

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 13, 2022

**1. Organization**

1.1. Call To Order

Chairman Charlie Goatz reconvened the July Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbia to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was held in Council Chambers at City Hall.

1.2. Roll Call

Quorum present and included the following:

Present were: Mr. Charlie Goatz  
Mr. Thomas Hutto  
Mr. Randy McBroom  
Mayor Chaz Molder  
Mr. Ray Pace

Absent were: Dr. Rose McClain  
Councilman Ken Wiles

Other attendees: Mr. Austin Brass, City Planner  
Mr. Glenn Harper, City Engineer  
Mr. Paul Keltner, Director of Development Services  
Mr. Tony Massey, City Manager  
Mr. Kevin McCarthy, Planning Associate II  
Mrs. Sandra Richardson, Secretary  
Mr. Tim Tisher, City Attorney  
Mr. Douglas Toney, Assistant Engineer

1.3. Welcome Of Visitors/Rules Of Conduct

1.4 Acknowledgement of Official Communications of the Columbia City Council on annexation and zoning.

Mr. Keltner stated that the first item was for second consideration, Ordinance 4400 which is an Ordinance to replace the current Zoning Ordinance which was deferred until tomorrow night's meeting. The item concerning the Engineering Standards and Specifications final consideration was approved. The first consideration for the rezoning of 1221 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street from a R-20, to RS-6 was approved to move to tomorrow nights meeting.

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 13, 2022

1.5 Approval of Minutes:

The June minutes were presented for approval. Mayor Molder moved to approve with Mr. Hutto seconding. The minutes were approved with a vote of five to zero.

1.6 Review of Bonds And Letters of Credit:

City Engineer Glenn Harper reported that all letters of credit are in order, or in the process of being updated.

**2. Consent**

*Chairman Goatz requested to move Items 2 & 5 to the Discussion items. Later clarified as items 2 & 4 moved to discussion.*

**2.1 Case #22-0123**

**Request from John Franks for final plat approval of Polk Place Phase 3 consisting of 62 lots.**

**2.3 Case # 22-0129**

**Request from Joseph Ahler for final plat approval at 1001 South Main Street consisting of three lots at 1001 and 1003 South Main Street and 106 East Ninth Street.**

**2.5 Case # 22-0148**

**Request from McNeely Civil Engineering for final PUD master plan approval of The Preserve at Drumwright subdivision located at Tax Map 51 Parcels 34 and 34.01 .**

**2.6 Case #22-0150**

**Request from SEC, Inc for final PUD master plan approval of Ridgeview Oaks, formerly Kinloch Village, at Tax Map 74 Parcel 42 off Tom Sharp Road.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report.

**Discussion:**

*Mr. Goatz moved to approve the consent items subject to Technical Comments. Mayor Molder stated for clarity the motion is to approve the consent agenda with the exception*

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

*of items 2 and 4. Mayor Molder seconded the motion. Consent items were approved with items 2 and 4 being moved to the discussion items. Motion to approve passed five to zero.*

**3.Discussion:**

**2.2 Case #22-0136**

**Request from T-Square Engineering for final plat approval of Homestead at Carter's Station 5.2B consisting of 38 lots off Chaplins Trace.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. This was a staff request to remove this item from the consent agenda to the discussion items. Staff received a late notification that the letter of credit the surety for the final plat has not been sent to our office yet. Staff would like to request this item be deferred.

**Discussion:**

Mr. McBroom moved to defer with Mr. Hutto seconding. Motion to defer passed five to zero.

**2.4 Case #22-0106**

**Request from Clint Camp for final PUD Master plan approval of McClure Farms consisting of 431 units at 2504 and 2524 Nashville Highway.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. This is a follow-up to the preliminary plan that was approved by the Commission back in October 2021. It encompasses two properties. Reviewing this master plan with the previous master plan it does look to comply with each other. There were questions about buffering along Nashville Highway.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Travis Bonar, WA Engineering was present to answer questions. Mr. Goatz stated that he wanted to discuss the specifics of the residential piece. Lots one and two rear faces Nashville Highway and he would like to see additional buffering and landscaping. Additional discussion included buffer, landscaping, softening the back of the homes, Mr. Goatz asked Mr. Bonar if he understood his request in reference to adding additional buffer. He stated that he did. Additional discussion included requesting a burm on Nashville Highway. Mr. Goatz moved to approve subject to his requests, and Mr. McBroom seconded the motion. Motion to approve with request passed five to zero.

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 13, 2022

*III. Discussion Items – Group One – 4:00 p.m.*

**3.1 Case #22-0069**

**Request from Andrew Ethridge for: Comprehensive plan amendment to change the future land use designation from Suburban Neighborhood to Suburban Corridor for approximately 405.5 acres; Annexation of approximately 405.5 acres with a plan of services; and Rezoning with approval of a residential Preliminary PUD Master Plan for: 338.2 acres RS-6 PUD; and 77.5 acres RM-1 PUD, being Tax Map 112 Parcels 2.03, 9, 10.01, And 10.07 off Trotwood Avenue.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner presented the details of the staff report.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Andrew Ethridge, Willow Branch Homes, and Jay Easter, and Brandon Baxter, both with Ragan Smith, were present to answer questions. Discussion included this is the old Zion site that they are proposing, located between Columbia and Mt. Pleasant, the frontage is already in the City of Columbia, they surround Ridley Park, and Ashwood Manor, suburban neighborhood, suburban corridor, mixed use, honoring buffer requirements, proposing five different products, alley loaded townhomes, front load townhomes, new entrance to the park, amenity center, flattening out the curve, donations, Type A buffer, Type B buffer, trail connection point, community center, mail kiosk, setbacks, townhomes back up to the railroad tracks, diverse mix of homes, building within eight to nine years, and traffic study submitted. Mr. Brandon Baxter discussed the traffic study process. Additional discussion included the number of lights warranted, helping the entrance of Ridley Park, Zion Road, and Old Zion Road. Mr. Bruce Peden, 6604 St. Johns Way, in Ashwood Manor, expressed concerns with the connection to Yeatman Lane, staff report page 8 states the higher density housing proposed by the applicant is not consistent without a plan amendment. He also pointed out age six referencing the requests to amend the plan are often small-scale, and he also referenced item three on page nine, safety and traffic concerns. Mr. Charles Craig, 6504 Breckenridge Cove, expressed concerns with the danger, and recommend denial. Mr. John White, 6503 Breckenridge Cove, expressed concerns with not needing that connection to Yeatman Lane, traffic congestion, speeding, hill, and he doesn't want to be annexed. Mr. Lee Bourque, 6758 Polk Lane expressed concerns with this project affecting the quality of life, learning from other cities, if higher density is allowed consider the character of Columbia, keep it suburban, and traffic. Randy Butler, 6510 Breckenridge Cove, expressed concerns with using an existing road, density, stoplight, not being able to turn left

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

on Trotwood, buffer, judge what quality of life will be, and the right kind of growth. Douglas Chatman, 6415 Yeatman Lane, expressed concerns with notification, 7.2 cannot be bulldozed flat, he feels the plan is unworkable with what is there, the matrix, and design criteria. Mr. David Baker, 2685 Hampshire Pike, shared concerns with environmental issues, schools, irresponsible growth and getting a plan for our schools. Mr. Bob Graham shared concerns for infrastructure, which are the need for Maury County landfill, and downtown parking. Mr. Michael Fulbright, Maury County School Board, stated that the School Board neither favor nor opposes the development. The developers have made an offer to the School Board. The School Board doesn't go out and initiate the conversation with the developers. He also stated that he is a concerned citizen and would like to see this project done right, and yesterday he had the pleasure of attending the Technical Committee meeting and he thinks that he discovered a lot of the miscommunication is the fact that information is not getting to the Planning Council and the School Director is being left out as well. What he did was look at the development and tell what schools were on this end and tell the capacity of the schools and that works for right now, but when these houses are build three to five years down the road those numbers and totals will be different. He would like to sit down with the Commission and decide what useful information to present to the Planning Counsel. He also stated that he was here yesterday and they did send in the comment forms that accompany each of these developments. He wanted to point out through increased communication, looking at what they do and how they present the numbers we will have a lot more success and a lot more control over our growth. Mr. Goatz, Chairman stated that he is definitely open for that meeting. Mr. Goatz stated that he may have to seek council to see how to proceed on the meeting. Mr. Tisher stated that the Commission can designate Mr. Goatz as the person to meet with Mr. Fulbright. Mr. Fulbright stated that he wanted to give useful information. Mayor Molder stated that one of the good things is that we now have an open line for communication. He stated that maybe reaching out to other schools to see what they are doing, because it seems in addition to having our own communication line we ought to also see what other counties are doing. He also stated that Maury is not the only county that is growing in the middle Tennessee area, in fact there are counties that are growing in a faster rate than Maury, Sumner County, and Wilson County. We also know that Williamson County has the impact fee which we all know that the conversations they had there. He also stated what is Sumner County doing and how are they managing their growth. They have more growth than us, and is it true that their county residents are now basically saying that in some ways the city needs to pay for the county schools, due to the City growth. He stated that he would like to know what other counties are doing. Mayor Molder also stated that this conversation will continue thanks to Mr. Fulbright, the Chairman, and City staff. Further discussion included looking at the developments of the Technical planning meeting, looking at capacity, growth curtails significantly All of a sudden, we cut that off altogether which is what some suggested in regards to response to the growth that we are having what does that mean. What is this community going to look like ten years from now, over growing, continue to thrive, finding the

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

July 13, 2022

balance, and going forward together. Mr. McBroom stated that we have three entrances and are they all needed. Mr. Harper stated anytime that there is a public roadway that stubs to the property line staff will recommend that they interconnect with the adjoining development. Additional discussion included access to a signal, giving another entrance for emergency responses, stubbing for future connection, staff recommends but it doesn't mean

that it has to be done, city road going to a county road, everyone from the city is also from the county, and if the Commission wishes to remove the entrance it could be a part of the motion. Mr. Harper stated that staff does recommend the connection. Further discussion included forty-nine acres. If the school doesn't want it this will be given to Ridley Park. A proposal of forty-five hundred dollars to the school system which will roughly be four point five million dollars, this is unique it was volunteered. They also discussed the Ridley Park entrance, intersection round about, cul-de-sac, getting the pool, commercial to benefit the area, density, houses need to face Trotwood, bigger lots, keeping the consistency, only one pool, the location of the pool, matching up, the club house, the Beckett and the Biltmore have one car garages, garage door width, on street parking, the lots that bud up to Ashwood Manor could be larger, perception, lighting the current entrance way unable to do a light at Ridley Park, drag strip, trying to give another outlet for people to get out, signalize the roadway, unable to buy enough right-of-way, driving through a neighborhood to get to a school, congestion on Trotwood, The applicant asked if they could make a request to defer after a first motion has been made. Mr. Tisher stated that they cannot. The Commission can make a motion to defer, but the applicant cannot after a motion has been made. The applicant can make the request before a motion has taken place. If after one of the members makes a motion, another member can make a motion defer, but the applicant cannot. Mayor Molder stated that he appreciated the presentation, the fact that they are offering fifty acres, and a self imposed impact fee. He also stated that he felt that this development is a good start, but he is not quite there yet, and he support the motion to defer based on the comments that were heard from Mr. McBroom. He also stated on the density piece one of the things about the growth in Columbia is that it has allowed us to be a little more selective in product of what we are willing to approve. He stated that he thinks that townhomes are becoming harder and harder to get approval before this Commission, and he think for a good reason because the Commission has seen a lot of townhomes that have spurted up over the last several years. The Commission has had that phase of our growth, and he believe that our growth is transitioning to a new, less dense especially in that area. This project is in the right area for growth, south of Columbia is right for this growth. This will ultimately be a developed property, and he have seen with other projects that the final product is always better, because of the public input. He also stated that he looks forward to seeing this project evolve into a better final project ultimately that he can envision supporting. Mr. Goatz stated that this is not an area of change, and density, and amenity, and Cooper Street cul-de-sac is a concern of his. He also stated that he applauded the applicant in what they are trying to do for

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

the school system, but it does seem weird to him and he feels that it would create some traffic stacking off Trotwood. Mr. McBroom stated that it is not known if they are proposing a high school or what on the fifty donated acres, and the applicant stated that it would not be a high school, and the smaller schools have less traffic. Further discussion including how everyone knows it will not be a high school, parking will have to be included, school being in a neighborhood, donation of the land, on street parking, alley loading, larger sidewalks, corridor, connection, turning left on

Trotwood will be impossible ten years from now, Mt. Pleasant is going to grow, misunderstanding the traffic study, the improvements, and lights. Mr. Tisher stated that based on what have been allowed in the past he recommend that it be gated in that way there is not a house there and eventually if you do that it is available, because if the houses are put there it cannot be available. That way in the future if it is wanted, it is there, and if you don't it's not. He also stated that at least the Commission are not closing the door, and this Commission have required it in neighborhoods in the past, and at least this way the door is being left open. Mr. Pace stated that this board wants something there that will look nice, sidewalks, and more than one pool. The applicant requested to defer. Mr. Goatz moved to defer based on the applicant's request, with Mr. McBroom seconding. Motion to defer passed five to zero. The applicant asked what study session they deferred to. Mr. Tisher stated that you were deferred to the next regular meeting.

### **3.2 Case #22-0105**

**Request from Denton Floyd Real Estate for annexation with a plan of services and rezoning to a high density under a residential preliminary PUD master plan consisting of 308 units for a portion of property at 1887 Nashville Highway, being a 38 acres portion of the property.**

#### **Staff Recommendation:**

The applicant has requested to defer this item. The section for review is 3.18 and 3.20 of the Zoning Ordinance is listed for the Commission's review.

#### **Discussion:**

Eric Criswell, Civil Engineer, and Jerry Tally, were present to answer questions. Discussion included amenity, meeting City code, retaining wall, split level buildings, material, and no traffic engineer present. Mr. Tally stated that this is Class A, and the amenity proposal is club house, fitness center, and a upscale large pool. The buildings themselves are hardie board siding and brick. They have split levels buildings, and they have engaged a structural engineer for the design. There will be retaining walls onsite, other amenities will be a dog park, playground, and landscape. Kristie McCarty, 1107 Johnson Road, expressed concerns with access, property backing up to the creek, traffic, traffic study, lacking in school, lacking in grocery store, and short notice. Mr. Harper gave the traffic study. Mr. McBroom stated coming down the hill if a traffic light is not

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

wanted there is that part of what can be taken into consideration whether the Commission passes or fails this project. Mr. Harper stated that the light is warranted. Further discussion included impact, design, back side four story high, the height variance request, based on average grade, the design is pretty basic, variances, the buildable area, the purpose of the slope, run off safety, slope ordinance, longevity, potential hazard of that, and higher elevation. Mr. Keltner stated that the variance that is being requested for this particular height goes from thirty-five feet to fifty. The reduction of setback off of

Nashville Highway from one hundred to fifty, as well as increase the units per building from twenty-four to twenty-eight, and the increase in the builder areas on the steeper slopes. Additional discussion included the reduced setback variance from one hundred feet may have been a miscommunication. The request was to allow for parking on the side of the building, the height of the building remaining at fifty point five. Mr. Goatz discussed the staff comments and reference 3.18.7B item 6 in reference to the stub road request. Mr. Harper stated that staff recommended that the property stub the road toward the creek for future development. The applicant did agree to do that, but TVA has prohibited them from filling it. Mr. Keltner stated because of the close proximity. Further discussion included private streets, driveway entrance public, the grade, all are maxed out at ten percent, city responsibility, three lanes pulling in and out, city requirements, property management, maximizing density, high density, variance request based on the slopes, topography, and run off issues. Mr. Goatz stated Ordinance 3.18.7B there will be an adverse affect upon property owners, and doesn't conform to zoning ordinance. Based on those two he made a motion to deny the request with Mr. McBroom seconding. Motion to deny passed five to zero.

**3.3 Case #22-0125**

**Request from Seth Howell for preliminary plat approval of Hampshire Hills consisting of 41 lots off Avalon Drive.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. Staff find the plat compliant subject to Technical comments.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Seth Howell was present to answer questions. Discussion included storm water has changed a little bit. Mr. Goatz referenced the City Engineer comments on the staff report in regards to the City Engineer's approval of a road segment longer than permitted under the Engineering Standards, and Specifications. Mr. Harper stated that six hundred and fifty feet is the maximum length for a deadend road, but due to the fact that the property is long, narrow in nature, and stub out, staff will support that request. Additional discussion included gravity, and the applicant is willing to do what upgrades that are needed. Mr. McBroom moved to



**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

approve subject to Technical comments, with Mr. Hutto seconding. Motion to approve passed five to zero.

**3.4 Case #22-0122**

**Request from McNeely Civil Engineering for preliminary plat approval of The Preserve at Drumwright subdivision consisting of 111 lots off Nashville Highway located at Tax Map 51 Parcels 34 and 34.01.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. Staff does find the preliminary plat compliant with the master plan subject to Technical comments.

**Discussion:**

Mr. McNeely was present to answer questions. This request had to follow the plan as they have done. Mayor Molder moved to approve, with Mr. Pace seconding. Motion to approve passed five to zero subject to Technical comments.

**IV. 10-Minute Break**

**5.1 Case #22-0126**

**Request from Civil Design Consultants, LLC for site plan approval of The Legacy at Highland Estates located off Willis Way and Porter Circle.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the request.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Jared Gray, Civil Design Consultant, was present to answer questions. Discussion included height, setbacks, buffer areas, landscape architect, straight zone, amenities, one full lot of the RS-20 will be dedicated to the amenities. Mr. Marc Munkres, 940 Crosby Ct. expressed concerns with Willis Way access, no sidewalks, kids on the cul-de-sac, safety issues, Parkmere is the only road coming in to this location, and it is seventeen feet wide. He asked how will they pull these mobile homes in, and had concerns about location, people park on the street, safety issue, no ingress and egress, the property is a solid rock, and blasting. Mr. Phil Bossingham, 955 Crosby Ct., expressed concerns with the creek area, and the tall tower in the middle of the development. Mr. Paul Brown, 424 Willis Way, express concerns with cul-de-sac, cars parking on the side of the road, children, safety and integrity of the neighborhood. Mr. Gray stated that in reference to blasting they do have some rock and they do a pre-blast survey, and a pre-

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

construction survey and if they have any issues with the roads they will have to take care of that. He also stated that on their plan shortly after entering their property they have an intersection that will be a stop condition. Cars can go down before they get to the stop sign. They will be trying to keep it from being a race track to get to a property. For the private drives they do have sidewalks. Additional discussion included stormwater, buffering, the creek, topography, the private roads, steepness, HOA, this is a separate piece of property, the only way into this property is Willis Way, the amenities will be adding into the RS-20 section, the zoning, landscape buffer, and the plans will be compliant. Mayor Molder asked for clarity when the Commission have a site plan and rezoning application. Mr. Tisher stated that you

have specified criteria under the rezone, and under a site plan there is a site plan criteria. Mr. Keltner stated rezone, annexation and PUD master plan all have things that you are looking at and reviewing, regards to it actually an amendment to your Ordinance. When the property is zoned the current zoning, they have assumed their right based upon a zoning, and what they will do. Like any other subdivision they will look at the standards in regards to the subdivision regulations and zoning. If they meet those standards then there is no review criteria other than the standards themselves. Mayor Molder stated even if safety is a concern for the traffic issues for squeezing this kind of density in this recognizing that before the development around this development had occurred he could see there being a much easier way for him to get around on this one. But now it is like it is so late in time of being developed after all these other properties around it has been developed. It seems like it is just being squeezed in, in a way that is going to create some safety concerns. Mr. Keltner stated that it is not large enough for a traffic impact study to say it was at high risk of service, this project was a small enough service where it did not require that. Mayor Molder asked if a traffic study was needed to say that there are concerns. Mr. Keltner stated no, when it comes out staff give them time to address that. It's a safety issue, then that safety issue should be stated, but it is not a actual review criteria. The standards that Commission is looking at will help to address all of those items. Mr. Tisher stated that the traffic study would address those, and they will have the opportunity to address it. Mayor Molder asked if they could require a traffic study for this project even though it is not required as matter of right in the ordinance. He also stated that he has a hard time to see how you would not have a major issue with trying to squeeze that amount of density. Mr. Harper stated that there are some instances where a traffic study could be required but the traffic study will not look at the narrowness of the road. Additional discussion included radius, variance, and access. Mr. Tisher stated that when a property is zoned property they have the right to build meeting our standards, regulations, and constructions standards. He also stated that in the zoning don't get bogged down on the plan you may be shown, and then rezoned, because once an applicant has property rezoned they can build anything that the particular zoning category allows. Mayor Molder stated that they now have vested rights based upon the zoning at the classification that this property already is. Mr. Tisher stated that

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

they can build anything that is legally authorized in that building category. Mayor Molder asked if the Commission would be subjecting the City to legal liability if this request was denied, unless there was a basis. Mr. Tisher stated that he didn't know what kind of basis that you would could state. The reasoning for your denial is looking unfavorable, he stated that he couldn't advise that. Mayor Molder stated that his basis was going to be on safety concerns which he thought was always a basis that the Commission could utilize. Mr. Tisher stated that the applicant has the opportunity to address a safety concern if you point out the safety concern to him as long as it is within the zoning category. Mr. Goatz stated but the applicant is requesting a variance for that. Mr. Tisher sated that you can deny the variance. Further discussion included it is an intersection, discussions about getting around the cell tower, and materially change the number of units. Mr. Tisher stated that the fact that the zoning is appropriate does not obligate the Commission to grant a variance. Mr. Gray stated that they resubmitted based on Technical comments. Mr. Harper stated that the curb around the cell tower does not meet standards. Mr. Tisher inquired if Mr. Harper was saying that there has not been a variance request. Mr. Harper stated no, not that he was aware of. Mr. Tisher stated you can deny based upon the comment that it does not meet the requirement, and then the applicant can redesign, and resubmit. You can deny if the request does not meet the requirement, they do have to meet all the requirements. You cannot deny based upon the zoning. Mayor Molder asked the applicant hearing that if he would be willing to defer and bring it back addressing the issue. He also stated that ultimately he do not really believe that this is a good product based upon safety concerns, based upon the lateness and time this property being developed, but he also believe that this is a situation that the applicant is going to succeed based upon legal issues; however, while the Commission can deny he is also cognitive of that could be an exercise of utility, because the applicant has already heard what they can do and come back with. He also stated that he wanted to see if it is better for them to defer and come back. He felt that would go a long way versus the Commission denying it. Further discussion included deferring is the applicant choice, compatibility, zoning classification under the new zoning code, remaining the same having vested rights in that classification. Mayor Molder made a motion to defer for purposes of cleaning it up from what was discussed, with Mr. McBroom seconding. Motion to defer passed four to one, with Mr. Goatz voting nay.

**5.2 Case #22-0133**

**Request from Kimley Horn for Hampshire Pike Mixed Use multifamily site development plan approval of 360 units off Hampshire Pike.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. The standard for review is laid out in the staff report for this Commission. The applicant has provided the renderings that will give you the details for the architecture for that. Staff review the

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

July 13, 2022

multifamily site plan and finds it within the standards subject to any Technical comments.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Josh Rowland, Kimley Horn, was present to answer questions. Mr. Pace abstained from this request. Mayor Molder inquired about the similarities of what was provided. Mr. Keltner stated that the multifamily does look very similar the only difference is there is an open area where there were single family homes shown, and now it is a open that will be the only difference that he has seen. Mayor stated in essence they reduced the density or they increase it by clearing the home and putting it somewhere else. Mr. Rowland stated that he thinks the question asked was in regards to the preliminary plat the reason they are not plotting lots at this time they don't have a specific builder in mind to size the lots. They did set expectation at the rezoning for those lots on the eastern boundary to the western

boundary property that they will be roughly ten thousand square feet. Additional discussion included infrastructure, public right-of-way, large parcels, traffic impact study, exhibits, intensity, concept plan, six intersections were reviewed in the traffic study, the second page list the improvements, proposed improvements, it is within the City's best interest to go ahead and propose a full signal entrance at the driveway entrance, widening of the intersection, overall site development, the signal will get built with the first project, and signal modifications. Mr. McBroom stated for clarification Mr. Rowland said after the multi-family, after six hundred and twenty-four units were built the last Certificate of Occupancy you will have the light in correct. Mr. Rowland stated that the multi-family before you tonight is three hundred and sixty. Further discussion included putting the light in quicker, City recommendation, staff requested the light to go in last, state road, TDOT, blocking Cherry Springs connection, building the road first, widen the road, build the turn lane, the signal will go in with the first project, timeline, within two years, three years before the last unit will be put in, fifteen buildings, club house, working with the County to make connection. Mr. Goatz asked if having the traffic light warrant connectivity at Cherry Springs. Mr. Harper stated yes, with the stipulation that the connection is blocked until the signal is up and functional. Additional discussion included traffic improvement that was warrantied, traffic comparison, constraints, flood plains, topography, additional traffic, changing the medians, open to other types of improvements that are more feasible, and traffic at the bridge. Mayor Molder asked Mr. Harper his thoughts about the bridge on James Campbell. Mr. Harper stated that the turn lane is warranted today, the development will generate traffic, and it will be very difficult to construct. Mayor Molder inquired about the traffic study identifying the issues. Mr. Harper stated, that is something staff has asked outside of the traffic study. Why can we not put this right turn lane. Further discussion included major project, and Citywide improvement. Mr. Rowland stated that they will gladly look at the suggestions from staff. Mayor Molder asked what are our checks to make sure those conversations continue. Do the Commission state in the motion

**City of Columbia**  
**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 13, 2022

that staff recommendation be followed with respect to traffic improvement as a whole. Mr. Harper, City Engineer, stated that he felt that it would be best in both cases the signal and the improvements at James Campbell, and Hampshire Pike be tied to a unit count. Further discussion included how many buildings will they build at a time. They will start with one or two and continue until the project is complete. After nine buildings they will have a light. Discussion also included run split phase, turning on the median is tight, slowing down, opening the median, moving through in a safer way, improve function and the safety pattern. Mr. Goatz stated that this does not address the widening of the bridge which will require the right turn lane. Mr. Harper stated that the right turn lane is along James Campbell, and Hampshire it is not over the bridge. Mr. Roland asked Mr. Harper if they were in agreement of that improving those medians is going to be a sufficient remedy at Hampshire Pike, and James Campbell and you can put that as the improvement in the traffic study versus the turn lane. Mr. Harper stated yes that is what we are looking at we can still do other improvements. Mr. Toney stated to be clear the modification of that signal will be included in what staff is talking about,

not just the physical relocation of the median. By changing the signal phasing there may be some electrical equipment requirement with that. Additional discussion included commercial lots, two building types, open stair rails, three story garden style, unit access, open window type, frontage side, three bedrooms units with the balcony on the corner, character of the area, different elevations, original submittal, club house layout, open gable on the left side, balcony on the corner on both ends, and design diversity, and consistency. Mayor Molder moved to defer for these two items to be clarified, with Mr. McBroom seconding. Motion to defer passed four to zero, with Mr. Pace abstaining.

**5.3 Case #22-0131**

**Request from Kimley-Horn for preliminary plat approval of Hampshire Pike Mixed Use development consisting of 18 lots.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Josh Rowland, Kimley Horn, was present to answer question. Discussion included consistent, site plan, road modification, Cherry Springs, connectivity, the original concept plan, and adding on. Mr. McBroom moved to approve with Mayor Molder seconding. Motion to approve passed four to zero with Mr. Pace abstaining.

**5.4 Case #22-0135**

**Request from Kimley-Horn for rezoning with approval of a Preliminary PUD Master Plan from RS-40 (Low Density Residential) and GCS (General Commercial**

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

July 13, 2022

**Services) to mixed use Planned Unit Development consisting of 362 residential units  
an detail space being Tax Map 51 Parcels 19.20 and 20.01 located at the intersection  
of Nashville Highway and Greens Mill Road.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Rowland, Kimley Horn, was present to answer questions. Discussion included staff requesting a deferral, advertisement issue, and Architectural Design Review. Mr. McBroom moved to defer, with Mr. Hutto seconding. Motion to defer passed four to zero with Mr. Pace abstaining.

**5.5 Case #22-0107**

**Request from Adam Bledsoe for approval of a Preliminary Plat for Phase 1 of  
McClure Farms consisting of 70 lots at 2504 Nashville Highway.**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Keltner gave the details of the staff report. Staff finds the request to be compliant subject to Technical comments.

**Discussion:**

Discussion included intersection, fire hydrant, improvements, and tight road. Mr. Goatz stated in this case right here with what the Commission agreed on before with the addition of landscaping buffering and all of the stuff in his motion to approve subject to Technical comments, and subject to the agreed upon landscape buffers amended from previously. Mr. McBroom inquired if the intersection needs to be brought in there where you turn in and everybody hit the curb, almost hitting the fire hydrant. Didn't they say they were going to fix that. Mr. Harper stated that is one of the improvements that they were going to make. Mr. McBroom asked if that was still good, and Mr. Harper confirmed. Mr. Goatz moved to approve, with Mr. McBroom seconding. Motion to approve passed five to zero.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mayor Molder thanked staff for the good work in getting these two meetings together. He also thanked everybody for their input and patience. He said also a special shout out to Ms. Sandra Richardson who doesn't always get the appreciation, but she has been here very diligently throughout these meetings as well, and we appreciate her as well as all other staff. Thanks for the good work these last several meetings.

**City of Columbia**  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 13, 2022

**5. ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. McBroom made the motion to adjourn, with Mayor Molder seconding the motion. Motion to adjourn passed five to zero. Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

DRAFT