



AGENDA
CLEVELAND MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2025, 12:00 PM
CLEVELAND MUNICIPAL BUILDING 190 CHURCH STREET NE

The special called meeting of the Cleveland Municipal Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Ben Berry at 12:00 P.M.

Commissioners present included: Bonnie Cretton, Walt Vineyard, Jarrod Casteel, Bill Estes, Clarke Taylor, Blake Allison, Ben Berry, Maryl Elliot, Alma Dotson

Staff present included: Robert Varnell, Senior Planner, Joe Fivas, City Manager, Joel Prince, Planner II/Code Enforcement Supervisor, Brian Beck, City Engineer, David Sheely, Transportation Engineer, and Christy Rogers, Administrative Coordinator

Legal Counsel present included: John Kimball, Attorney for the City of Cleveland.

Others present included: See Attached Sign in Sheet

Minutes

Minutes for November 18, 2025, will be approved during January meeting.

In Public Hearings,

No Public Hearings

Consent Agenda,

- A. Request by Bent Tree Development LLC for consideration of approval for a preliminary plat for about 9.90 acres, more or less, of property located at Benton Pike (Tax Map 050N Group B Parcel 009.00) and located within the PUD 53 Zoning District.**

B. Request by Bowers Place LLC for consideration of approval for a preliminary plat for about 3.27 acres, more or less, of property located at Blythe Avenue (Tax Map 065C Group B Parcel 007.00) and located within the R-2 Low Density Single and Multi-Family Zoning District.

C. Request by Duane Goff for consideration of approval for a preliminary plat for about 7.31 acres, more or less, of property located at Pleasant Grove Church Rd (Tax Map 056 Parcel 062.03) and located within the R-2 Low Density Single and Multi-Family Zoning District.

Robert Varnell: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. Well, the first item on the consent agenda. It is a preliminary plat 65 lots part of the PUD 53 this came through zoning probably a year and a half ago. It's a mix of single family detached as well as a small section of townhomes towards the back off Benton Pike and an area of Whirlpool and there's a couple of outstanding labeling related comments CU the utilities it's listed so we're waiting on that resubmittal which may even be in the queue now for review, but those 2 items need to be fixed before staff signs off on the plat. So otherwise, it's ready to go. Any questions on that one?

Okay, the next one is Bowers Place LLC, it's 3.27 acres, this is a preliminary plat for 21 lots. As you can see there's one new road being built with these sidewalks around the exterior just a side note. Here on Bowers Lane where the sidewalk ends our CDBG program is going to be extending that sidewalk a good distance so we'll see it kind of right in front of your eyes where we get some private development that we can then attach public dollars to extend those sidewalks. No comments left on that one we're pretty much ready to go from the preliminary plat standpoint.

Moving towards civil this is a preliminary plat for 40 townhomes. It's off Pleasant Grove Church Road this is in the area where the old Cleveland Speedway used to be. Zoning is R2 at this location Brookside townhomes I believe there's just a couple of small labeling related items from a planning standpoint part of the sidewalk on Pleasant Grove was on the private property, so I just asked for that lot line to be adjusted. That's it the consent agenda standpoint I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any.

Ben Berry: Any questions or a motion?

Walt Vineyard made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda, Pending staff comments, seconded by Clarke Taylor.

Walt Vineyard-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Jarrod Casteel-Yes, Bill Estes-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

Old Business,

No Old Business

In New Business,

- A. Request by Teofil Kurochka on behalf of Cleveland Church of Evangelical Faith for consideration of an ordinance to zone about 2.94 acres, more or less, of property located along Baldwin Street NE from CH Highway Commercial zoning district to CG General Commercial zoning district and includes Tax Map 065D Group E Parcels 13.00, 16.00, and 018.00.**

Robert Varnell: So, this is a down zoning from highway commercial to general commercial. The first level of conversation I had about this, you know. In my opinion this parcel probably never should have been zoned highway commercial to begin with GC is probably what made the most sense it's not on the highway and I mean it is a former bowling alley I think it is now a church. The primary reason for their down zoning request relates to setbacks they've got. Some additions to the structure they want to do mainly storage related buildings and the GC zoning has setbacks that are more allowable from my perspective. When I look at it, it protects the neighborhood that's behind it better on the type of uses that can go in the GC make a lot of sense. When we start talking about? Is there a GC in that area? No should there be probably. It's not necessarily a spot zoning because it is still commercial zoning it's just a different level of it we're stepping down so I'm not worried about how that looks from that standpoint staff supported the request. You know I can't imagine a gas station or some things like that ever wanting to go there but this protects the land and the neighbors around it from that ever happening.

Jarrold Casteel: Let's ask a practical question here and the analysis that you all provided says. They'd like to add an addition to the rear. Where would that happen?

Robert Varnell: So, there's an existing one right here we have a preliminary site plan. That shows it's a small addition it's a storage room and based on the interior layout of the structure that's where it goes out of door that exists and where they have kind of, I guess behind there where the pulpit would be and things like that towards the back of it so it's in that back. You're looking at it back left corner and it fits and meets the seed GC rear set back it does not fit the CH rear set back. Looking at it looks tight on this map, but when you actually get survey it's pretty big parcel you know my first request was we'll just put it here put it their interior function of the building didn't work for that and so it goes in the very back left corner there.

Jarrold Casteel: And did you say there's already an addition on the back of the building is that what I'm seeing there?

Robert Varnell: This right here. It is mainly some kind of metal storage. It could have been a freezer at one point I don't know but so it'll be at the other end of the structure in line with that existing one.

Bill Estes: I actually been in there for a wedding and I understand now what they're asking for because that is we're looking at to the right is like a reception hall kitchen area. I had to listen through translators, and I had translations in the back, and they had other storage you know music and stuff. In the front left where that would be it makes perfect sense the way you just described.

Robert Varnell: With the layout of theirs and where they need to store chairs and things like that yeah? Yeah, there is a representative of the applicant here so if you've got questions for him as well, I'll step out of the way, but it is down zoning it's sort of an unusual reason why it do it but I actually think that zone is better for that property than what's there now so.

Ben Berry: Anyone here that likes to speak to this?

Teofil Kurochka: My name is Teofil Kurochka and I'm with the Molot Construction LLC and I'm representing Cleveland Church of God.

Robert Varnell: The Ukrainian evangelical church.

Teofil Kurochka: I've been a member for a long time, but I always have a hard time saying it properly. And what we have in this situation we put a container and it's extremely difficult to take the chairs roll outside and just couldn't find any better use. Except like maybe adding a storage so we could just roll it on a concrete you know our little rollers into the storage next to the building, but we can't put a little bitty ones if you have to do at least 20 feet. In order to do 20 feet we run into this problem that we need to push it closer to that retaining wall and we never had that container out there we always had homeless people and we will one now one we have a container it's less trouble and we put some

cameras we put little gates. So, we were thinking if we can add it will eliminate all that good area it would just be really tight just for the servicemen to maybe get around and you know maybe do a service around the building.

Jarrold Casteel: So, there's a retaining wall?

Robert Varnell: Yeah, that's one thing I was going to mention is along the rear property line there's at least 10 foot retaining wall, so this sits below that wall so nobody 's going to see the addition. Okay they don't even see the building from the backyards. That's one thing I was going to mention. It is up against the wall.

Ben Berry: Anymore comments questions or a motion?

Walt Vineyard: Motion

Clarke Taylor: Second

Walt Vineyard made a motion to approve the request by Teofil Kurochka on behalf of Cleveland Church of Evangelical Faith for consideration of an ordinance to zone about 2.94 acres, more or less, of property located along Baldwin Street NE from CH Highway Commercial zoning district to CG General Commercial zoning district and includes Tax Map 065D Group E Parcels 13.00, 16.00, and 018.00

Walt Vineyard-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Jarrold Casteel-Yes, Bill Estes-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

Ben Berry: Items B, C and D are related.

B. Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of a plan of service for about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. and includes Tax Map 056 Parcel 002.00.

Robert Varnell: Thank you Mr. Chairman as stated this is an annexation request plan of services included in the packet the PUD request at this time is zoning request. I'm going to talk briefly up front just about the zoning first. We looked at a couple of options here highway commercial just bringing it in or possibly even RA or something like that. The real need in this case for this property is to get it in the city and show what the level of service can be from the utility standpoint and things like that. They need that part done and the city is in agreement with that, so I went with PUD because I did have the ability

to add some level of restriction to the property. You bring it in as highway commercial that's very open I wanted to have some level of restriction on it and typically, in the PUD process we have a preliminary site plan. We don't always have one. There's been about 4 cases I could find in the past 6 years where we didn't. This will be another one of those that requires them once they have a full plan of development to come back to this board with that site plan. These specific uses and present it to you just like we're doing right now but as I said the real emphasis in this case is to get the annexation done and show what that level of service can be and what's required for utility on the site. As you can see from the plan of service it's fairly straightforward. Part of this is already as you could probably determine in the city we're annexing the remainder of it and working with these applicants this is in the area several years ago with cooperation and Tennessee Department of Transportation the MPO did a transportation study for Freewill Road and connecting to exit 20 and this piece will obviously be integral in that process so from where all the auto dealerships are going north you'll be able to eventually get through connect all the way up to Freewill Road which eventually get all the way to Eureka Road it's a kind of a I guess frontage type idea road that will stretch from exit 20 all the way to exit 33. There's a lot of moving parts with this, but the annexations got to move forward and so that's why we're here now. I'm happy to answer any questions that may be on your mind.

Ben Berry: So, I'm struggling a little with the fact there is not a concept plan attached and if it was just residential or it was just commercial.

Robert Varnell: It's a mix of uses that they're proposing.

Ben Berry: So, you got 4 different uses defined with different requirements commercial area. Single family multifamily townhomes you got these 4 different areas defined in the text about the restrictions would be that you don't have a location assigned.

Robert Varnell: No, not yet.

Ben Berry: Like we're the annexation is fine, level of service plan of service is fine, obviously have to have a zone to annex.

Robert Varnell: That's right.

Ben Berry: But we don't. We're not creating the zone. But there's no map that goes with these rules.

Robert Varnell: Not yet it will have to come back through some similar situations pretty much anything on Paul Huff from Mouse Creek to the Interstate does not have a site plan yet except for where Harbor Freight is. Everything else has to come back to you guys.

Ben Berry: You know the site plan with their development rights and that's where like Hardwick didn't have a site plan.

Robert Varnell: It's still pretty vague though if you read those PUDs. There's 3 or 4 in that area that have some rights it's like you can do residential actually they have less restrictions than I put into this one. Because it just says R2 which is pretty wide open in this case we specifically dictate if you're going to do this, you're going to do that there's some things I kept out in the commercial uses that protects the type of development. This is something we've done probably like I said 5 or 6 times in 5 or 6 years and a little bit before I was even with the city so this gets the property zoned and annexed into the city so we can finish the planning.

Ben Berry: Again, with the zoning defines the rights that the property owner has and we're approving a zone that has no rights like they can't build anything.

Robert Varnell: No, they have to come back to you.

Ben Berry: What if they get this rezoned and they can't build anything?

Robert Varnell: They're comfortable with that.

Ben Berry: They come in and say we want to do all townhomes and there be a disagreement and we vote no. Where does that leave them?

Robert Varnell: That leaves them having to come back and figure out something else and they're comfortable with that.

Ben Berry: So, when this gets approved, they literally can't build anything on that property.

Robert Varnell: Until they come back to this body again this is about annexation and giving it a placeholder until.

Ben Berry: It's about zoning and zoning defines right so we're basically they're fine having no rights.

Robert Varnell: Yeah, I guess that's a good way to put it their rights are that they're in the city and they're entitled to the utilities and the rest of it will work itself out.

Ben Berry: I guess I just don't understand what's so hard about, like even a bubble plan like you don't have to have a site plan with like a house here

house is here but if you have an area there are site plans that exist for this property that are not in mine.

Robert Varnell: There are site plans that exist for this property certain things that are not in my opinion would want to attach to this. There are site plans that reference certain things that are not for public consumption and so that's why it goes this way.

Blake Allison: Timeline wise is there's no concept tied to it just because you need to get the services available?

Robert Varnell: They're going to make them nail down their concept based on once you get it needs to be annexed into the city and before certain commitments are made.

Ben Berry: So, several times when they don't know what to do property, we've annexed under RA with the idea that it will come back for a reason because RA is not developer friendly, we've done that a few times with concept plan.

Robert Varnell: I can think of one where we were going to, but it was withdrawn, I have not done that I don't have a problem with that, but this needs a reference some level of commercial under zoning. Plan of service pretty straightforward and so, there's any other questions I'm happy to answer.

Ben Berry: Any other questions?

Blake Allison: I don't see any. I guess I don't know what they're designed for to see any sort of figures around the plan of service, and I'm might have missed it completely?

Jarrold Casteel: Yeah, I didn't either.

Robert Varnell: It's the sewers on the property right now they already have sewer at the corner lot there's 2 line 2 options and I do think in the long run you're going to see some other parcels around this also included in this PUD but at this point this is where we're at.

Alma Dotson: Do they have any intentions of tying into construction that's kind of right down the road from it?

Robert Varnell: Which direction?

Alma Dotson: Kind of behind it.

Robert Varnell: So, eventually there will be a road that will run this entire stretch going north yes. That is laid out in a plan that MPO did. Is that the direction you meant?

Alma Dotson: Well, I'm kind of tying into what he's saying too because it would help me better to see what their intention is, but I understand what you're saying too I'm trying to getting the zoning it still would help.

Robert Varnell: I think the intention right now is to lock in the utilities and get the service run and then come back.

Walt Vineyard: We do have sewer and water and electric all on site. Obviously, there will be more detailed discussions about the amount of flow and fire protection amount you know the size of the water line and stated I think there's a 12-inch water line at that location I know that the sewer has capacity at that location and obviously we definitely have electric service available there.

Jarrold Casteel: I probably a much more simplistic version of what our chairman has been asking you here, but you know when we're hearing from Walt that utilities are all there. I guess I'm still not quite understanding why we need to take this approach as opposed to having something clear.

Robert Varnell: Because it's not clear yet.

Jarrold Casteel: What's not clear?

Robert Varnell: A lot of it.

Jarrold Casteel: Okay, talk me through one more time the purpose of doing it.

Robert Varnell: So that it's in the city and the rights are guaranteed for the service connections.

Blake Allison: Even though the service connections are there.

Robert Varnell: They are there but this guarantees their ability to connect to it.

Blake Allison: I understand what you're trying to get at if there's anything that can be done within another month if constant plan. It is odd just not to have it.

Robert Varnell: Yeah, it's not that odd though I mean this body has approved probably 8 of these at least 4 or 5 in the past 6 years I'm surprised that the over analysis of this one.

Blake Allison: We've had and I could be wrong. We've had concept plans for anything of decent size typically, especially 96 acres.

Robert Varnell: Pretty much all most of the PUDs from 16 to 30. That are commercially related I have no site plan.

Jarrold Casteel: Well, I mean the over analyzation from my perspective is because this PUD looks different but I've ever seen from the city right so it's when I read this my immediate question was what are we approving right the discussions that we've had here have clarified that somewhat I'm not suggesting that I'm against it I'm just trying to understand it.

Robert Vanell: They'll have to come back you know they they've got to do this twice and that's not always ideal but in some circumstances that's required.

Blake Allison: They're okay with that?

Robert Varnell: There's no risk on the city at this point this this is design and to protect us.

Blake Allison: Yeah, that's exactly what it does with that being the case we're going to see it again.

Bill Estes: So based on what Walt said I move we approve the plan of service.

Blake Allison: Second.

Bill Estes made a motion to approve the Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of a plan of service for about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. and includes Tax Map 056 Parcel 002.00. Seconded by Blake Allison.

Bill Estes-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Walt Vineyard-Yes, Jarrod Casteel-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryll Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

C. Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of a resolution to annex about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. and includes Tax Map 056 Parcel 002.00.

Bill Estes made a motion to approve the Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of a resolution to annex about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. and includes Tax Map 056 Parcel 002.00. Seconded by Blake Allison.

Bill Estes-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Walt Vineyard-Yes, Jarrod Casteel-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

D. Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of an ordinance to zone about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. from CH/FAR to PUD Planned Unit of Development 72 and includes TaxMap 056 Parcel 002.00.

Bill Estes made a motion to approve the Request by Sam Bruner for consideration of an ordinance to zone about 96.47 acres, more or less, of property located along Pleasant Grove Rd. from CH/FAR to PUD Planned Unit of Development 72 and includes TaxMap 056 Parcel 002.00. Seconded by Blake Allison.

Bill Estes-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Walt Vineyard-Yes, Jarrod Casteel-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

E. Request by Bent Tree Development for consideration to amend PUD 65 to remove townhomes as an allowable use and replace them with single family homes as an allowable use.

Robert Varnell: So soon after I don't know if you guys remember but for about six months, we were dealing with this PUD rezoning. Six months is a minimum it took a long time. We were back and forth anyway we came to a really good place in in regard to the level of requirements within the PUD for the development this included a 50 foot buffer along the existing residential neighborhood to the West and included infrastructure improvements on 20th Street and the closing or eventual closing of Williams Street and the use of Neely instead which takes away some of the conflicts. Flip over to the site plan as soon as we got done literally that week, I got a call that said I think we're not going to do this here. I've got somebody who wants to do single family, so I said well good because I get to go back and do this all over again. This PUD has not changed in any way all of those standards that were included before the buffer the planting of trees.

Bill Estes: The saving of the big white oaks in the swamp.

Robert Varnell: The planning of trees where the buffer doesn't create the screening the fence. The use of Neely as opposed to Williams I think there's some work we can do in this area and we'll talk about that in a minute.

But I want to hit the focus nothing in the PUD was changed except for I took out townhomes and allowed a 46-by-foot single family detached lot I changed no other standards and don't intend to and that was what I said to them from the start is that this goes nowhere without the rest of it. The unit count is now down to about 88 I believe it was at 127 or 130 with the townhomes so our unit count has decreased and obviously the structure improvements on 20th Street I think is probably the most important part of all of it are still there. The timing of the closing of Williams Street there's another private property owner who has property here. It would be ideal to have that connect over to this existing development street and I think you guys can. Talk about that instead of that small roundabout their cul-de-sac excuse me they may even get an additional lot within their development by doing that. We've talked about that but it's hard I can't close William Street until I get a sign off on all property owners who are involved in it and so that is not a requirement I'm going to put on this developer that's not their problem that's mine what I can do is make sure that the connection is possible I can't make it. This development dependent on another property owners agreements. So, I support this request as I said the PUD remains the same, we go down in lot count, and we get single family detached instead of the townhomes so for us I think it's a win it's a good it's a good request. Happy to answer any questions you may have oh and I also want to point out one more thing. This mail kiosk design is interesting I actually like it because it completely removes you from the roadway, but it is different but I like it. Any questions for me?

Maryl Elliot: So, there won't be no boxes on the houses.

Robert Varnell: The Postal Service no longer allows house to house pick up all these developments we're doing require these mail kiosks. That's been going on for about what 6 years.

Blake Allison: Roughly 5 or 6.

Ben Berry: Yeah, I do remember when we first rezoned was talked about William Street and the fact that we got to where everything is good but now that you access nearly circled the proximity of William Street to Neely Circle.

Robert Varnell: Makes it more practical too.

Ben Berry: Long term William Street needs to be historically that's a city thing.

Robert Varnell: I agree and I think I'm going to start the conversation with these people pretty quick so we can integrate it in.

Ben Berry: And just let me know what you want for this. I think having a requirement to dedicate the right of way between that.

Robert Varnell: I think that's highly appropriate.

Ben Berry: Plat and maybe show that instead of the cul-de-sac or something and then really looking at the language that's in here because I know what was intended was have like no access is permitted it talks about driveway access this is no access permitted onto Williams Street like we know but houses on William Street but just making sure like you say that the city can come in tie Williams Street into this new road and disconnect it from 20th because that's the safety problem is the 20th street point.

Robert Varnell: So maybe adjusting that certain point and saying right away to the existing Williams Street must connect to Neely.

Ben Berry: I think that gets it because that gets the city in a position that it's not anymore on here on the developer they probably get another lot on the side so.

Robert Varnell: I think they do too.

Ben Berry: And it lets it give the city flexibility if there's a problem to fix it.

Robert Varnell: Yeah, I would support a motion to reflect that that be included. But otherwise, we're fully supported by the request and I'm I do know some of the neighborhood probably is here so I'm happy to stand out of the way.

Ben Berry: Anybody here to speak for against this item? Questions, comments or motion?

Jarrold Casteel: I'd like to make the motion to approve with the right of way shown connecting William Street to the development.

Blake Allison: Second.

Jarrold Casteel made a motion to approve the Request by Bent Tree Development for consideration to amend PUD 65 to remove townhomes as an allowable use and replace them with single family homes as an allowable use with the right of way shown connecting William Street to the development. Second by Blake Allison

Jarrold Casteel-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Walt Vineyard-Yes, Bill Estes-Yes, Clarke Taylor-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

F. Request by City of Cleveland to amend the Cleveland, TN Zoning Ordinance, Appendix C, by adding Section 3.4.(5) to require a traffic impact analysis for new developments.

Robert Varnell: So, this is an item that that Dave Sheely and myself and several others have been kicking around for probably 2 years at least. In some instances when we do PUDs, you'll see the requirement that a traffic impact study be performed the Williams Street one we just talked about was one of those where that was required. What this document proposes to do is give a concise consistent requirement to providing these now there are levels within development where certain things are? Required initially if you take a for instance 102 lot development on Freewill Road and looked at that and there's a sheet that as a part of this ordinance addition. You fill out that sheet it hits a number that wouldn't require a full study it just doesn't hit it your peak hour trips and your peak hour trips or your maximum trips would not trigger that happening. Peak hour you know is between that it it's called an analysis at that point and all you got to do is something that is kind of a step down from a full blown study so there are levels to this thing so it's not like you hit that thing and you're doing this full blown study that cost you 100 grand there's levels to it because we're not trying to deterred development what we're trying to do is have a consistent way of infrastructure improvements where the taxpayer is not the full burden of all these costs? A traffic signal on average at this point is costing about \$400,000.00 a piece to put in and so instead of me and Dave looking at every development and saying we think that this is going to trigger a certain thing, this is an approved document that guides that decision it's not it can't be called arbitrary or whatever it is specific, and we've seen tremendous growth these past 6 years I think that continues for us. Regardless of what the global market is doing we've been buffered pretty well, and I think that continues and we want a transportation system that functions properly and this is going to help us achieve that in a better way the MPO which we are in MPO and have been since 2008. Most MPO's have this requirement and have for years Murfreesboro Franklin and Tennessee those are a couple I can think of Knoxville of course the bigger cities and it's something we probably should have had on the books for a considerable amount of time through a lot of PUDs we end up requiring it but this would make it just we we've got a determined based on what you're doing. The developer's engineer is the one who's going to look at this it it's not the city telling you have to do it it's us telling you we need you to look at it so. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Blake Allison: I don't discredit that we need some sort of guidelines right because right now we're looking. PUD by PUD basis right and based on the based on the size location is it going on to what level of service road etcetera.

Robert Varnell: And there been situations where I've missed it well, they should have.

Blake Allison: And staff is handling the question is to what end and also the threshold I want to discuss a little bit briefly like on page 6. Level one right is just simply what you talked about.

Blake Allison: Say on Freewheel Road though it'd be a traffic access analysis of full traffic impact analysis so essentially David and Robert can correct me if I'm wrong but that's essentially looking at do we need a right lane, left lane. Do we need AD cell and that's a pretty simple couple pages not incorrect but site this site distance I didn't see.

Robert Varnell: On that no I mean those are things we look at you know I mean.

Ben Berry: That's not that's separate from a traffic study.

Blake Allison: But the minimum thresholds and I know Ben's going to the more detail we have peak trips peak hour trips right and then we have daily trips total trips the each one if you go by peak. You may be based on your number of lots you may be in one or 2 if you go in daily maybe in one or 2 so it might be a little bit easier to just simplify, we're trying to get simple and transparent. There we go by peak there's one peak trip and I'll let Ben touch on this I'm probably going to get out of my depth. But there's one trick per lot and go into manually there's 9 so then that really can kick you into one or 2.

Robert Varnell: And we looked at a specific development on Freewill Road to give us an idea, and we put it in and your peak hour trips comes out in the 70s. And it was like 78 I think and then your daily trips is still going to be less than 250. Which those are the thresholds.

Blake Casteel: Maybe different table because I was saying 9 daily trips per lot and one peak hour maybe looking at the wrong one but.

David Sheely: Well, it's not the peak hours based off of the peak hour Freewill Road. All it's looking for is what's the average number of traffic that leaves or enters a subdivision during the peak hour of the road, it's not the peak hour of the generator

Blake Allison: For developers to try to equate this to have I'm 100 lots where am I going to be it's really a function of you have 100 lots depends on where it's at It's what I'm hearing.

Robert Varnell: Development always depends on where it's at though and if you think about it this.

Blake Allison: But in this it just says based on peak hour trips it doesn't out I'll kick it to Ben because I'm going to get out outside of my depth so my concern

was that the threshold was too low to go into level 2 traffic impact analysis that was that was my concern because I don't want to have to slow down development completely this it's going to take a couple months once you get into that level 2 and 3 in order to get your traffic counts and this is not a quick this is a 3 to 4 month deal.

Robert Varnell: Possibly the higher the development gets you know.

Blake Allison: I'll let someone who actually does this.

Ben Berry: I did read all of it I made bunch of notes, and I put together just a little like trip generation table to see what would trip what thresholds. And this won't mean much but I can explain it won't mean much. And I think overall so we do that you're right we do these all over the place and the frustration from the development community not so much in the consultants who they get paid either way. From the development community is when you go through all this effort that so what right what changes and nothing. You know we did a hotel in downtown Chattanooga. Those roads are fully built out we know that there's not you're not going to dedicate right away you're not going to widen but because it tripped this arbitrary threshold, we had to do it full study the study took 4 months and it cost \$20,000.00 but what was the result of the study. Nothing there was no, there was no changes, the conclusion was obvious from the beginning without going through the time and the effort and most of the frustrations that that I see happen with the smaller projects they happen. When a Dollar General on a 4 lane or a 5 lane highway trips the threshold and you know what does what is it going to do the big projects are obvious Hardwick had a traffic study we saw that that was massive that's a big deal Publix probably should had a traffic study the calling lane I had had a traffic study. I think with the you know a lot of those big developments that's common sense and we can take common sense and put it in document I think that's great, but I think we should be real cautious about the low end. What's the end goal what are we trying to because we go through we have gone through the city a lot of effort to get it right but also like keep things moving and if you if you require a traffic study for a 50 lot subdivision which trips the threshold for well a 26 lot subdivision trips to the first threshold 50 lot subdivision trips the threshold. The study the quantity of projects that require traffic studies pretty great you're also going to all these traffic studies get done, you got to review them, you got you got to answer this so what's right and so. I know like there's a frustration outside of this there's a frustration that I feel in the office when I work on things I don't want to be working on that aren't important it's like I just want to I want to focus my efforts I have a limited amount of time I have a limited amount of resources what can I do to be most effective and I want to apply those to the things that matter the most and that a lot of times those are the bigger projects and not so much an auto parts store. Which triggers a level 2 traffic.

Robert Varnell: Study so let me let me ask this and I'm just curious. From a frustration standpoint on the side of a developer. You say it's frustrating that you have to do the study but then nothing comes of it but isn't it also frustrating if I decide to make you do one but somebody down the street doesn't have to, I think that's much worse?

Blake Casteel: I agree with the consistency however I want the threshold to reflect.

Robert Varnell: And I think the thresholds Dave correct me if I'm wrong the thresholds come from an existing manual where this is utilized correct?

David Sheely: Yeah.

Alma Dotson: Can I ask a question? Does it threshold also take in consideration not just the flow the peak that the volume but the level of the age level of the drivers driving at that time?

Robert Varnell: No.

David Sheely: It's just it's strictly from the development point of view.

Alma Dotson: Does it take into to consideration also the number of tickets or accidents that have happened in those areas?

David Sheely: Crashes it can it certainly can.

Ben Berry: It just practically speaking there's a few things one is. I think even on the low end turn lane warrants our minimum thing that could be required. Turn line warrant and site distance are not it's not this it's not traffic study. That can be done super easy it doesn't require counts can use existing counts someone can get that done and get it done in like 4 hours without a lot of cost of paying in some time frame, so you know I want to make sure everyone understands what this is. This is not this has nothing to do with does a driveway have sight distance which is very important, in fact it was the most important thing on William Street. Not capacity of an intersection wasn't that was what was studied and that wasn't important but that studying what wasn't important took I don't know how many 10s of thousands of dollars and months. What was important with sight distance turn lanes can be done super easy I know a lot of these smaller projects to me that's the most concerned it's not is the signal timing correct because you're adding a Dollar General onto Georgetown.

Robert Varnell: The biggest question that I face is if there's not a signal. How does this moving in the direction of when we need one?

Clarke Taylor: I don't think there's any way to make it perfect I think your point out to get things a bit but I know from experience about having something that just allows consistency there's no way it's going to be perfect if we go through and pick out every little thing where it doesn't need to be an example but like you just said the worst thing is saying well you need to have one but you don't it's like.

Robert Varnell: Like well and I so we moved the threshold, but to what I mean what is that magic number that everybody 's like oh I'm good with that to me I don't get that either this is a threshold that's in use.

Ben Berry: Yeah, I mean I'm just so I'll give you a copy of this of what uses triggers these thresholds and I think you know.

Robert Varnell: And that analysis isn't as deep as a study I don't think that takes months for these minimums.

Ben Berry: So if you've got to get traffic counts one of the calendar issues with traffic counts is that you can't get counts when kids are out of school so if you have a project that starts and you need to get it get it going in may you may not be able to get a study until September.

Robert Varnell: Right and some of those counts are on you know you have to do them yourself and it's very rare that there's existing counts you can use. We're actually moving in a direction where we're going to start doing that ourselves on most of our city streets. And I don't know you know the prospect of being able to use those numbers but that's I mean I get your point I'm not saying it's wrong but you know there's steps within this whole PUD development thing I mean this all this stuff could take months and months and months of time and as a staff I think we work real diligently to make sure that doesn't happen. This is one of those things that may take some time on certain occasions about certain types of development I completely agree I'm not against it. The biggest complaints we get that all the stuff I mean that comes at me is traffic and we have got to lock it in.

Blake Allison: Completely agree that this is needed.

Robert Varnell: I just don't know what that threshold change is like I think no I understand.

Blake Allison: Parameters but we got this on Thursday, so I think no it's not going to be perfect, but I think there is some time to do some due diligence and refine a little bit. I really do I don't want to go through and got this on Thursday today's Tuesday. Would like to refine and also to Ben 's point I think there could be to clean up process and everything else there could be a flow chart very simple that says hey submit?

Robert Varnell: And keep yeah well and I think a lot of our ordinances could use something like that yeah.

Blake Allison: Exactly but you have you have X amount of lots you need to here's how we get to the right or left turning lane because even property on Freewill Road there was a little bit is there a right is there a left where is the location going to be. Where is the entrance going to be that is not and that's all very exactly and then shifted because of CU that is not none of that which is extremely none of that is in here right so I'd like to see if we could? Readdress this and convey some points. I Commend David for doing a great job this is a long document it takes a lot of time. Anything can have a couple more eyes on it before we push it through.

Robert Varnell: And keep in mind and this last thing I'll say on my job is not to make the developers life easier, my job is to protect the residents and the taxpayers of the City of Cleveland.

Blake Allison: Absolutely.

Robert Varnell: And that's where I'm coming from.

Robert Varnell: And I'm all for speedy development I work hard to make sure that these things happen, but I am not going.

Ben Berry: Let me rephrase that this is not about that I think we've we have developed a process that uses some common sense in things. I think it's because we work in a lot of communities that it takes months to get the simplest easiest thing to do it takes months if not years to get time in those communities the result of those communities is higher cost of living. Which does go back to the public interest so it's a real easy to say oh you know this is we're going to protect the public and interest, but they're all connected they're all and there's, so I think there's things that are again 75% of this I think is great and I think the problem. That I have or maybe not. The problem but the details, probably in the lower end the things that don't matter as much that lower end thresholds like what can we look at that and see. What is the lower end being affected because if a Publix or Kroger for big grocery store comes in new Food City grocery store was shops like yes go through that it counts do the thing Hardwick of course that's a big example but you know some of those things but if we want to have a new auto parts store on a Georgetown Road that's been freshly widened to 5 lanes are we going to put it through the same process and answer in fairness is yes.

Robert Varnell: Everybody goes through the same yeah, you'll fill out the form.

Ben Berry: And the answer of common sense.

Robert Varnell: So I think there's a step that everybody has to take period I think what you're saying is those the threshold might need to adjust if I'm hearing you're going to fill out this paperwork no matter what and you're going to submit it to me and you and it's going to tell you you're going to know what you're doing.

Ben Berry: I think 26 lot subdivision needs to analyze their driveway and the nearest intersection both ways.

Blake Allison: That's how it's written.

Robert Varnell: No, I know that yeah, it's.

Blake Allison: You know there's a circumstance where an apartment complex either doesn't need study or needs a level 2.

Robert Varnell: So, what if we have 10 to 26 lot subdivisions in a row at which point does that become something else where I go. I mean I get it I mean we're talking about one but I'm talking about the bigger picture.

Ben Berry: But the study doesn't look at the bigger picture, it looks at that 126 lot subdivision.

Robert Varnell: And the traffic counts, right?

David Sheely: Now I think we'd be open to looking at the thresholds just I mean just in case the board doesn't know. That if we never have a chance to convey this these were TDOT thresholds and this these are pretty much anywhere you go this is what it is I mean we're open to different ones but this is pretty standard and as far as if I may the William Street I totally agree with you part of this part of these guidelines actually introduced the concept of scoping you come to us and we tell you what you want they did that. Not because we asked them to, they just did it on their own, we would have stopped them had we had the opportunity, but we didn't.

Robert Varnell: I think Dave's point with the TDOT standards is we can make up our own but we're trying to be consistent with what the practice is in in the world.

David Sheely: Yeah, that is something that we need to also consider is that consultants and developers you know consistency not only within our own jurisdiction, but you know we should be looking to do the same sort of threshold that Knoxville doing that Cookeville doing this Chattanooga doing we should. Just something to think about.

Robert Varnell: We didn't make them up as what we're saying. That's all I got on that.

Blake Allison: Can we move to table to next month or do we just?

Robert Varnell: You got to.

Ben Berry: Like I would love to defer to at least give David my comments.

Clarke Taylor: I would like to make a motion to defer to next month.

Blake Allison: Second

Clarke Taylor made a motion to approve to defer to next month Request by City of Cleveland to amend the Cleveland, TN Zoning Ordinance, Appendix C, by adding Section 3.4.(5) to require a traffic impact analysis for new developments. Second by Blake Allison

Clarke Taylor-Yes, Blake Allison-Yes, Bonnie Cretton-Yes, Walt Vineyard-Yes, Jarrod Casteel-Yes, Bill Estes-Yes, Ben Berry-Yes, Maryl Elliot-Yes, Alma Dotson-Yes

The motion was passed to defer to next month. Yes-9, No-0, Recused-0, Absent-0

Chairman's Report

Ben Berry: City Manager would like to speak.

Joe Fivas: Thank you for a couple of things, first of all to wish you a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. We don't say it enough but this this body this board just the amount the heavy amount of weight that you carry and work through some very difficult things isn't lost on all of us and we appreciate all the time that you dedicate to that throughout the year it's you're really unsung heroes and it's so refreshing to hear these conversations like we just had I think that that's really what we are here to do is trying to work through the details and figure all that stuff out. So, thank you for all that. I wanted to take a minute and just give I think Robert hit these points, but I just wanted to crystallize a little bit, and I didn't really want to get between conversation that staff was having with you on the annexation. Out at Pleasant Grove is that the right road. Is you know annex it now when there isn't a fully developed plan. A couple of things and I think Robert touched on these, but I don't think it got crystallized that there's a couple things. That the state is working with us to potentially help fund the road the connector that you can get from, I think Robert mentioned getting from Freewill all the way through there. It's hard for us to have a dialogue with TDOT if we don't know what jurisdiction is this in

and how are we going to pay for that so that's one reason why it's helpful to move forward even though there's kind of a blank slate there is a stopgap there's nothing bad going to happen. The other thing with this particular piece of property is that there are some conversations going on with different type of pilots and tax increment financing having it in the city though if it went through an annex that allows us to see what it is and to engage in those conversations and when we engage in those conversations are going to be coming up with exactly with how things are situated. So, I think Robert touched on those, but I didn't want to get in the middle of your deliberations is that that's why it's probably helpful to give us this time. Then to work with the box doors work with TDOT to figure out some of these things before there's actually a site plan brought so that's just a little bit more deeper context to why was it brought this way I don't think that the developer is just trying to be lazy or not or trying to get ahead of something the utilities are certainly a question that that they've had but I think that that those are those are part of the big things. TDOT conversations and some of the incentive stuff if it's not in the city it's hard for us to really engage and make decisions because it's not really in the city. So just a little bit of additional information on that and we'll bring back more information as we get more information so back to the directors' report.

Director's Report

None

Adjourn 12:57 PM