Mr. Rainey opened the meeting.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY AGENDA

After confirming that there were no changes to the Agenda, Mr. Rainey called for a motion on the approval of the December Minutes.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER MINUTES
Ms. Webster made a motion to approve the December, 2019 Minutes, seconded by Mr. Stamper. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rainey turned the floor over to Mr. Suddath for staff presentation.

1. **Courtney Ward and Kevin Bruns** were requesting a variance from County requirements contained at Article VI, Section 1.6, of the Sumner County Zoning Resolution, related to placement of an accessory structure within a required rear yard setback. Subject property is located at **103 Phosphate Lane, Gallatin, TN, 37066**, is on Tax Map 92, Parcel 072.00, contains .92 acres, is zoned Agricultural (A) and is in the 3rd Commission Voting District (Alan Driver and Steve Graves).

   This is a public hearing and was advertised in the Gallatin News on December 5, 2019. The adjoining property owners were notified by certified mail.

   Mr. Suddath began the presentation by stating that he would need the BZA to provide assistance to determine what type of Setback this request is needing.

   Upon confirming that there have been no public comments, Mr. Suddath displayed an aerial photo of the property.

   Mr. Suddath added that another reason that this request must come before the BZA is that the assessor’s map did not have this lot properly recorded, therefore making it impossible to determine the property boundary. Mr. Suddath stated that this has since been corrected.
Mr. Suddath displayed the Public Notice, then displayed the Approved Plat from 2003 and the Plot Plan submitted by the applicant. Mr. Suddath pointed out that the Plat does not have the yard setbacks labeled. Elaborating, Mr. Suddath stated that it is important to know which yard is considered the rear yard and which is the side yard. The surveyor indicated that the lot line in question is a side yard.

Mr. Suddath showed wording from the County Zoning Code, Agricultural District, Article IX, Section 1.9 which states, “Accessory structures shall not be permitted in any required front or side yard” and “Accessory structures shall be at least five (5) feet from the rear lot line and from any building on the same lot.”

Mr. Suddath explained that by receiving this variance, the landowner would be able to place the accessory structure 7.5 feet from the lot line, encroaching between 10-15 feet into the setback.

Mr. Suddath concluded his presentation with example motions.

Mr. Rainey opened the public hearing.

Courtney Ward, 103 Phosphate Lane, Gallatin, TN, 37066, came forward, stated that she is the property owner. Ms. Ward stated that this is the only location the garage may be placed on the lot, due to the location of the septic field.

Mr. Suddath confirmed that the lot does have hardships.

Confirming that no one else wished to speak, Mr. Rainey called the requestor forward and asked if the garage could be placed 10’ closer to Phosphate Lane.

Ms. Ward stated that there is a ridge there, adding that the requested location is the most flat area.

Mr. Rainey asked Ms. Ward if she had researched the restrictive covenants for this property.

Ms. Ward stated that she had, and added that she believes it (the garage) will fall within the covenants.

Mr. Rainey disagreed, explaining that the covenants state that no building shall encroach in any setback on the recorded plat. Mr. Rainey added that the covenants are to expire in about fifteen months.

At this point, Mr. Holt asked about the location of the septic field and the drop in elevation at the ridge.

Ms. Ward stated that the drop is significant.
Mr. Stamper asked what is north of the property.

Mr. Suddath stated that a house is north of the property.

Mr. Suddath explained that the Plot Plan shows the northern part of the property as being the side yard, but the Plat seems to indicate the opposite. Mr. Suddath added that because the side and rear yards are not labeled, there is a discrepancy in the interpretation by the surveyor and himself.

Mr. Rainey stated that the address of the property is 103 Phosphate Lane and the building sits in a way that the north side must be interpreted as being the rear yard.

Discussion among the Board members concluded that rear yard interpretation is correct, and the 5’ setback would be allowable.

Additionally, Mr. Rainey noted that the house is encroaching over the front yard setback line. Mr. Rainey asked Mr. Suddath for the required front yard setback on Phosphate Lane.

Mr. Suddath answered that Zoning Code states that, in the Agricultural Zoning, for corner lots, the required minimum front yard setback is 1.5 times the required side yard setback for the district.

At this point, Mr. Rainey returned to the topic regarding setbacks in the restricted covenants, stating that while this board doesn’t enforce them, the board should not circumvent them, either.

Mr. Holt asked the requestor if they had considered moving the garage toward the house.

Stating that yes, that is still a possibility, Ms. Ward stated that there is not much space between the deck and the garage, adding that the garage entrance will be from the deck side.

Mr. Rainey stated that based upon the address and the house position on the lot, there is legitimate reason to interpret the north side as the rear lot. Therefore, should a motion be made to accept the requested variance, Mr. Rainey stated that a condition of said motion should be to require a Plat Amendment, with the correct labeling of the setback lines.

Mr. Holt asked Mr. Rainey about the covenants posing a future problem.

Mr. Rainey agreed, but stated that it could be noted that no neighbors showed up in opposition of this request.

Mr. Stamper made a motion to approve a request for a side yard setback variance for 109 Phosphate Lane for an accessory structure in accordance with a Plot Plan submitted by the applicant with the following condition:
a) The accessory structure must obtain a zoning permit from the Sumner County Building and Codes Department

b) Applicant must submit a Plat Amendment depicting the minimum building setbacks.

Seconded by Ms. Webster. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rainey turned the floor over to Mr. Suddath for staff presentation.

2. **Ken and Jessi Knack** were requesting a Hardship Variance for a relative to live in an existing structure on the subject property to care for a relative due to medical circumstances. Subject property is located at **394 Martin Lane, Cottontown, TN, 37048**, is on Tax Map 075, Parcel 012.03, contains 3 acres, is zoned Residential A (RA) and is in the 12th Commission Voting District (Michael Guthrie and Justin Nipper).

This is a public hearing and was advertised in the Gallatin News on December 12, 2019. The adjoining property owners were notified by certified mail.

Mr. Suddath provided an overview of the request and confirmed that there had been one call to the department with concerns/questions.

Mr. Suddath presented wording from Article IV, Section 2, County Zoning Code, an aerial photo, a Plot Plan, the public notice and the septic permit for this property. Mr. Suddath completed his presentation with example motions.

Mr. Rainey asked Mr. Terry Haynes if he had anything to add.

Mr. Haynes stated that if approved, the building should meet all County Building Codes requirements.

Mr. Rainey called the requestor forward.

**Mr. Ken Knack, 394 Martin Lane, Cottontown, TN, 37048**, stated that he and Jessi were available for questions.

Mr. Rainey emphasized the requirement that at such time the hardship is no longer necessary, the structure must be either removed or retro-fitted to make it uninhabitable.

Mr. Knack stated that as of now, the structure is a two-car garage, and if approved, will be remodeled with the addition of a bathroom and a bedroom. Mr. Knack further stated that appliances will be placed in the remaining open living space. Concerning the bathroom, Mr. Knack asked if the bathroom may remain after the structure is retro-fitted.
Mr. Haynes stated that the bathroom may remain, as long as it is just the sink and toilet, adding that there could be no tub or shower.

Mr. Stamper asked the requestor for confirmation of the knowledge that they must come before the Board every two years to verify that the hardship still remains.

Mr. Knack stated that he understood.

Mr. Rainey opened the floor for public comment. Confirming that no one wished to speak, Mr. Rainey closed the public hearing.

Mr. Holt made a motion to approve a request for a Hardship Variance for 394 Martin Lane, Cottontown, for term of two years, with the following conditions:

a) All structures must meet applicable setback requirements of the County Zoning Code;

b) The applicant must meet all TDEC requirements for all required septic system improvements prior to issuance of any building or zoning permits;

c) The applicant must obtain a certificate of occupancy for any proposed structures from the County Building and Codes office;

d) Upon resolution of the hardship, the structure must be removed or retro-fitted at the property owner’s expense.

e) The applicant must return to the BZA every two years to verify that the hardship remains,

seconded by Mr. Stamper. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rainey turned the floor over to staff for presentation.

3. Lawrence McMurtry and Crown Castle USA, Inc. were requesting a Conditional Use Permit to add an additional wireless communication tower. Subject property is located at 120 Neals Court, Gallatin, TN, 37066, is on Tax Map 124, Parcel 019.00, contains 125 acres, is zoned Estate A and is in the 4th Commission Voting District (Jerry Foster and Leslie Schell). This is a public hearing and was advertised in the Gallatin News on December 5, 2019. The adjoining property owners were notified by certified mail.

Mr. Suddath provided an overview of the property, displaying the Public Notice and stated that the Planning Department had received one call regarding this request.

Mr. Suddath provided an aerial photo depicting the location of the tower, stating that a complete set of construction plans have been submitted by the applicant with the fall radius
provided on the submitted plans. Mr. Suddath stated that there are no residential or other structures located within the fall radius, meeting a requirement of the County Zoning Resolution. Mr. Suddath added that given the lot size, and characteristics, the tower is not located in what would generally be called a “residential area”, however, the lease area does abut property that is part of the Carellton Planned Unit Development. Additionally, Mr. Suddath noted that a study provided by the applicant shows the existing tower to be structurally deficient to accommodate the proposed hardware that will be on the new tower.

Mr. Suddath displayed the driveway easement to the tower, the Site Plan and both ground level and aerial photos of the existing tower. Mr. Suddath added that the applicant has stated that the existing tower will be removed in the future, but has not specified a date of removal. Mr. Suddath listed the next steps that would be taken:

- After receiving final approval, the project may move forward, and a Building Permit may be obtained.
- After obtaining a Building Permit, construction may begin.

Mr. Suddath concluded his presentation with example motions.

Mr. Rainey asked if this request must be sent to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Suddath stated that the Zoning Code does not explicitly require that cell towers must be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Haynes added that the Codes Department will need input from the Engineer when reviewing the pad/footers.

Mr. Rainey opened the Public Hearing.

**Ms. Donna Davis, 3701 Mallory Station Road, Suite 505, Franklin, TN 37067**, representative of Crown Castle USA, Inc., came forward, stating their request to replace the existing cell tower due to the structural incapacity of the tower.

Mr. Rainey asked if there were a time table in which to remove the first tower.

Ms. Davis stated that it depends, maybe the first or second quarter of 2021.

Mr. Stamper asked if this would be 5G.

Ms. Davis responded that yes, it is for 5G.
Mr. David Willoughby, 99 Blue Ridge Trace, Hendersonville, TN, 37075, asked if this tower would have a beacon.

Ms. Davis stated that the tower will not have a beacon.

Mr. Rainey closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Stamper made a Motion to approve a request for a Conditional Use Permit for Crown Castle, USA to construct and operate a cell tower at 120 Neals Court, Gallatin and to provide a positive recommendation to the Sumner County Regional Planning Commission, contingent upon:

- a) Submission of a letter from a licensed engineer certifying that the tower meets most recent design requirements and standards of the Electronics Industries Association with application for a building permit
- b) Submission of a “Determination of No Hazard” letter from the Federal Aviation Administration concurrent with application for a building permit,
- c) Applicant receive a Building Permit from the County Codes Department

Mr. Holt asked Mr. Haynes if the Engineering firm reviews the building documentation.

Mr. Haynes answered that the Engineering firm will submit recommendations and inspect their own recommendations regarding the footing, etc. Mr. Haynes added that it is the County Codes Department that issues the final CO.

Seconded by Mr. Holt. Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Rainey turned the floor over to staff for presentation

4. Derek and Amanda Preston were requesting an expansion of a Conditional Use Permit to operate an event venue. Subject property is located at 939 Newton Land, Gallatin, TN, 37066, is on Tax Map 149, Parcel 023.02, contains 8.73 acres, is zoned Residential A (RA) and is in the 3rd Commission Voting District (Alan Driver and Steve Graves).

This is a public hearing and was advertised in the Gallatin News on December 19, 2019. The adjoining property owners were notified by certified mail.

Mr. Suddath provided an overview of the property, explaining the applicant’s request to expand the parking. Mr. Suddath presented an aerial photo of the property and the public notice, stating that the Department has received no calls regarding this request.

Mr. Suddath provided a brief history of this property which included:
- Item was originally approved by the BZA on December 14, 2017
  - Scope of the event center was explained as being largely for professional development
conferences for teachers, and small church day camps during the week
• Original application indicated approximately 100 persons
• Event center as built will accommodate a total occupancy load of 527 guests per

• At 8.73 acres, does not meet minimum lot size requirements contained in County
Zoning Code for Private Recreational Areas, Facilities and Similar Uses (15 acres, not
observed by staff at the time)
• Did not receive site plan approval from the Sumner County Regional Planning
Commission (not required by Staff at the time)
• No traffic study or analysis conducted by applicant (not required by Staff at the time)
• 75 total parking spaces depicted on construction documents (4 handicap)
• Proposal is to double the amount of parking to 150 spaces.

Next, Mr. Suddath displayed the original BZA Minutes regarding this property, dated
December 14, 2017.
Mr. Suddath also provided the Configuration that had been submitted to the State Fire
Marshall, stating the applicant’s compliance by installing a fire suppression system and
widening the driveway.
Next, Mr. Suddath displayed the applicant’s summary of Proposed Expansion of their
Conditional Use Permit which included:
Goals and Operations:
• 2 Weddings/Week
• 1-2 Weekday Corporate Events/Week
• Hours of operation 9am-11pm
• Parking attendant present at all events
• Handicap accessible
• Parking for 150 cars
• Drive is 20 feet wide to allow for 2-way traffic
• Occupancy Load (State Fire Marshall’s Office)
  o Reception Hall (Serving Food) – 432 persons
  o Total Load (Without Food Service) – 527 persons

Requests:
• Occupancy changed from 100 guests to up to 300 guests.
• Additional parking to accommodate up to 300 guests.

Mr. Suddath also displayed the Plot Plan depicting the proposed additional parking and photos of
the structures on the property.

Mr. Suddath concluded his presentation with example motions.

Mr. Rainey asked if any work had been done to the parking expansion.

Mr. Suddath stated that additional structures are under construction.
Mr. Rainey asked if the inspections had been done.

Mr. Haynes stated that the applicant has passed the framing inspection.

Mr. Rainey opened the floor for Public Hearing.

Ms. Amanda Preston, 1939 Newton Lane, Gallatin, TN, 37066, came forward to explain her request, beginning by providing a history of their ownership of the property. Ms. Preston stated that they obtained their Conditional Use Permit prior to purchasing the property, adding that it took over a year to obtain all the permits that were required. Ms. Preston then explained the requirements, inspections, permits and improvements that have been required by the Fire Marshall, architects, engineers and the Codes Department.

With regards to the parking, Ms. Preston stated that there have been about 30 loads of gravel brought in and the handicap parking is designated. Ms. Preston stated that the additional building that has been added is a storage building. Ms. Preston stated that although the Fire Marshall has given them an occupancy of 400-500, they do not wish to have events that large, adding that they wish to have events with between 50-200 people in attendance. Ms. Preston stated that they wish to accommodate the needs of the community as well as make money.

Mr. Rainey closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rainey expressed a primary concern for the request to double the capacity of the parking, without a traffic study submitted. Further, Mr. Rainey stated a secondary concern that the existing Conditional Use Permit was approved for 100-150 people and doubling the parking/occupancy becomes a new request.

Mr. Suddath stated that this continuation was publically noticed as a new request.

Mr. Suddath added that wedding venues are a high intensity commercial use that happens to be in a very rural area, which creates issues that must be addressed, and therefore, sometimes a rezoning is the best avenue to pursue. However, Mr. Suddath added that when this Conditional Use Permit was originally approved, requirements were vague.

Ms. Preston stated that she would be OK with a 250-person occupancy.

Mr. Rainey asked how often events of that size would be held.

Ms. Preston stated that people could be shuttled in to reduce the traffic on the property.

Mr. Rainey stated that they could limit the number of large events, and the county could be put on notice of those events.
Mr. Holt and Mr. Rainey stated that from a county standpoint, additional officers and/or private security may be required for larger events.

Mr. Rainey stated a desire for applicants to be able to have a zoning for these events that protects the venues and the landowners.
Mr. Rainey proposed that the Board approve the request, but impose a limit on the number of large events.

Mr. Holt expressed appreciation for the applicant’s compliance and willingness to follow the requested steps. Mr. Holt went on to express concern that this property does not meet the 15 acre lot requirement; a requirement which was created after this original Permit was granted and the larger capacity request.

Mr. Rainey stated that this Board gave direction to the applicant two years ago, and that the applicants have spent the money to meet the Board’s request.

Mr. Suddath stated that the County Staff’s responsibility is to tell the applicant the steps that must be followed, but in the early years of these requests, the rules were not laid out.

Mr. Stamper asked if any neighbors have spoken out in opposition to the request.

Mr. Suddath stated there have been no calls received by his office.

Mr. Preston stated that he and his wife moved here two years ago, bought the land to pursue a dream, and have been building relationships with neighbors, the Gallatin and the county.

Mr. Stamper stated that he is concerned with the traffic on the road, stating that it may be desirable to limit the number of events with an attendance over 250 per year.

Discussion ensued about the maximum capacity

**Mr. Stamper made a motion to approve a request for a request for a continuation and expansion of a Conditional Use Permit to conduct an event venue at 939 Newton Lane, Gallatin, TN, contingent upon:**

- a) The applicant obtaining any required certificates of occupancy for all existing or proposed structures from the Sumner County Building and Codes Department
- b) The applicant obtaining any required permits from the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation and from the County related to wastewater disposal and Stormwater runoff.
- c) The applicant obtaining site plan approval from the Sumner County Regional Planning Commission
- d) The applicant shall limit the number of events, involving more than 250 guests, to 6 per year.
Seconded by Ms. Webster. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rainey turned the floor over to Mr. Suddath for staff presentation.

5. Kirsten Matthews Reese was requesting a continuation of her Conditional Use Permit granted on November 12, 2015 to conduct a wedding venue. Subject property is located at 283 Bob Perry Road, Bethpage, TN 37022, is on Tax Map 049, Parcel 009.00, contains 1 acre, is zoned Agricultural and is in the 1st Voting District (Mike Akins and Moe Taylor). The adjoining property owners were notified by mail.

Mr. Suddath presented an overview of the property. Upon verifying that no comments from the public have been received, Mr. Suddath provided aerial and ground photos of the property, as well as a history of the property which included:

- Item was originally approved by the BZA on November 12, 2015
- Does not meet minimum lot size requirements contained in County Zoning Code for Private Recreational Areas, Facilities and Similar Uses (not observed by staff at the time)
- Did not receive site plan approval from the Sumner County Regional Planning Commission (not required by Staff at the time)
- No traffic study or analysis conducted by applicant (not required by Staff at the time)
- A certificate of occupancy was issued by the Codes Department on November 9, 2017
- However, a letter was sent to property owner by Building Codes Department on January 31, 2019 stating that several significant code violations had been observed. (Letter was included in BZA Packet.) These Violations included:
  - Combustible fuels and liquid being used inside the facility (facility has no fire suppression system)
  - Max Occupancy signs (200 persons) were removed during events
  - Mezzanine area being used for meals and other public uses despite requirements that they be permanently secured and inaccessible to the public
  - No emergency exit signs over doors
  - Unpermitted electrical usage (extension cords etc)
  - Facility operating outside of period of time authorized by BZA
    - BZA authorized April to October operations; Facebook and other postings showed the facility in operation year round.

Mr. Suddath displayed a copy of the letter and photos sent to the property owner from the Building Codes office, dated January 31, 2019, addressing the above violations. At this point, Mr. Suddath asked Mr. Haynes if the Codes Department had been to the property recently.
Mr. Haynes stated that the Codes Department had been to the property recently and confirmed that all the issues raised in the letter had been addressed and resolved by the landowner, to the specifications of the Codes Department.

Mr. Rainey asked if they can receive a Certificate of Occupancy, now.

Mr. Haynes stated that the landowner has complied by blocking access to the Mezzanine, hanging maximum capacity signage, and removing the heaters.

Mr. Rainey opened the floor for public hearing.

Ms. Kirsten Matthews Reese, 301 Bob Perry Road, Bethpage, TN 37022, came forward, stating that she does not want to hold events December through March. Ms. Reese added that she would like to host a Fall Festival in the future. Ms. Reese stated that she has removed the heaters and complied with the requirements made by the Codes Department.

Mr. Rainey asked how many events are held per year.

Ms. Reese stated that in the beginning, there were probably about 60 events per year, but now there are about 40 events per year.

Mr. Haynes stated that this property has taken five years to be compliant from a safety standpoint.

Mr. Rainey stated that, if approved, an annual compliance inspection by Codes should be required.

Mr. Stamper made a motion to approve a request for a continuation of a Conditional Use Permit to conduct an event venue at 283 Bob Perry Road, Bethpage with the following conditions:

a) The applicant shall address all outstanding issues noted by the Sumner County Building and Codes Department.

b) The applicant must submit to an annual compliance inspection by the Codes Department.

Mr. Holt asked if there is a limit to the size of the event.

Mr. Suddath stated that the size was not discussed in the original permit.

Seconded by Ms. Webster. Motion passed unanimously.

At this time, Mr. Rainey recused himself and turned the meeting over to Vice-Chairman Webster.
Ms. Webster turned the floor over to Mr. Suddath for staff presentation.

6. **Ralph and Tammy McGuffie** were requesting to appeal a staff decision denying a building permit due to inadequate width of an existing easement. Subject property is located at **336 C East Biggs Road, Portland, TN, 37148**, is on Tax Map 059, Parcel 076.00, contains 24.21 acres, is zoned Agricultural (A) and is in the 12th Commission Voting District (Michael Guthrie and Justin Nipper).

   **This is a public hearing and was advertised in the Gallatin News on December 5, 2019. The adjoining property owners were notified by certified mail.**

   Mr. Suddath presented an overview of the property, explaining that the applicant is requesting a reinterpretation and appeal of the staff decision. Upon confirming that no calls regarding this request have been received by his office, Mr. Suddath displayed the Public Notice, the Plot Plan and wording from the Zoning Code Article IV, Section 2.3.

   Mr. Suddath stated that the access easement, of 20’ width, was created, for this property, in 1983. Mr. Suddath stated that rules changed in the 1990’s, requiring the easement to be 50’ in width, with ambiguous wording, leading to grandfathered easements.

   Mr. Suddath completed his presentation with example motions.

   Ms. Webster opened the floor for Public Hearing.

   **Mr. Ralph McGuffie, 336C East Biggs Road, Portland, TN, 37148**, came forward to request an easement to obtain a building permit.

   Mr. Rainey, as surveyor representing this request, came forward to explain that a 50-acre parcel was created in 1908 and was divided in 1918. Mr. Rainey stated that the driveway that is present was always used as a “prescriptive easement” to the property and in the 1980’s, the Cook’s bought the land on which the “prescriptive easement” is given, and put it in the deed as a 20’ easement. Mr. Rainey added that the land was later subdivided and subsequently, approximately 6 properties are using the driveway.

   Referencing the Plot Plan, Mr. Rainey explained the parcels and their easements upon review of multiple deeds.

   Mr. Stamper asked for clarification of the request.

   Mr. Suddath stated that the staff interpretation was the strictest interpretation, stating that the issue is whether the Codes allow room for grandfathering.
Mr. Stamper stated that the BZA has previously allowed grandfathered situations.

Ms. Webster closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Stamper stated that with respect to staff, there is precedent for the 25’ grandfathered easement.

Mr. Holt and Ms. Webster stated agreement for the “grandfathering” case for the easement.

Mr. Stamper made a motion to reverse a staff determination denying a building permit due to inadequate width of an existing easement with the following conditions:

a) One primary structure may be constructed on the subject property utilizing the existing easement;

b) All structures built upon the subject property shall meet all applicable setback and other zoning requirements;

c) All structures built upon the subject property must obtain all applicable building, zoning and land disturbance permits and must pay all acceptable fees;

d) A permit must be obtained from State of Tennessee related to Septic disposal,

seconded by Mr. Holt. Motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, Mr. Stamper made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Holt. Meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.