

**MINUTES OF THE  
WILLIAMSON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 10, 2010**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

John Cain  
Don Crohan  
Susan Fisher  
Holli Givens  
John Lackey  
Steve Lane  
Pete Mosley  
Tom Murdic  
Paul Pratt, Jr.

**STAFF PRESENT**

Joe Horne, Community Development Director  
Mike Matteson, Planning Director  
Aaron Holmes, Planning Coordinator  
Robbie Hayes, Planner  
Lincoln Sweet, Planner  
Floyd Heflin, County Engineer  
William Andrews, Assistant to County Engineer  
Kristi Earwood, Attorney  
Sheila Myers, Administrative Assistant  
Lania Escobar, Secretary

The Williamson County Regional Planning Commission met in regular session Thursday, November 10, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Williamson County Administrative Complex. Commissioners Baldree, Sanders, and Walton were unable to attend.

Chairman Lackey called the meeting to order.

Mr. Horne made the following announcements:

1. The applicant for Item 27, request for Laurel Cove Phase 2 Preliminary Plat Continuation, has requested a deferral.
2. A community meeting to discuss the Leiper's Fork Small Area Study has been set for Tuesday, November 16, 2010. This meeting will be held at Hillsboro Elementary Middle School from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
3. The Community Development Department has a series of interactive training materials. They are available for viewing in the Community Development conference room and may also be checked out for home viewing. Certificates of Attendance for these materials are available from the Planning Department. All Planning Commission members are required to complete four (4) hours of continuing education each year.
4. The submittal deadline for the December 9, 2010 meeting will be Tuesday, November 16<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Holmes announced a series of three Public Workshops which will be held to present the public with Module 1 and Module 2 of the update to the Williamson County Zoning Ordinance. The times of all meetings will be from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The dates and locations are as follows:

1. Page Middle School, Monday, November 29, 2010 in the school cafeteria;
2. Burwood Community Center, Tuesday, November 30, 2010 at 5435 Carter's Creek Pike;
3. Grassland Middle School, Thursday, December 2, 2010 in the school cafeteria.

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:**

Chairman Lackey asked for a motion to consider the minutes of the October 14, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Crohan to approve the minutes as submitted and was seconded by Commissioner Givens. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**BONDS:**

1. **Arrington Retreat, Section 1** – Maintenance Bond for Water (N/CG) - \$40,500.  
**Recommendation:** Release the Bond.
2. **Arrington Retreat, Section 1** – Performance Bond for Landscaping - \$115,750.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
3. **Arrington Retreat, Section 1** – Performance Bond for Wastewater Treatment & Disposal System - \$137,800.  
**Recommendation:** Convert to Maintenance in the amount of \$137,800 for a period of two (2) years.
4. **Arrington Retreat, Section 1** – Performance Bond for Wastewater Collection System - \$171,900.  
**Recommendation:** Convert to Maintenance in the amount of \$51,570 for a period of two (2) years.
5. **Arrington Retreat, Section 1** – Performance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$360,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
6. **Bell Pond** – Maintenance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$50,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
7. **Belle Vista, Section 2** - Maintenance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$130,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
8. **Brienz Valley Addition, Section 2** – Performance Bond for Landscaping - \$4,800.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
9. **Brienz Valley Addition, Section 2** – Performance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$82,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
10. **Chardonnay, Section 1** - Performance Bond for Landscaping - \$80,900.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months and require completion or the bond could be called.
11. **Inns of the Cove, Section 1** - Performance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$575,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of one (1) year.
12. **Ivan Creek** - Performance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$375,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.

13. **Ivan Creek** - Performance Bond for Off-Site Roads Improvements - \$83,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of one (1) year.
14. **Owendale** - Maintenance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$110,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of one (1) year.
15. **Silver Stream Farm Amenity Center** – Maintenance Bond for Landscaping - \$2,800.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months and require completion or the bond could be called.
16. **Silver Stream Farm, Section 1B**– Performance Bond for Landscaping - \$35,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months and require completion or the bond could be called.
17. **Silver Stream Farm, Section 2**– Performance Bond for Landscaping - \$25,400.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months and require completion or the bond could be called.
18. **Silver Stream Farm, Section 2**– Maintenance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$90,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
19. **Silver Stream Farm, Section 5**– Maintenance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$80,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
20. **Silver Stream Farm, Section 5**– Performance Bond for Sewer (Metro) - \$15,000.  
**Recommendation:** Release the bond.
21. **Stag's Leap, Section 1** – Performance Bond for Off-Site Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$35,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.
22. **Stag's Leap, Section 2A** – Performance Bond for Roads, Drainage and Erosion Control - \$206,000.  
**Recommendation:** Extend in the current amount for a period of six (6) months.

There being no comments, Commissioner Murdic made a motion to accept Staff's recommendation. Commissioner Lane seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**ITEM 23**

**SITE PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW FOR SECURITY CENTRAL STORAGE (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL), ON 9.52 ACRES LOCATED ON CANNON DRIVE IN THE 8<sup>TH</sup> VOTING DISTRICT (5-2010-033)**

Mr. Holmes reviewed the background (see Staff report) recommending approval with the conditions as outlined in the October, 2010 Staff report. The conditions are as follows:

1. Execution of an Affidavit of Compliance to ensure continued adherence to Section 4520 (Z) of the Williamson County Zoning Ordinance, and the approved Site Plan (Attachment 21-1);
2. All signage be approved per Ordinance requirements;
3. An ARAP permit must be obtained from the State of Tennessee for the stream crossing;
4. Execution of a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement and submission of an Operation and Maintenance Plan for stormwater improvements; and
5. The posting of a Landscaping Bond in the amount of \$10,350 for landscaping improvements.
6. The entire facility shall be fenced and a revised site plan reflecting the fence shall be submitted for review.

Chairman Lackey asked Ms. Earwood to address the State of Tennessee's blasting requirements.

Ms. Earwood stated that based on her research, it is her opinion that the authority of the Planning Commission is pre-empted and superseded by state law, and does not have the authority to regulate or prohibit blasting through the zoning process.

Chairman Lackey noted the Public Hearing for this item was held at the October 14, 2010 meeting. He then asked for any comments from Commission members.

Ms. Earwood noted that the minutes from the October, 2010 meeting contain the comments that were made at the October meeting and these were included in the Commissioner's packets.

Ms. Dorris Allen, representing the applicant, stated they have submitted additional material on the blasting issue and their civil engineer is in attendance for technical questions. Also the professional engineer from VCE, Inc. is in attendance for technical questions concerning blasting.

Chairman Lackey asked what the symbols on the site map dated November 1, 2010 concerning blasting control evaluation referred to.

Mr. Hutchinson, from VCE, Inc., stated it identifies the buildings and houses inside the orange zone as being in the pre-blast zone and these homes and building would be inspected before the blasting begins.

Chairman Lackey stated there are eight (8) residences that will be inspected before blasting begins.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that was correct.

Chairman Lackey asked if the commercial buildings were included.

Mr. Hutchinson stated all of the buildings inside the orange pre-blast zone would be included. This includes commercial buildings, residential homes, rock walls and some common parking areas.

Commissioner Givens asked about the change in the fencing.

Mr. Adam Seger, Dale and Associates, representing the applicant stated per the zoning code, this use requires the entire area to be fenced. There is a decorative eight (8) foot wrought iron fence along the front of the property. On the North and West side there is eight (8) foot stockade fencing for privacy, and along the East and South borders there is the wide landscaping buffer with a vinyl coated chain link fence. This brings the use into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Givens asked how emergency vehicles would access this site.

Ms. Allen stated it depends on what the County's Emergency Management Department requires. One way works off of a "Yelp System" which operates off of the siren and is programmed into the computer to automatically open the gate. Another way is to provide a key box or provide emergency management with an access code.

Commissioner Givens stated she noticed on the pre-blast inspection it mentioned the damage claims reporting process but did not see the form in the documents provided. She asked what the process is if damage occurs.

Mr. Hutchinson stated the property owner would convey the information to VCE, Inc. and they would in turn convey the information to the excavating contractor that is conducting the blasting. He stated the excavating contractor has the damage process forms and that they carry liability insurance that would cover any damage.

Commissioner Givens asked if it would cover damage to septic systems.

Mr. Hutchinson stated it covers any damage. He stated he was asked to evaluate the concerns about damage to septic systems related to this particular project. Given the actual exposure distances from this project and the types of ways that blasting would have to impact it. He opined that based on his review of site, the blasting should have no effect the septic system.

Commissioner Givens stated she would like special attention paid to the septic issues.

Mr. Hutchinson stated this is addressed in the blasting report that was given to the Planning Commission under special provisions.

Chairman Lackey asked if a copy of the pre-blast survey would be provided to the owners.

Mr. Hutchinson stated it is mandated by law that a copy be given to the owners within three-hundred (300) feet of the project.

Chairman Lackey stated he felt it would be beneficial for the homeowner to have a copy of the pre-blast survey so they know where they stand as of the survey.

Ms. Earwood stated if the homeowner requests a copy of the pre-blast survey in writing, then one would have to be provided within a timely manner according to state law.

Commissioner Fisher asked for clarification of the hours of operation.

Ms. Allen stated the gate would be accessible to people with gate codes until 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Fisher stated she would like the facility to close at 7:00 p.m. because of the noise factor and proximity to the residence.

Chairman Lackey asked what time the facility would be open.

Ms. Allen stated the gate opens at 6:00 a.m. but the office doesn't open until 8:00 a.m.

Commissioner Givens asked what time the other businesses in that area, such as the Food Lion, close.

Ms. Allen stated the Food Lion closes at 9:00 p.m. She also stated it would be detrimental to their business to close at 7:00 p.m., because a lot of people need access to their units after 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Crohan asked for clarification that the facility would be open from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. each day seven days a week.

Ms. Allen stated on Sundays the office is closed but there would still be gate access for those hours.

Commissioner Crohan asked if the Planning Commission has any control over the hours of construction.

Ms. Earwood stated that Staff does not regulate the hours of construction but because this is a Conditional Use, the Planning Commission can impose additional conditions and one of those could be related to the timing of construction.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the lighting met all the regulations.

Mr. Holmes stated the applicant submitted a photometric plan and it does meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. All light will be contained on site.

Commissioner Murdic stated he was concerned about the lighting and this could become an issue with the residents.

Ms. Allen stated all of the lighting is internal to the site and will not spill over into the residences.

There being no other comments, Commissioner Lane made a motion to accept Staff's recommendation. Commissioner Cain seconded the motion.

Commissioner Givens amended the motion to include the coordination of emergency access with the Emergency Management Department; require the blasting company to provide the claims process to the property owners for whom a pre-blast survey will be prepared; and limit the hours of construction to Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Commissioner Murdic seconded the motion.

Commissioner Crohan offered a second amendment to the motion to include that the hours of operation be 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Commissioner Fisher seconded the motion which failed four (4) to five (5), with Commissioners Cain, Lackey, Lane, Givens and Pratt voting "No".

Commissioner Pratt stated he was concerned about limiting the hours of construction on Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Commissioner Givens' amendment which included the coordination of emergency access with Emergency Management Department; require the blasting company to provide the claims process to the property owners for whom a pre-blast survey will be prepared; and limit the hours of construction to Monday thru Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. passed seven (7) to two (2), with Commissioners Pratt and Cain voting "No".

The main motion made by Commissioner Lane to accept Staff's recommendation as amended, passed eight (8) to one (1), with Commissioner Fisher voting "No".

#### **ITEM 24**

#### **SITE PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW FOR JEANNE PRUETT FULTON PRIVATE HOME RECORDING STUDIO, ON 118.80 ACRES LOCATED AT 4446 PEYTONSVILLE-TRINITY ROAD IN THE 4<sup>TH</sup> VOTING DISTRICT (5-2010-035)**

Mr. Holmes reviewed the background (see Staff report) recommending approval with the condition that the applicant complete an Affidavit of Compliance to ensure continued adherence to Section 4520 (X) of the Williamson County Zoning Ordinance, the approved Site Plan, and the applicant's Letter of Intent.

Chairman Lackey opened the public hearing.

There being no comments, Chairman Lackey closed the public hearing.

Chairman Lackey asked for any comments from Commission members.

There being no comments, Commissioner Pratt made a motion to accept Staff's recommendation. Commissioner Crohan seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **ITEM 25**

#### **SITE PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW FOR PET VET (AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT), ON 5.36 ACRES LOCATED AT 2340 HILLSBORO ROAD IN THE 8<sup>TH</sup> VOTING DISTRICT (5-2010-034)**

Mr. Hayes reviewed the background (see Staff report) recommending approval with the following conditions:

1. Completion of an Affidavit of Compliance to ensure continued adherence to the Williamson County Zoning Ordinance, the approved Site Plan (Attachment 25-1) and the applicant's Letter of Intent (Attachment 25-4);
2. Submittal of a revised Site Plan reflecting a 75-foot stream buffer instead of 50-foot;
3. That all signage be approved per Ordinance requirements; and
4. The posting of a Landscaping Bond in the amount of \$11,000.

Chairman Lackey opened the public hearing.

There being no comments, Chairman Lackey closed the public hearing.

Chairman Lackey asked for any comments from Commission members.

There being no comments, Commissioner Pratt made a motion to accept Staff's recommendation. Commissioner Cain seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **ITEM 26**

#### **SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR SILVER STREAM FARM (REVISED), CONTAINING 327 LOTS ON 171.28 ACRES LOCATED OFF ROCKY FORK ROAD IN THE 5<sup>TH</sup> VOTING DISTRICT (1-2010-200)**

Mr. Matteson reviewed the background (see Staff report) indicating that the revised Site Plan meets all technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, and if the Planning Commission is inclined to approve the request, Staff recommends incorporating the same Conditions established in conjunction with the original Site Plan approval, and the additional condition that \$286.65 per lot as funds in lieu of roadway improvements be paid by the applicant in conjunction with Final Plat approval beginning with the 308<sup>th</sup> lot.

Mr. Matteson noted that a letter from the Town of Nolensville was received and has been given to the Commission. He also noted that several additional pieces of correspondence were received before the meeting began and that he would pass those around for the Commission to see.

Chairman Lackey opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jefferson Wallace, 3108 Rutgers Pass, stated he had additional letters of opposition to this proposal, which he gave to the Commission. He stated he is not in favor of this proposal. He stated the estate section of Silver Stream Farm was supposed to have larger lots and higher minimum square footage requirements. This proposal would plat lots in the estate section smaller and this would likely result in the larger homes in the estate section being surrounded by smaller and less expensive homes. As a community the residents want the lot sizes to remain untouched. He stated they would also like the landscaping to be improved. He urged the Commission to vote no on the request.

Mr. James Eaton, 2247 Dominick Drive, stated he opposes this proposal. He stated he was promised when he bought his home that there would be lots of open space but the developer failed to account for unusable open space such as detention ponds and waterway areas. He also stated open space was lost to add more lots. He urged the Commission to deny this request.

Town of Nolensville Alderman Jimmy Alexander and Mayor Elect, 1010 Dortch Lane, stated Silver Stream Farm is in the Town of Nolensville's Urban Growth Boundary and will be annexed by the town sometime in the future. He stated the Town of Nolensville has had two (2) similar requests from developers of subdivisions in their jurisdiction, and the residents of the developments opposed the requests. He stated one request was denied and the other was withdrawn. He hopes the Williamson County Regional Planning Commission will take this under consideration and deny this request due to the fact that the residents of Silver Stream Farm bought homes in this development with the understanding that the development would be built out with similar lots and homes with what they purchased.

Ms. Sue Smith, 2370 Broadway Street, stated this proposal is not in the best interest of Silver Stream Farm and she opposes the request. She stated these additional homes will have a negative impact on the Williamson County School System. The schools in the Nolensville area are already overcrowded, and the addition of more lots would be detrimental to the children in this area.

Ms. Heather Paxton, 2375 Broadway Street, stated she is one of the original homeowners in Silver Stream Farm and is opposed to this request. The proposal that the developer is requesting is not consistent with the image and character that the original homeowners purchased. She stated the developer needs to fix the landscaping and appearance of the development. She urged the Commission to deny this request.

Mr. Richard Lee, 3008 Wanamaker Trail, stated he closed on his property in Silver Stream approximately one (1) month ago and there was no mention of lot sizes being reduced. He stated at first he picked out a home on the executive side which is smaller lots but after much consideration they decided to go with the estate side for the larger lots and they were told for about \$25,000 more they would get a lot of standard features on the estate side, such as side entry

garage, four sided brick, the larger lot, etc. which would cost extra on the executive side. He stated he was surprised to learn after closing that the home he paid extra for would now be comparable to the homes in the executive side. He urged the Commission to deny this request.

Ms. Leslie Wallace, 3108 Rutgers Pass, stated she would like to speak about lot density. At the Town of Nolensville's Board of Mayor and Alderman Meeting on January 5, 2006, it stated in the minutes that Mr. Steve Clifton, representing the developer, noted the ten (10) percent open space has been exceeded, that there would be a buffer area and that this was a standard subdivision, not a PUD. He also noted that 1.8 is the allowable density and the developer is proposing .95. Many residents opposed this request as well. The new proposed plat would have a 2.0 allowable density, which is more than Mr. Clifton noted in 2006. She asked how this is allowable if it was not allowable four (4) years ago. She asked the Commission to please vote no to this request.

Mr. Christopher Frith, 2239 Dominick Drive, stated he lives in the estate section of the subdivision, that the residents are seeing a complete degradation of their community and he urges the Commission to vote no.

Ms. Leann Morrow, 2235 Dominick Drive, stated when their homes were purchased they were promised several amenities verbally and in writing. They were promised a large pool with a pool house where the community could gather, not a small pool with a cabana. They do not have adequate sidewalks around certain open space areas. This is not a safe environment for the children. She also noted the tornado sirens are not adequate and can barely be heard. They were also promised a game field, which the original plat called for and this has also not been done. The proposed revised plat does not have the game field on it. A walking trail was just put in and was supposed to be paved with a bridge over a deep dip in this area but this is a rough gravel walkway with no bridge. They invested their money in their home based on these promises and urge the Commission to vote no.

Mr. Charles Winfrey, 3012 Wanamaker Trail, stated he lives on the estate side of Silver Stream Farm. He stated they paid a premium to live on the estate side with the promises of what was coming and these promises have not been fulfilled. He asked the Commission to vote no on this request.

Mr. Scott Short, 2205 Dominick Drive, stated he would like to bring attention to what he feels is a safety issue. He stated the entrance to this subdivision only has one entranceway which is at the corner of Rock Springs and Rocky Fork Road. This is a through path for people traveling between Smyrna and Franklin. In the evening you can not see due to the sun and bushes in the way. The addition of more homes will increase traffic and something needs to be done to fix this problem not add to it.

Ms. Barbara Fohr, 2709 Water Lane, stated she lives on the executive side of Silver Stream Farm. She stated they all have issues with the way the development has gone, but that it is a great neighborhood. She is not opposed to lot change sizes in phase seven because this is a whole other area that has not been developed yet. She stated she understands the people who have homes on the estate side wanting the lots to remain consistent, but this decision needs to be made on fact and not emotion.

Mr. Chintan Shah, 2501 Broome Street, stated everything that has happened from the developer and builder sides has hurt their home values. He stated the promises that were made to the homeowners on the executive and the estate sides of Silver Stream Farm have not been met. Homes are being built with cheaper materials so it is not just the lot size the citizens are concerned with. He urged the Commission to vote no on this request.

There being no other comments Chairman Lackey closed the public hearing.

Chairman Lackey asked for any comments from Commission members.

Commissioner Mosley asked Counsel if a homeowner is sold property in a neighborhood with certain guarantees such as a certain brick or certain amount of road frontage, is it a legal obligation for the properties to remain as such.

Ms. Earwood stated if the condition is on the recorded plat and is required by the Zoning Ordinance, then that is something the County can enforce. If the conditions are in the Restrictive Covenants, this is a private contract between the seller of the property and the purchaser and only the owners of the property who are subject to those conditions can enforce those.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the condition is on the plat then is it supposed to be upheld.

Ms. Earwood stated if it is on the plat, and imposed as a result of the Zoning Ordinance, it can be enforced.

Commissioner Crohan asked if the open space is still within the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Matteson stated that it was and the total amount of open space remains the same.

Commissioner Givens asked if the open space was taken in as a whole or whether it could be beside the road, between homes, etc.

Mr. Matteson stated that there is an overall amount of overall open space required and also a fifty (50) foot peripheral buffer, which can be counted as part of the open space. Therefore the open space that makes up the perimeter of the development serves two purposes, to provide an actual buffer between the development and adjoining properties, and as open space to meet that requirement. There is no requirement for the size of individual open space areas.

Commissioner Givens then inquired about the note on the plat that states all open space may be used as a public utility and drainage easement and if that included the retention ponds.

Mr. Matteson answered yes and that is a standard note on plats.

Commissioner Givens stated she was concerned about the status of the landscaping and roads, that the Consent Agenda noted several of the bonds could be called

Commissioner Murdic asked the number of lots the developer is reducing in size to get twenty (20) additional lots.

Mr. Tom Moon, the applicant, stated the current lot size by road frontage is eighty five (85) feet, and they will each be reduced by twenty (20) feet. He stated the number of lots affected is approximately eighty (80) lots in Section Four (4) and Section Seven (7), and this will not occur for another two (2) years.

Commissioner Murdic stated eighty (80) lots is a significant number.

Mr. Moon stated the original plan called for one-hundred eighty (180) lots at sixty five (65) feet and one-hundred twenty (120) lots at eighty five (85) feet, therefore the character is predominantly sixty five (65) feet.

Commissioner Givens asked where sidewalks fall in regard to bonds.

Mr. Matteson stated the County does not bond sidewalks because it is not a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Givens then asked what if the sidewalk is on the plat.

Ms. Earwood stated that is something the developer has proposed. The County does not regulate sidewalks.

Commissioner Givens asked for an explanation in the density change that was referred to during the Public Hearing.

Mr. Matteson stated that at some point during the project, there was some discussion between the developer and the Town of Nolensville and that the standards the speaker referred to were likely for the Town of Nolensville and not for Williamson County.

Mr. Moon stated in regards to the landscaping, this year the weather was too dry and he has been waiting for that to change. He expects to have the landscaping installed at any time.

Chairman Lackey stated that on similar requests, such as Laurelbrooke, where there was a change to the site plan due to open space, the signature of contiguous homeowners was required because they have a vested interest. He stated he believes that the homeowners in this development also have a vested interest in the changing of lot sizes.

Commissioner Givens stated she agreed with Chairman Lackey.

There being no other comments, Commissioner Murdic made a motion to deny the request based on Section 9310 of the Zoning Ordinance because it will adversely affect the character of the neighborhood. Commissioner Givens seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PRELIMINARY PLATS:**

**ITEM 27**

**REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR LAUREL COVE, PHASE 2, CONTAINING 96 LOTS ON 77.216 ACRES LOCATED OFF ARNO ROAD IN THE 3<sup>RD</sup> VOTING DISTRICT (1-2010-303)**

Mr. Matteson reviewed the background (see Staff report) and stated the applicant has requested this item be deferred until the December 9, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Kevin Estes, Dale and Associates, representing the applicant, stated the applicant would like to have this request deferred to the December 9, 2010 meeting.

Chairman Lackey asked for any comments from Commission members.

Commissioner Pratt stated the owners should be prepared to be at next months meeting.

There being no other comments, Commissioner Murdic made a motion to defer this item to the December 9, 2010 meeting. Commissioner Fisher seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

- - - - -

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m.

**APPROVED BY A MAJORITY VOTE BY THE WILLIAMSON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ON DECEMBER 9, 2010**

CHAIRMAN JOHN LACKEY