Town of Arlington

5854 Airline Road, Arlington, TN 38002



Planning Commission April 18, 2016 6:30 P.M. Meeting Minutes

I. Invocation

The opening prayer was led by Aldtric Johnson.

II. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Russ Campbell called the meeting to order and noted that a quorum was present.

Present

Russ Campbell, Chairman Glen Bascom, Secretary Oscar Brooks, Alderman Don Hinkle Aldtric Johnson Lee Mills

Others Present

Angela Reeder, Town Planner Gerald Lawson, Town Attorney Jason Allen, Engineer See list

Absent

Tommy White - excused

III. Approval of Minutes from the February 16, 2016 Meeting

Motion: Don Hinkle made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2016 meeting. Oscar Brooks seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Comments from Citizens

Chairman Campbell invited anyone wishing to address the Commission to please come forward and state his/her name and address for the record.

There were no comments.

V. Old Business

A. Other as Properly Presented

There was no old business to come before the Commission.

VI. New Business

A. <u>Airline Road PD, Phase 1 – Southeast corner of Milton Wilson Boulevard and Airline Road – Final Plat Revision</u>

Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who provided an analysis (on file) and stated this is a request for a revision to the Final Plat for Phase 1 of the Airline Road PD. Cara Martin, representative from Pickering Firm, is requesting to replace a previous six (6) lot subdivision with a seven (7) lot subdivision by dividing Lot 2 into Lots 2A and 2B. The seven (7) lots meet the minimum lot size, dimension, and access requirements for nonresidential lots in the Shopping Center (SC) Zoning District. Staff recommended approval of the request, subject to Staff conditions and any other conditions levied by the Planning Commission.

Main Motion: Oscar Brooks made a motion to approve the revision to the final plat for Phase 1 of the Airline Road PD, subject to Staff conditions and added conditions levied by the Planning Commission. Don Hinkle seconded the motion.

Don Hinkle asked Staff whether the change would make two (2) separate buildings instead of one (1) large strip center. Ms. Reeder explained that the building would not be separated, but would be on different lots with zero (0') foot setbacks. The existing Kroger on Highway 70 did something similar when it was built. Jerry Caldwell, representative from Pickering Firm, explained that a grade break of approximately three (3') feet where the invisible property line will be and each lot would have the opportunity of separate ownership. Chairman Campbell called for further discussion, and hearing none, he called for a vote on the main motion.

Vote on Motion: The motion carried unanimously.

Conditions of Approval:

Standard Conditions:

- S-1. It is found that the application as presented and with the conditions of approval meets the provisions of the Town of Arlington Subdivision Regulations, the Town of Arlington Zoning Ordinance, and any other applicable regulations, and the project shall be constructed in accordance with those regulations.
- S-2. The Final Plat shall conform to all requirements of the Town of Arlington Subdivision Regulations.
- S-3. The developer shall provide the Town with a copy of the Final Plat using state plane coordinate system with NAD 27 or NAD 83 datum on disk or CD in a generally accepted format at the time the Final Plat is presented for recording.
- S-4. The applicant's design professional shall address all Final Plat mark-ups prior to recording the Final Plat.

Project Specific Conditions:

- P-1. Approval of the Final Plat is contingent upon approval of the Construction Plans.
- P-2. All conditions of the Planned Development Overlay, Construction Plan approval, and Final Plat approval shall be added to the plat.
- P-3. A five-foot utility easement shall be provided along the boundary of each parcel.
- P-4. The development agreement approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen is required, including posting all development fees for the subdivision.
- P-5. The owner/developer shall execute a revised Certificate of Ownership and Dedication for the Final Plat to address specific issues raised by the sewer lines shown on the plat being within a public easement.

B. Decorative Street Light Requirement Discussion (Non-Voting)

Chairman Campbell recognized Angela Reeder, Town Planner, who provided an analysis (on file) and advised that this is a non-voting discussion item regarding the street light requirements within the Town of Arlington Subdivision Regulations. The regulations set forth minimum

standards for developers of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. A portion of the regulations handles utility requirements in new subdivisions, and, with regards to streetlights, developers are required to pay for the installation of lights both in and abutting their projects. The most recent update to these regulations was in July 2011, and a part of that update added language that specifically called for Green Post Top fixtures or Beale Street fixtures to be used in all subdivisions and developments. Other than the obvious aesthetic differences, there is a price difference between light standards that is incurred by the developer, as well as a difference in the number of poles required due to the pole height differences. Since the amendment, several developments have been approved with the conditions to meet these requirements. In February, the developer of Windsor Place, 1st Addition requested an amendment of his approval to authorize the use of cobrahead streetlights to mirror the adjacent Windsor Place development, as they will be joined into one HOA. The Planning Commission (PC) approved the request and expressed interest in addressing the situation in the future to determine if an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations was needed. Currently, our Code requires decorative lights in new developments, but gives the PC authority to approve other designs for development. Staff is requesting more direction on the Commission's intent, and will bring back any amendment per their request.

Don Hinkle asked Staff what the cost difference to the Town was for each type of streetlight. Ms. Reeder explained that the Town pays a nine (9%) percent maintenance and replacement fee per pole per month to MLGW, so, the more poles there are throughout Town, the higher our bill is. Lee Mills explained that he likes the fact that cobrahead lights were approved for Windsor Place, Phase 1, and felt that they should continue to be in phases and additions of subdivisions already constructed, e.g. Villages at White Oak. He also asked whether the Town had any Dark Sky Lighting Requirements to limit the amount of light allowed in certain areas. According to Ms. Reeder, the Town's Design Guidelines require lights in developments to be full cutoff, which the suggested Post Top streetlights somewhat goes against. Chairman Campbell asked if there was a difference in the number of poles for each light, and Ms. Reeder explained that there are approximately seven to nine (7-9) Post Top poles for every five (5) cobrahead poles. Gerald Lawson, Town Attorney, clarified that the developers pay for the installation of light poles, but the Town pays MLGW a 9% fee calculated by the number of each pole in Town. Chairman Campbell asked Staff what needed to be done in order to make the nonconforming

chairman Campbell asked Staff what needed to be done in order to make the nonconforming poles, that are currently required, conform to Town standards. Ms. Reeder stated that she had contacted MLGW to see if the lights could be shielded or if there was a different globe option that was already shielded, but she never heard back from her contact there.

Chairman Campbell asked Ms. Reeder for more information on the Beale Street lights. She explained that the spacing would be closer to that of the cobrahead, because of the height, but the cost is significantly higher than the other options. Glen Bascom stated that he heard that MLGW had a limited inventory for Beale Street lights, which caused further delays for developments. Ms. Reeder felt they were more appropriate for specific areas, e.g. historic districts, instead of lights within subdivisions throughout Town.

Seth MacDonald of 6373 Cambramill Drive felt that subdivisions currently under construction should follow the standards placed before them, but could understand the reasoning behind wanting to change the regulations.

The committee agreed for Staff to research the issue further and bring it back at a later date, after speaking with MLGW.

C. Other as Properly Presented

1. There was no new business to come before the Commission.

VII. Adjourn

Chairman Campbell called for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Oscar Brooks made a motion to adjourn. Don Hinkle seconded the motion.

Planning Commission April 18, 2016 Page 4

The motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:01 pm.

Minutes approved. Signed minutes on file at Town Hall.

Russ Campbell, Chairman	Date
	Data
Glen Bascom, Secretary Submitted By: Hannah Taylor	Date