

MINUTES
OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: June 22, 2000
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: Howard Auditorium

Roll Call

Present:

Douglas Small, Vice Chairman
Frank Cochran
Tonya Jones
William Manier
Ann Nielson
Vicki Oglesby
Councilmember Phil Ponder

Absent:

Mayor Bill Purcell
James Lawson, Chairman
Marilyn Warren

Executive Office:

Richard C. Bernhardt, Executive Director
Karen P. Nicely, Assistant Executive Director
Carolyn Perry, Secretary III

Current Planning & Design Division:

Theresa Carrington, Planning Division Manager
Jennifer Regen, Planner III
John Reid, Planner II
Robert Leeman, Planner I
Jeff Stuncard, Planner I
Andrew Wall, Planning Technician I

Advance Planning & Research:

Jeff Lawrence, Planner III
Ryan Latimer, Planning Technician I

Others Present:

Jim Armstrong, Public Works
Bill Kelly, Historic Zoning Administrator
Ann Roberts, Historic Zoning Commission
Leslie Shechter, Legal Department

Vice Chairman Small called the meeting to order and welcomed Rick Bernhardt as Executive Director.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Carrington announced the following changes to the agenda.

2000S-208G-04 The request is for 33 lots not 3.

2000Z-080U-10 Parcels 246-255 should be added, and the total number of properties is 331 not 333.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to adopt the agenda with the noted corrections.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS

At the beginning of the meeting, staff listed the deferred items as follows:

2000S-160-05 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.

2000S-183U-07 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

2000S-198U-09 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

2000S-202U-07 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

175-75-G-06 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

98-84-U-14 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

97P-019G-06 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to defer the items listed above.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Nielson moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which unanimously passed to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 8, 2000.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

No Councilmembers were present to speak at this point in the agenda.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which unanimously carried, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

SUBDIVISION AND BOND PROPOSALS

99S-116G-12

Addition to Highland Creek (First Revision)

Map 180, Parcel 24

Subarea 12 (1997)

District 31 (Knoch)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide nine lots into ten lots abutting the north margin of Holt Road, approximately 1,572 feet east of Redmond Lane (3.47 acres), classified within RS10 District, requested by Holt Valley LLC, owner/developer, Anderson-Delk and Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-539

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 99S-116G-12, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$16,000.00 (7-0).”**

2000S-100U-05

Maplewood Home Tract, Resubdivision of Lots 1-3
Map 61-14, Parcels 212, 216 and 217
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 8 (Hart)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide three lots into four lots abutting the south terminus of Hilltop Avenue, approximately 160 feet south of Oak Street (1.45 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by B. B. Doubleday, Jr., owner/developer, Land Surveying Consultants, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-540

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-100U-05, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

2000S-197U-09

Lindsley Avenue Subdivision
Map 93-15, Parcels 37 and 42
Subarea 9 (1997)
District 19 (Wallace)

A request for final plat approval to consolidate four lots, one parcel and closed street right-of-way into two lots abutting the southwest corner of Lindsley Avenue and Third Avenue South (1.05 acres), classified within the CF District, requested by SunTrust Bank, owner/developer, Crawford Land Surveyors, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-541

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-197U-09, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

2000S-204G-12

Mill Run, Phase 1A
Map 173, Part of Parcel 83
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 31 (Knoch)

A request for final plat approval to create 24 lots abutting the west terminus of Claybrook Lane, south of Bending Creek Drive (4.41 acres), classified within the RS10 District, requested by Mill Run, L.L.C., owner/developer, Littlejohn Engineering Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-542

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-204G-12, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$158,500.00 (7-0).”**

Request for Bond Release

98S-401U
Northside Station, Lot 3 (Advance Auto Parts)
Bordeaux Advance, LLC, principal
Subarea 3 (1998)

Located abutting the east margin of Clarksville Pike, north of West Hamilton Road.

Resolution No. 2000-543

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 98S-401U, Bond No. 99BD-104, Northside Station, Lot 3 (Advance Auto Parts), in the total amount of \$15,500.”

Request for Bond Release
2000S-007U-13
Forest View North
John E. Cain, principal
Subarea 13 (1996)

Located abutting the northeast corner of Forest View Drive and Murfreesboro Pike.

Resolution No. 2000-544

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 2000S-007U-13, Bond No. 2000BD-002, Forest View North, in the total amount of \$5,250.”

Request for Bond Extension
98S-073G
Poplar Creek Estates, Phase 5, Section B-1
Poplar Creek Development Company, principal
Subarea 6 (1996)
[Buildout is at 36%]

Located abutting the south margin of Poplar Creek Road, approximately 800 feet east of Allens Lane.

Resolution No. 2000-545

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for extension of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 98S-073G, Bond No. 98BD-072, Poplar Creek Estates, Phase 5, Section B-1, in the amount of \$30,000 to 7/2/2001 subject to the submittal of an amendment to the present Letter of Credit by 7/21/2000 which extends its expiration date to 1/2/2002. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**”

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

192-69-U-12
Hickory Plaza
Map 161, Parcels 167 and 174
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 30 (Kerstetter)

A request for final approval for a phase of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the southeast corner of Hickoryview Drive and Hickory Plaza, classified CS District (1.50 acres), to develop a 10,866 square foot autobody and paint shop facility, requested by Gresham, Smith and Partners, for Eric Stengel, owner, Autobody America, optionee.

Resolution No. 2000-546

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 192-69-U-12 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final plat shall be recorded combining parcels 167 and 174 on tax map 161, including all necessary bonds for public improvements.”

98-73-G-02
Hickory Hills Commercial PUD
Map 40, Parcel 36
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 10 (Balthrop)

A request to revise a portion of the preliminary plan of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the south margin of Westcap Road and the west margin of Hickory Hills Boulevard, classified OR20 District (7 acres), to permit a 20,350 square foot office and warehouse storage facility, to relocate a 59,224 square foot 3-story motel and to add a 15,266 square foot medical distribution building, replacing 18,000 square feet of self-storage, two restaurants, and a 59,240 square foot, 4-story motel, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, for Hickory Lenders, LTP.,LP. (Also requesting final plat approval).

Resolution No. 2000-547

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 98-73-G-02 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PHASE (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.**
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits a final plat shall be recorded, including any necessary bonds for public improvements.
3. The applicant shall submit to the Planning Commission, no later than June 30, 2000 revised plans showing the floor plan of the proposed two new buildings, a breakdown of the square footage of each building on-site, the tree density calculations on the plan, and the revised retention pond as approved by the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

98-73-G-02
Cubby Hole Self-Storage (Hickory Hills)
Map 40, Part of Parcel 36
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 10 (Balthrop)

A request for final approval for a phase of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the north margin of Old Hickory Boulevard and the west margin of Hickory Hills Boulevard, classified OR20 District (4.31 acres), to develop 20,350 square feet of office and warehouse storage and distribution uses in two buildings (13,150 square feet and 7,200 square feet), requested by Liane Miller, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-548

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 98-73-G-02 is given **CONDITIONAL PRELIMINARY APPROVAL; APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.**
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits a final plat shall be recorded, including any necessary bonds for public improvements.
3. The applicant shall submit to the Planning Commission, no later than June 30, 2000 revised plans showing the floor plan of the proposed two new buildings, a breakdown of the square footage of each building on-site, the tree density calculations on the plan, and the revised retention pond as approved by the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

195-76-G-06

National Car Wash (Highway 70)
Map 142, Parcel 235
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 23 (Bogen)

A request to revise the preliminary site plan and for final approval for a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the north margin of Highway 70, approximately 132 feet east of Belle Forest Circle, classified SCC District (.57 acres), to develop a 4,144 square foot self-service car wash, replacing an existing 760 square foot Amoco gas station, requested by Bruce Rainey and Associates, for National Car Wash, LLC, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-549

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 195-76-G-06 is given **APPROVAL TO REVISE THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PORTION (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

93-86-P-06

Lakeshore Meadows
Map 141, Part of Parcel 14
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 35 (Lineweaver)

A request to revise a portion of the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Commercial and Residential Planned Unit Development Districts located abutting the south margin of Coley Davis Road and the west margin of Dona McPherson Drive, classified CL (4 acres), to add 67 parking spaces and to relocate a driveway connection to Donna McPherson Drive, requested by Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., for Lakeshore Estates, Inc., owner.

Resolution No. 2000-550

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 93-86-P-06 is given **APPROVAL TO REVISE THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PORTION (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

MANDATORY REFERRALS

2000M-057U-05

Brunswick Drive Property Acquisition
Map 60-16, Parcels 42-45, 62, 63, 64 and 72
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 4 (Majors)

A request to acquire eight parcels of properties located at 2804, 2817, 2819, 2821, 2825, 2826 and 2832 Brunswick Drive, classified RS10 (1.44 acres), to accommodate the Pages Branch “Buy Out” Program, requested by the Department of Public Works.

Resolution No. 2000-551

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-057U-05.”

2000M-058G-06

Council Bill BL2000-327
Conveyance of Property to Harpeth Valley Utility District
Map 157, Part of Parcel 1
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 35 (Lineweaver)

A council bill to convey a portion of a parcel of property located on Highway 100, west of Old Hickory Boulevard on 600 acres), designated as Edwin Warner Park, from the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to the Harpeth Valley Utility District for the mutual benefit of a public water line extension that will also serve the park, requested by the Public Property Administrator.

Resolution No. 2000-552

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-058G-06.”

2000M-059G-13

J. F. Kennedy Middle School Easement Acquisition
Map 164, Part of Parcel 60
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 29 (Holloway)

A request to acquire a portion of a parcel of property at the southwest corner of Hamilton Church Road and Hobson Pike on 3.36 acres for the extension of sewerage services to serve the new J. F. Kennedy Middle School on Hobson Pike, requested by the Public Property Administrator.

Resolution No. 2000-553

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-059G-13."

2000M-060U-14

Council Bill No. BL2000-295
Metropolitan Board of Education Lease Agreement II
Map 94, Part of Parcel 125
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 15 (Loring)

A council bill authorizing a lease agreement for property at 101 Spence Lane to use as warehouse space for the storage of equipment, furniture and surplus property by the Board of Education, classified IWD (.55 acres).

Resolution No. 2000-554

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-060U-14."

This concluded the items on the consent agenda.

SUBDIVISION AND BOND PROPOSALS

2000S-180G-04 (Public Hearing)

Peak Business Park
Map 51, Parcels 51-56, 169 and 171
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 4 (Majors)

A request for preliminary approval for seven lots abutting the northwest corner of Cheron Road and Briarville Road (8.8 acres), classified within the OR40 District, requested by Peak Returns, Ltd., owner/developer, Rick Fussell, surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated the applicant has indefinitely deferred this project in order to give them more time to work out issues with the Tennessee Department of Transportation.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to leave the public hearing and defer this matter indefinitely.

2000S-187U-03 (Public Hearing)

The Park Preserve
Map 59, Parcels 135 and 191
Map 60, Parcels 64 and 72
Subarea 3 (1998)
District 2 (Black)

A request for preliminary approval for 476 lots abutting the east terminus of Revels Drive and the northeast terminus of Trinity Hills Parkway (260.4 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Park Preserve, Inc., owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending conditional approval with a variance to road grade. This is an MDHA affordable housing project and is also a cluster lot subdivision, which meets the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. They have provided a significant amount of open space, far exceeding what is required, some of which is existing steep topography which will remain in its natural state. There are several street connections to the north, west and south proposed to tie into the existing surrounding development. The variance to the maximum permitted road grade of 12% is being requested at several ends of steep cul-de-sacs that will approach 14% grade and Public Works is recommending approval of those variances.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Manier seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing and approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-555

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-187U-03, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-6.2.1.B OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-200G-13 (Public Hearing)

Maxwell Road Estates
Map 176, Parcel 27
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 29 (Holloway)

A request for preliminary approval for 52 lots abutting the south margin of Maxwell Road, approximately 1,150 feet east of LaVergne-Couchville Pike (15.3 acres), classified within the RS10 District, requested by Jerry Peiser, owner/developer, Garver Engineers, surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated this applicant has requested a two weeks deferral in order to give them more time to meet with the Department of Public Works regarding sinkholes on the site.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to leave the public hearing open and defer this matter for two weeks.

2000S-201U-08 (Public Hearing)

Preston Taylor Homes, Home VI-Phase 1
Map 91-8, Parcels 149 and 321
Map 92-9, Parcel 1
Subarea 8 (1995)
District 21 (Whitmore)

A request for preliminary approval for 15 lots abutting the northeast corner of Clifton Avenue and 40th Avenue North (29.95 acres), classified within the RM9 District, requested by Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending approval of this plan. There are 9 single family lots proposed and 6 multi-family lots. This is an MDHA project and there was a Mandatory Referral at the last meeting to close several of the sewer easements, which was approved.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing and approve.

Resolution No. 2000-556

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-201U-08, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF PUBLIC WORKS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-208G-04 (Public Hearing)

Shannon Place, Sections 3 and 4
Map 43-1, Parcels 72, 74-77, 87, 96, 220 and 260
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 9 (Dillard)

A request for preliminary approval for 33 lots abutting the north margin of Shannon Avenue and the west margin of Palmer Avenue (8.62 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Charles E. and Carole Rhoten, owners/developers, Burns and Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Ms. Carrington stated staff is recommending conditional approval subject approval of a Mandatory Referral closing Lawrence Avenue with a variance to the maximum length of a dead end street in the Subdivision Regulations. That Mandatory Referral has been through 2nd reading at Council and is scheduled for 3rd reading tonight. It has been to the Traffic and Parking Commission and was disapproved by them because they were unaware of this proposed plat, which will provide access to that property. They were concerned closing that unbuilt right-of-way would leave some land locked parcels, however, this plat does address that issue. It is somewhat unusual for staff to be supporting street closure and a dead end street that exceeds the 750 foot maximum length, but this is an isolated area, there is a blue line stream and in this case there is no access to Gallatin Pike.

Mr. Manier expressed concerns regarding accessibility and the width of the tract.

Mr. Cochran stated he also felt there should be another access.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Councilmember Ponder moved and Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which carried with Mr. Cochran and Ms. Nielson in opposition, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-557

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-208G-04, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF A MANDATORY REFERRAL TO CLOSE LAWRENCE AVENUE WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-6.2.1.G OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (5-2).”**

2000S-211U-13 (Public Hearing)
Dell Computer Corporation (Nashville Campus)
Map 120, Parcels 157-159 and Part of Parcel 154
Map 134, Parcels 310 and 312
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 27 (Sontany)

A request for preliminary approval for five lots and final plat approval to dedicate right-of-way for Dell Parkway abutting the southwest margin of Murfreesboro Pike, approximately 700 feet northwest of Donelson Pike (292.68 acres), classified within the IR District, requested by The Industrial Development Board of the Metropolitan Government, owner/developer, Gresham, Smith and Partners, surveyor.

Ms. Carrington stated staff is recommending conditional approval subject to posting a bond for extension of utilities and construction of roadway.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-558

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-211U-13, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$162,500.00; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-212G-13 (Public Hearing)
Logistics Way Subdivision
Map 175, Parcels 194, 195 and Part of Parcel 205
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 29 (Holloway)

A request for preliminary approval for three lots and final plat approval to dedicate right-of-way for Logistics Way, abutting the east margin of Old Hickory Boulevard, north of CSX Transportation Railroad (117.8 acres), classified within the IR, IWD, OR20 and AR2a Districts, requested by CNF Properties, Inc., owner/developer, Cherry Land Surveying, Inc., surveyor. (Deferred from meeting of 5/25/00).

Ms. Carrington stated staff is recommending conditional approval subject to approval by the department of Water Services and with a variance to the maximum length of a dead end street. The purpose of this plat is to dedicate a private street, which is in existence, to Metro and to create 3 lots. The cul-de-sac is 2,130 feet. The Subdivision Regulations allow a maximum of 750, however, this is an industrial area.

Councilmember Ponder stated he was concerned with what businesses will go on the property.

A representative from Hawkins Development Company stated there are pending contracts for industrial users on this property but that he was not sure he was in the position to disclose the user.

Mr. Cochran expressed concern regarding the private street being dedicated to Metro.

Mr. Bill Hawkins stated the street does meet street standards and has been approved by Public Works.

Ms. Carrington stated Public Works has approved the street and the only outstanding issues are private water lines.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Hawkins to address what would be built there.

Mr. Hawkins stated this will be an industrial warehouse park.

Ms. Marilyn Homes stated she did not want an industrial park in her neighborhood and wanted to know how it would effect her appraisal.

Vice Chairman Small stated this property is already zoned industrial and this is not a proposal to change the zoning. The roads are already built and they are not trying to expand outside of borders that have already been established.

Mr. Manier moved and Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing and approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-559

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-212G-13, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF WATER SERVICES WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-6.2.1.G OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-196U-07

West End Annex, Resubdivision of Lot 61
Map 103-4, Parcel 195
Subarea 7 (1994)
District 24 (Summers)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into two lots abutting the north margin of Nebraska Avenue, approximately 300 feet west of 42nd Avenue North (.36 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Robert and Molly Stillers and Nicholas B. Bailey, owners/developers, John Kohl & Company, surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard state staff is recommending disapproval. This is a developed area and comparability was applied, and was not met for street frontage.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-560

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-196U-07, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.7 OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$11,000.00 (7-0).”**

Request for Bond Extension

97S-319G
Tree Haven, Section 1
Forrest Partnership, principal
Subarea 13 (1996)
[Buildout is at 90%]

Located abutting the east terminus of Asheford Trace, approximately 135 feet east of Murphywood Court.

Ms. Carrington stated staff is recommending disapproval of the extension and request authorization for collection of the performance bond unless all road improvements, water and sewer testing and deeds are completed by September 22, 2000.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-561

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **DISAPPROVES** the request for extension and **AUTHORIZES** the collection of the performance bond for Subdivision No. 97S-319G, Bond No. 98BD-025, Tree Haven, Section 1, in the total amount of \$30,500 unless all road improvements and all water and sewer testing and deeds by 9/22/2000. The developer will be required to maintain appropriate security. **Failure of principal to maintain appropriate security shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**”

Consideration of Bond Collection

98S-352G
Poplar Ridge Condominiums
Karl Haury, Jr., principal
Subarea 6
[Buildout is at 100%]

Located abutting the west margin of Coley Davis Road and the north margin of CSX Railroad.

Ms. Carrington stated staff is recommending collection of the performance bond, with a grace period until August 1, 2000, for the developer to put in a guardrail.

Mr. Karl Haury, Jr. stated he felt they could get it in by the end of July and requested the grace period.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-562

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **AUTHORIZES** the collection of the performance bond for Subdivision No. 98S-352G, Bond No. 99BD-007, Poplar Ridge Condominiums, in the amount of \$10,000 if all work is not complete by **8/1/2000**. The developer will be required to maintain appropriate security. **Failure of principal to maintain appropriate security shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**”

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

2000Z-012T
Council Bill 2000BL-317

A council bill amending Section 17.12.050 (Building Height Controls) of the Zoning Ordinance by restricting the maximum height of buildings to 35 feet along six state designated scenic highways within Davidson County by the Tennessee Scenic Highway Act.

Ms. Regen stated this text amendment is to clarify a current state law that regulates the development of buildings along state designated scenic highways. The state law regulates the height of buildings, staying within 1,000 feet of those highways. Buildings can be no taller than 35 feet. The issue has come up as to how you measure that 35 feet. Metro Legal has drafted a bill, which is now before the Council, that clarifies how you would measure that. If a property is below the roadway, you would actually go up to the

level of the roadway and go 35 feet from there. If the property was level with the roadway you would go 35 feet from there and if the property was undulating and had different heights to it, you would take an average of the properties height above sea level and come up with a starting point and go 35 feet above that.

Mr. Bernhardt stated this ordinance is not intended to clarify state law. It is intended to establish a height limit for those roads that are designated scenic highways by the state and a method of calculating that in the Metro code book.

Mr. Manier stated his questions had been answered.

Ms. Oglesby moved and Mr. Manier seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-563

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-012T is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

This council bill clarifies how building height is to be measured along State designated scenic highways within Davidson County. As currently written, state law restricts the height of all buildings within 1,000 feet of a scenic highway to 35 feet, but does not indicate how to measure building height. This bill proposes that all buildings fronting a scenic highway to a depth of 300 feet shall have a maximum height of 35 feet above the scenic highway elevation, factoring in the average elevation of the site before any grading occurs and the average elevation of the abutting scenic highway. The provisions of the proposed amendment are also consistent with Metro's standards for measuring sign height. This clarification will enable the Metro Codes Department to enforce a consistent standard."

2000Z-080U-10

Council Bill BL2000-316

Map 103-8, Parcels 176-232, 234-238, 241, 242, 244, 245 –255 and 290

Map 103-12, Parcels 3-19, 19.01, 20-25, 27, 27.01, 28, 30, 33-44, 46-86, 88-124, 126-140, 140.01, 141-146, 149-154, 156-164, 164.01, 165, 168-175, 177-206, 208, 212-226, 228, 230, 230.01, 231-240, 242-245, 247-250, 252-260, 292, 293, 296 and 298

Map 103-12-0-B, Parcels 35-CO thru 38-CO

Map 103-12-0-D, Parcels 101-CO thru 102-CO

Map 103-12-0-E, Parcels 101-CO and 102-CO

Map 103-16, Parcel 1

Subarea 10 (1994)

District 24 (Summers)

A council bill that applies the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District to 331 properties located on Cambridge Avenue, Aberdeen Road, Wilson Boulevard North, Lauderdale Road, Mockingbird Road, Cherokee Road, Valley Road, and Mayfair Road, north of West End Avenue (89.89 acres), requested by Claudette and John Fergus, appellants, for various owners.

Ms. Regen stated to the east is the beginning of the Richland/West End Conservation Overlay. Staff is recommending approval. This meets the intent of the conservation zoning and the Subarea 10 Plan goals, which are to preserve and protect this neighborhood. The Historic Zoning Commission voted approval of the design guidelines as well as approval of the overlay district to the Council. This neighborhood was developed over a 30 period of time and has a diverse architectural type of housing. 63% of the properties have been deemed to have historic value by the Historic Zoning Commission.

Ms. Oglesby asked for a copy of the regulations the Historic Commission voted approval of.

Ms. Regen stated they were being copied and the Commission would receive them as soon as they were ready.

Mr. Bill Kelly, Historic Zoning Administrator, explained the neighborhood conservation zoning.

Ms. Shechter stated under the Zoning Ordinance, the structure of historic overlays is divided into two entities, the Historic Zoning Commission is charged with the responsibility of determining whether or not an overlay should be applied, whether it is a historic district, conservation overlay or landmark. Their role is to determine whether the area meets the criteria to be eligible for a historic overlay. If they do, then they recommend the establishment of that overlay to the Metro Council. In addition, the Historic Zoning Commission is charged with the responsibility of developing design guidelines. The design guidelines are not approved by the Council. Once the Historic Zoning Commission develops those guidelines they are final and they have the force and effect of law on these properties.

Then role of the Planning Commission is limited to determining whether, if this neighborhood is designated for historic overlay, that designation consistent with the General Plan. Your role is not to determine whether this neighborhood is historic or not and is not to second guess the design guidelines.

Mr. Robert Rutherford, attorney representing numerous property owners in opposition to the overlay stated the Commission will hear a very marked split in opinion on how much support this overlay has among the homeowners. The result of the MBA overlay was that it distorted the overlay process. The compromise that came out of that political process reduced the overlay to almost meaninglessness. What we wound up with was one street and a couple parcels as a neighborhood overlay, and that was because it was sent forward through the process to the political arena without a consensus.

This issue brings into question the houses that have been deemed worthy of conservation. The numbers that have been brought before you as being questionable, if viewed and accepted, are not in fact worthy of conservation and that brings the numbers here down below the arbitrary 60% level that the Historical Zoning Commission has set. They have set that as the triggering level beyond which conservation zoning is appropriate. Many of these homes have been gutted and renovated and are no longer worthy of conservation.

Aquinas and West Minster should also be brought into this process, as a tax paying citizen of this county. This bill needs to be deferred or defeated.

Mr. Jay Catiani, Ms. Karen Daskowitz, Mr. George Vogt, Ms. Rosette Tucker, Ms. Jeanelle Wilson, Mr. Darik Sklar, Mr. Paul Zefin, and Mr. Archie Potts spoke in opposition to the conservation overlay and expressed concerns regarding property value, homes not being worthy of historic zoning, requirements on repairs and additions, Aquinas and West Minster expansion being the only reason driving the Conservation Overlay Zoning, Councilmember Summers' verification of petition signatures and counts, the inappropriateness of the guidelines, insurance coverage and not being included in neighborhood meetings.

Ms. Nielson left 3:10, at this point in the agenda.

Ms. Claudette Fergus, Ms. Patti Marshall, Ms. Patsy Bruce, Ms. Elaine Getts and Mr. William Narramore spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Ann Roberts, Metro Historic Commission Director, stated Cherokee Park is similar to other 20th century neighborhoods and there is a collection of revival styles and that helps to put this into some sort of context.

Mr. Bernhardt stated the Historic Commission has two roles here. The Commission did find that this area had enough historic significance to comply with the code and has adopted and recommended design guidelines as it applies here.

Ms. Roberts stated the Zoning Ordinance does stipulate that the Historic Zoning Commission look at two things. One is, does this area meet the criteria that are stated in the ordinance for eligibility, and the other is, have there been design guidelines developed. The Historic Zoning Commission did meet yesterday and said yes to both of those things.

Councilmember Summers stated that what the Commission is being asked today, by the opponents, is to become councilmembers, make a political decision and look at things they are concerned about. We have two groups of people here who really want to achieve the same objective. That is to preserve their neighborhood. I think some concerns, fears and some age differences maybe the problem. Fear has brought us to two different conclusions about the same thing and that is – we like our neighborhood and want it to stay the same. From going door to door it was my personal opinion, and having done a pole in my district, that 80% of people in my district support historic preservation. He stated he had not had time to verify petitions but without questioning duplications and errors it is 60% to 40% in favor. If this bill passes, we are all going to wake up the next morning and nothing is going to change. The only people this is going to effect is someone that wants to build a new house, tear down a house, add an addition or build a garage. A Conservation Overlay is to conserve neighborhoods.

Mr. Manier stated the Historical Commission recommends, and that he is controlled in what he can do. Since he had voiced his self before the Historical Commission as being opposed to the approval, he would like to abstain from any vote in the future on it here, because that would be contradictory of what he feels, yet he will accept the recommendation of the Commission. We need badly to address the relationships between these overlays and other factors that are primary in the welfare of the city. I suspect, and most people will deny it, the historical overlay is being used for other purposes than pure historic appreciation. It is being used to confront other fears, real or unreal, and that is not the intent of historical zoning. I have voiced this before this Commission and I have voiced it before the Historical Commission. There is a high degree of need to preserve residential areas. There is a high degree of need to preserve and appreciate historical structures, but we also have as a conflict to that, institutional uses who we will choke off at the pass and literally be ruinous to them. Churches area a community element. Churches tend to grow and that growth needs to be accommodated. Our educational institutions, 4 or 5 colleges and private schools, also contribute something to the neighborhood and they also contribute to the general welfare of the metropolitan area. When you put an overlay out there you are pretty much freezing it. Nothing is permanent but it really puts a clamp on the thing. These things are going to have to be taken into consideration. When you decide to have an overlay in an area you need to consult those institutions in the area as to what their future anticipated needs are. It doesn't mean you give into them but at least you compromise, negotiate or look for an answer that both serves the neighborhood well and also serves the institutions, because if we run all the institutions out of town we will have a pretty sterile sort of city. They are vital to life in the city.

Councilmember Ponder stated Mr. Manier had brought up some good points. He asked Ms. Shechter for advice. We have talked about these houses being built over a 20 or more year period. Does that make any difference in the application of the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District rules and regulations?

Ms. Shechter stated the Historic Conservation District, as defined in the Zoning Ordinance says; there are a number of things that can make a district historic and one of them is that it contains structures or a group of structures that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master or that possess high artistic values or represent a significant and distinguishable entity, but yet may lack in individual distinction. There is not a difference that I can see from the text of the Zoning Ordinance that all the houses have to be of a particular period. If they are from a variety of periods and represent a variety of distinctive architectural characteristics worthy of conservation, they fit the definition.

Councilmember Ponder asked who makes that judgement.

Ms. Shechter stated that would be the Historic Zoning Commission. Actually it is the Council who has the final determination.

Councilmember Ponder stated there have obviously been several additions made to these buildings a various times. He asked if that made any difference.

Ms. Shechter stated not according to the text as long as they meet the definition of having an architectural significance.

Ms. Roberts stated no neighborhood is ever esthetic, so yes, there have been additions, and there have been new buildings built in this neighborhood since it began to be developed. That will not stop with or without conservation zoning. Richland/West End, which was designated about 4 years ago, has had over 40 changes out of about 300 buildings. So, additions continue as we look at them. Our staff, who made the assessments, is 2 people with master's degrees in historic preservation and also an architect. They are the ones who went out and mapped those buildings. If there were buildings that had additions that changed their characters so much that we could no longer say that building is historic, then we eliminated those from our list of historic buildings. I would stress that additions may continue. There are ways to do that. In the Richland/West End neighborhood there have been no disapproval's of additions. They were not always approved as they were when presented but working through it with staff and the Commission the differences were worked out.

Councilmember Ponder stated it was his understanding that all the homes in Cherokee Park are on a historic significance list.

Ms. Roberts stated that was correct because a number of them are from the 50's.

Councilmember Ponder asked what happens to those homes if they wanted to change something on that.

Ms. Roberts stated this is not the only neighborhood where that happens. There are always special guidelines that address those houses which are later and are included.

Councilmember Ponder stated there are 2 vacant lots in the neighborhood. What if someone came along and wanted to build the ugliest house in the world on one of those lots.

Ms. Roberts stated the Historic Commission would look at the plans.

Councilmember Ponder asked if they had review privileges?

Ms. Roberts stated they do review. You can not legislate good design, but roof pitch, windows and that sort of thing is reviewed.

Councilmember Ponder asked what if a house burns down?

Mr. Kelly stated they would follow what the zoning ordinance says, which is 50% of floor area and 50% of the reconstruction value. If something was destroyed more than that it would have to be rebuilt in accordance with the design guidelines.

Councilmember Ponder asked if there were any legal reasons that supports or does not support eligibility of this neighborhood to be considered for a Conservation Overlay District?

Ms. Shechter stated the determination of whether the neighborhood qualifies for an historic overlay is a decision of the Metropolitan Council. When they hold the public hearing they will have these folks before

them to give them assessments, evidence if you will, as to whether or not the neighborhood meets the qualifications that is specified in the ordinance for historic overlay designation. As a matter of law, the Council can decide, based on the evidence in the record, whether or not the criteria have been met. So long as the Council has not acted arbitrary or capriciously that decision will be upheld.

Councilmember Ponder asked if the same general rules apply if this Commission were to decline approval – that it would have to have a 2/3 approval by the Council on 3rd reading.

Ms. Shechter stated that if this Commission votes to disapprove the historic designation of this neighborhood, that disapproval must be based on a determination that such a designation offends or is not in conformance with the General Plan. That disapproval, as any other disapproval on a zoning bill, will require a 2/3's vote at the Council.

Councilmember Ponder asked – but as far as the staff's designation of their recommendation for approval, have to the best of you knowledge, been based on the General Plan and in compliance with all other regulations, stipulations, etc... that need to be considered in a case like this.

Ms. Shechter stated that in terms of the Planning Commission's role the staff is recommending to you approval based on their consideration that this historic designation meets the General Plan criteria.

Ms. Oglesby moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which carried with Mr. Manier abstaining, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-564

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-080U-10 is **APPROVED (5-0-1)**:

These properties fall within the Subarea 10 Plan's residential policy calling for conservation of the Cherokee Park neighborhood. The Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (NCOD) is consistent with that policy. The Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission (MHZC) approved the boundaries and the proposed design guidelines of the Cherokee Park Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District on June 21, 2000."

2000Z-083U-14
Council Bill BL2000-315
Map 96, Parcel 55 (4.58 acres)
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 14 (Stanley)

A council bill to change from RM9 to CS district property at 571 Stewarts Ferry Pike, opposite McCrory Creek Road (4.58 acres), requested by Bill Berkley, appellant, for John A. Thweatt, trustee.

5-85-P-14
Council Bill BL2000-318
Stewartwood Apartments
Map 96, Parcel 55
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 14 (Stanley)

A council bill to cancel and amend a portion of the undeveloped Residential/Commercial Planned Unit Development District located abutting the north margin of Stewarts Ferry Pike opposite McCrory Road, classified RM9 and proposed for CS District (4.58 acres), approved for 40 multi-family units, requested by Bill Berkley, appellant, for John Thweatt, trustee.

Mr. Reid stated staff is recommending disapproval because that district is not consistent with the residential policy west of McCrory Creek. The subarea plan established McCrory Creek as the boundary between the commercial around the interchange and the residential to the west. Allowing CS to go across the creek would encroach into the residential zoning pattern and could also implicate the single family homes. Approximately 50% of this property is within the McCrory Creek floodplain and staff believes it is not appropriate to intensify the zoning given that situation. While staff is recommending disapproval of the zone change we do recommend approval of the PUD cancellation because the RM9 base zoning that it would revert to is consistent with the residential policy that has been applied.

Councilmember Bruce Stanley stated that approximately 2 months ago the title holder to this 4.5 acres was wanting to have this property rezoned from its current RM9 policy to CS. He was wanting to locate a certain type of commercial facility on that property. One of the issues at that time was what impact this type of development was going to have on the highway infrastructure serving that area, Stewart's Ferry Pike in particular. It is very important to review the current development landscape of this section of Stewart's Ferry Pike. To begin with, the property in question is contiguous to the Stewartwood Plaza retail shopping Center to the south, which is zoned CL. To the north is the Clover Bottom Development Center. There are no facilities on that state institution that even approach this 4.58 acres. I requested Mr. Berkley and the title holder to have conversations with state because of the possible impact this rezoning might have on Clover Bottom. There has been no opposition from state officials regarding this rezoning. Also, because this is a state facility there will be no ability to expand this CS zoning further to encroach upon the state property. One half of the property in question is in the 100 year McCrory Creek floodplain. The development will concentrate on the front of the property and will not encroach upon or move into the floodplain. Planning staff has mentioned there is a substantial amount of undeveloped acreage on the west side of Stewart's Ferry Pike that needs to be developed commercially first before any consideration will be given to this 4.58 acres. Several years ago C.N.A. had looked at expanding their parking and facility down to Stewart's Ferry Pike and found it was not feasible. So there may not be any commercial development in that area any time soon. It is not up to Metropolitan land use officials or Council to deny if a commercial rezoning is not going to have an adverse impact on any existing properties. I don't believe it is within our authority to deny this type of rezoning. Therefore, I am requesting approval of this rezoning.

Mr. Bill Berkley explained the proposal and stated this project will be an auto service center that will offer service while people go to the airport. It will be a delivery service for the airport.

Councilmember Ponder stated this area is a traffic bottle neck and it may not be required, but that he would appreciate it personally if the developer would consider a turn lane for safety factors.

Councilmember Ponder moved and Mr. Cochran seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-565

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-083U-14 is **APPROVED (6-0)**:

The CS district is appropriate on this property adjacent to a retail shopping center and a State-owned institution (Clover Bottom hospital and school). Clover Bottom will provide a boundary between the commercial around the Interstate 40/Stewarts Ferry Pike interchange and the residential uses to the west."

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 5-85-P-14 is given **APPROVAL OF THE PUD CANCELLATION (6-0)**..The following condition applies:

Approval of the PUD cancellation by the Metropolitan Council."

77-87-P-03

Nocturne Forest
Map 70-3, Parcels 2 and 40
Subarea 3 (1998)
District 2 (Black)

A request to revise the preliminary plan for Phase Two and Three of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the northeast margin of Old Buena Vista Road, approximately 1,200 feet north of West Trinity Lane, classified RS15 (5 acres), to redesign a portion of the single-family lots in Phase Two currently under construction, and to redesign Phase Three, an undeveloped phase approved for 33 multi-family units to eliminate a street connection to Old Buena Vista Road, requested by Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., for Chateau Associates, LTD, owner. (Deferred from meeting of 6/8/00).

Mr. Leeman stated there is a previously approved final plan for the single family portion of this PUD, which provided the connection to Old Buena Vista. They are now requesting to revise the preliminary to create a cul-de-sac so Nocturne Forest Drive will not connect to Old Buena Vista and to redesign the undeveloped multi-family portion of the PUD so a private drive connects to Old Buena Vista, but the multi-family will not come through to the single family portion. Staff is recommending disapproval because it is not consistent with the approved preliminary plan and there are not topographic reasons or justifications not to connect Nocturne Forest Drive to Old Buena Vista. Staff feels a street connection will increase the safety by providing an alternate access point for residents and emergency vehicles.

Ms. Oglesby moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-566

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 77-87-P-03 is given **DISAPPROVAL (6-0):**

This plan is not consistent with the approved preliminary plan and there is no topographic or other property hardship to justify removing the street connection to Old Buena Vista Road. A street connection will increase public safety both for this PUD and the Chateau Valley PUD to the north by providing residents and emergency vehicles an alternative access point. Closure of this street would force 93 lots within this PUD to have one access point via Whites Creek Pike.”

MANDATORY REFERRALS

2000M-027G-04
Council Bill BL2000-297
Closure of Portion of Lawrence Avenue
Map 43-1, Parcels 72, 74-77, 87, 96, 220 and 260
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 9 (Dillard)

A council bill to close a portion of Lawrence Avenue beginning at Pierce Road and extending to the eastern most portion of parcel 87 on tax map 43-1 between Pierce Road and Palmer Avenue, requested by Mike Burns, Burns & Associates, Inc., appellant for Charles Rhoten, abutting property owner. (Portion of easements to be retained and abandoned).

Ms. Regen stated this mandatory goes along with the proposal for Shannon Estates presented earlier. Staff is recommending approval subject the plat for Shannon Estates being recorded and the easements being retained for a 10 inch sewer line. All reviewing agencies have recommended approval and the Council bill

has been amended to require the easements be retained and the plat must be recorded before the closure could take effect.

Mr. Manier moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which carried unanimously to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2000-567

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (6-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-027G-04."

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Legislative update

PLATS PROCESSED ADMINISTRATIVELY

June 8, 2000 through June 21, 2000

- 99S-218U CUMBERLAND BEND BUSINESS PARK, Section 3, 2nd Revision**
Revise common access and public utility easement
- 2000S-172U SOUTHLAKE, Section 3 , Resubdivision of Lots 19 and 20**
Reconfigures two platted lots
- 2000S-176U HARPETH VALLEY OFFICE PARK, Resubdivision Lots 6 and 7**
Combines two lot into one lot
- 2000S-177G JANELLE MANOR**
Plat a 2 acre parcel as one lot
- 2000S-194G GENE SMITH SUBDIVISION, Section 2**
Plat a 2 acre parcel as one lot
- 2000S-210G JEFF MONSON AND ELAINE SINNER ONE LOT SUBDIVISION**
Plat a 5 acre parcel as one lot

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, upon motion made, seconded and passed, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Minute Approval:

This 6th day of July, 2000