and would need to be filled in and slopes out and it takes up a lot of land, but it could work because there is clear access both ways for a safe exit.

Mr. Joyner commented that this project is dealing with undeveloped property and the Historic sites, so he would like to see a traffic study done and the main entrance wider for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Jones said that by making the entrance off of Highway 30 feet would give room for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Taylor asked if TDOT would make a turning lane?

Mr. Jones replied that TDOT would not confirm a turning lane because they did not want to take on the liability.

Mr. Joyner stated that developers will run into this problem every time when dealing with TDOT.

Mr. Jones asked if there had been any complaints or stack up at Greenfield Lane or surrounding roads entering or exiting onto Highway 25?

Mr. Graves stated that he does not come through that area in the mornings but is sure that there is some kind of stack up.

Mr. Joyner stated that roads connecting to the south side of Highway 25 turning left going into Gallatin, which would be a harder turn for vehicles, and the north side of Highway 25 would be turning right.

Mr. Taylor asked if TDOT could be forced to make a turning lane?

Mr. Jones stated that TDOT would let you do it but TDOT wouldn't pay for it.

Mr. Honeycutt stated that in his opinion that a traffic study before trying to force TDOT to put in a turning lane.

Mr. Graves asked if that was a motion and Mr. Honeycutt said yes.

Ms. Dennen asked if there would be a follow up according to the recommendations of the traffic study and not just doing the traffic study?

Mr. Jones answered yes to Ms. Dennen's question.

Mr. Geminden read the motion to pass the preliminary plans subject to the traffic study

Mr. Taylor asked if the plans would come back to this committee?

Mr. Joyner stated that it is his understanding that the motion is to approve the Preliminary plans subject to the recommendations and approval of the traffic study.

Mr. Jones asked if he would need to come back to this committee.

Mr. Joyner answered that once the traffic study is done and the recommendations are done that you will submit the traffic study and we will know before the final plat is submitted as to what the traffic study recommends.

Mr. Jones asked if then he would submit the engineering plans.

Mr. Joyner answered yes.

Mr. Jones went on to state that the comments would be contained in the engineering plans.

Mr. Honeycutt made a motion to approve preliminary plans subject to a traffic study. Mr. Graves seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

No further discussion.

2. **MATTHEW CARMAN – PRELIMINARY PLAT – REPRESENTED BY JIM CARMAN – (1<sup>ST</sup> COMMISSION DISTRICT)** – Applicant is requesting Preliminary Plat approval of 6 lots on West Mount Vernon Road. Subject property is located on Tax Map 42 Parcel 052.01. Property is 5.61 acres and is zoned Agricultural.

Mr. Joyner opened the discussion with a summary of the above mentioned plat stating that the property is located west of Mount Vernon Road, east of Cal Durham Road, south of Highway 52 closer to Westmoreland and is zoned Agricultural. There is no urban growth boundaries. The Comprehensive Plan, which will be used a lot going forward needs to play a bigger role in how decisions are made and should be used as a tool not only in Subdivision Regulations but in Zoning Resolutions and Comprehensive Plans. The Comprehensive Plan discusses this as a rural area with low density residential areas all the way to the city limits of Westmoreland. Planning comments have been addressed with a question from the engineering consultants about the drainage and other engineering aspects. These concerns have been discussed with the applicant and will be submitted on the final plat. Jim Carman will be representing the applicant. Staff had no further comments.

Mr. Geminden opened the floor for discussion.

There was no discussion.

Mr. Honeycutt made a motion to approve preliminary plans. Mr. Graves seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

No further discussion.

**3. McARTHUR ESTATES (FKA HELSON & HURST) – FINAL PLAT –  
REPRESENTED BY JIM CARMAN – (3<sup>RD</sup> COMMISSION DISTRICT) –**

Applicant is requesting Final Plat approval of 21 lots on Branham Mill/Brights/Hwy 31E. Subject property is located on Tax Map 106 Parcel 018.00 P/O. Property is 26.3 acres and is zoned Agricultural.

Mr. Joyner opened the discussion with a summary of the above mentioned plat stating that the property was previously known as Helson & Hurst. The property was rezoned by the County Commission on March 21, 2016, from Commercial to Agricultural which is now being called McArthur Estates. Since applicant was requesting final approval of this plat, Mr. Joyner reviewed the plat information from the previous meeting. This property is located on Branham Mill/Brights/Hwy 31E, northeast of Gallatin. The Comprehensive Plan discusses this as a rural area with low density residential with some Estate lots along Branham Mill. There are no urban growth boundaries. First came to Planning Commission in February and again was approved by County Commission on March 21, 2016, to be rezoned to Agricultural. All Planning comments have been addressed. The only engineering concern that has not been addressed in talking with consultant is Brights Lane which is narrow and concern was the width of the road for safety reasons. Mr. Joyner stated that there are lots scattered throughout Sumner County, more than five or six lots, on roads that are more dangerous than Brights Lane. That was the only concern but the plat meets or exceeds every standard for our Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Joyner finished his summary. Jim Carman will be representing the applicant.

Mr. Carman addressed the committee stating that Mr. Helson and Mr. Hurst have met with Judy Hardin, Sumner County Highway Superintendent, and the Highway Department is in the process of widening Brights Lane.

Mr. Graves asked Mr. Carman if he knew how wide Brights Lane was going to be?

Mr. Carman stated that he did not know how wide the Highway Department intends on widening Brights Lane.

Mr. Joyner addressed the committee telling them that the Planning Department now has a system in place where the Highway Department receives a copy of all plats turned in.

Mr. Graves asked what was in between the plat? Stating that it almost looks like two subdivisions.

Mr. Carman replied that it was a drainage pattern. There is one high spot and another high spot and a branch in between. The land is not conducive to anything lower than 5 acre tracts, maybe 10 acre tracts.

Mr. Geminden ask if there was any other discussion.

Mr. Honeycutt made a motion to approve final plans. Mr. Graves seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

No further discussion.

Mr. Honeycutt made a motion to adjourn meeting. Mr. Graves seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 P. M.