

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF OAK HILL, TENNESSEE**

February 23, 2010

The Planning Commission of the City of Oak Hill, Tennessee met in the City Office. Planning Commission members in attendance were Art McWilliams, Mike Allison, Mac Rucker, Joe Hodgson, Julia Wesley, and Patricia Carlson. Staff present were City Manager Kevin Helms, City Engineer Zach Dufour, Assistant City Manager M. C. Sparks, City Attorney Bob Notestine and Administrative Assistant Patrick Steiner. Mr. McWilliams acted as chair, and Ms. Sparks served as secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m., the following matters came before the Commission and was acted upon as indicated:

1.) Approve the Minutes of the Meetings – The reading of the January minutes was deferred until March.

2.) PC-10-2: Hear A Request From Mr. David Karzon, 1045 Overton Lea Road – A request was made to move a property line between two existing properties; this would place the property line at the same location as an existing fence, which is the desired end result. As part of this agreement Ms. Danner (the adjoining property owner on whose property the fence encroaches) would receive a very small amount of land, and Ms. Danner would take care of the plat fees, etc.

Mr. Notestine talked with the attorney for Ms. Danner today, and she indicated she is very in favor of this; it will help to clean up the title to the properties, which will aid her as she plans to sell her residence.

Mr. Dufour said he examined the plans, and everything is in order, and any requested changes to the plat have been made. The only stipulation he suggested is that the plat must be signed by all required parties.

After discussion, on a Motion duly made by Mr. Allison, and Seconded by Mr. Hodgson, the following was Approved Unanimously:

“Moved to approve with the request in Case PC-10-2 as presented, with the stipulation that plat must have all necessary signatures before being registered.”

3.) PC-10-4: Hear A Request From Mr. Raymond Watt, 4006 Newman Place - A request was made to combine two lots of 1.33 acres and .18 acre into one lot of 1.51 acres; Mr. Watt owns both lots. Mr. Dufour indicated the .18 acre is small sliver of land, which might have been a dedicated easement or section of an unimproved right of way. The addition of this small piece of land would help with the setbacks for the main lot, as the house is far back on the 1.33 acre lot. Upon inquiry, Mr. Dufour indicated there is no reason seen not to permit this combination.

After discussion, on a Motion duly made by Mr. Hodgson, and Seconded by Ms. Carlson, the following was Approved Unanimously:

“Moved to approve with the request in Case PC-10-4 as presented.”

4) New Process For Application – Mr. Helms discussed the new application procedure for the Planning Commission cases. After initial submittal, the staff has one week before meeting to review the cases. All comments go into a report drafted by Kimley-Horn, which is given to the applicant, and changes must be made and submitted prior to any cases being placed on the meeting agendas. This new process is helping tighten up on information received to make sure all is correctly submitted; this month five sets of information were submitted for the Planning Commission, and once this process was completed, three applicants did not get their updated materials resubmitted in time to be included on the February agenda.

Comments included: Ms. Carlson suggested that all signatures be present up front on the plats; Mr. Louis Reike and Ms. Sally Bradshaw discussed the posting of agendas on the web; Mr. Helms indicated this is not required, but in answer to a question, announcements of meetings are generally given five to seven days in advance by other cities.

Ms. Carlson questioned if the City is being too nice by letting the applications have an extra week to make corrections. Mr. Helms said the new guidelines are actually more strict.

In response to comments and questions, Mr. Helms said that the City Engineer does two reviews of submitted information, performing one and then submitting comments to the applicant, and a follow-up review to see if the appropriate corrections are made. The staff is working to establish an application fee to put the burden of cost back on the applicants. If the check list of requirements is not with the submission, the material is never sent to Kimley-Horn.

Mr. Hodgson indicated that this is typical procedure for most cities he has worked with. He asked if Oak Hill knows what other cities do about notifications and deadlines. Mr. Notestine said that Nolensville sends out notifications seven days before a meeting. There is no statute controlling this, but he will check on other requirements and practices.

Mr. McWilliams said to give as much as is practical in notifications sent out, but make sure not to create issues that can't be foreseen by having extreme requirements.

Mr. Hodgson suggested posting on the web a list of submittals, indicating it will be determined if the items will be on the agenda after a review of the submission for full content. Mr. McWilliams indicated this is a good idea, and said Mr. Hodgson had another good idea in suggesting the Planning Commission consider using a consent agenda. Mr. Hodgson then explained this means the staff does a complete review of a submission, and find it meets all requirements; someone on the Planning Commission reviews the information; when the case comes to the Planning Commission in open meeting it is shown that these cases have been reviewed, and it is asked of those in attendance if anyone wants to hear that case. If no one wishes to hear the case, then it is put on the consent agenda. Mr. Hodgson said this process is done at every commission he is part of.

Mr. Helms indicated that with the new audio streaming program to be used by the City, the agenda could go on the web with attachments, and then anyone before a meeting could pull up the documents before a meeting to look at them.

Mr. Helms said that the Board of Commissioners has approved an update of the subdivision regulations and zoning ordinances, and he asked the Planning Commission to make a list of things they would like to see changed or updated. This process to update the documents would include a staff work session to review and offer suggestions, a Planning Commission work session, a public hearing, and two hearings of an ordinance by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Allison said he appreciates how Mr. Dufour reviews and presents documentation for each case, giving good "cut and dried" information; the rest of the Planning Commission echoed his comments.

4.) Adjournment – After discussion of several general topics, there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on a motion duly made and seconded at 7:06 pm.

City Recorder

Chair