AGENDA
Regular Meeting
March 11, 2019
5:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. CHAIRMAN COMMENTS: Audience members wishing to speak to an agenda item will have the opportunity to speak at the beginning of the agenda and will have five minutes to address the Planning Commission. No rebuttal remarks are permitted.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT (NON-AGENDA ITEMS)

E. PUBLIC COMMENT (AGENDA ITEMS)

F. MINUTES
   1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from the February 11, 2019 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

G. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

H. CONSENT AGENDA
   1. **PC Resolution 19-16**
      Release Performance Bond and establish Maintenance Bond Southern Springs Ph 3C Sewer Pump Station
   2. **PC Resolution 19-17**
      Dedication of Road ROW and Public Improvements in Wade's Grove Sec 12, 13, 14
   3. **PC Resolution 19-18**
      Release Maintenance Bond Wade's Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14
   4. **PC Resolution 19-19**
      Dedication of Road ROW and Public Improvements in Wade's Grove Amenity Site
   5. **PC Resolution 19-20**
      Release Maintenance Bond Wade's Grove Amenity Site
   6. **PC Resolution 19-21**
      Establish Performance Bond for Barclay Port Royal Subdivision.

8. **FPL 648-2019**: Submitted by WES Engineers & Surveyors for Somerset Springs – Townhomes Ph. 2 Sec. 4. The property is located on Port Royal Road, zoned R-4 and contains approximately 1.27 acres. A master plan was approved in 2007. The applicant requests final Plat approval for 20 residential townhome units. Requested by Allen O’Leary.

I. OLD BUSINESS

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **ANX 643-2019**: Submitted by Crunk Engineering for the annexation of property located at 3233 Cleburne Road. The property is zoned AG, contains approximately 103 acres and is directly south of Harvest Point Subdivision. The applicant requests annexation and has submitted a concept plan for potential residential development. Requested by Adam Crunk.


3. **PDP 646-2019** Submitted by Civil Site Design Group for Derryberry Mixed-Use. The property is located at 3786 Jim Warren Road, zoned C-4 and contains approximately 46.85 acres. The applicant requests planned development preliminary plan approval. The planned development concept plan underwent final review and comment at the February 11, 2019 meeting of the Planning Commission. Requested by Joe Haddix.

4. **FPL 647-2019**: Submitted by Sawyer Land Surveying, LLC for Lots 36, 37, 39 & 40 of Carnation Place. The property is located at Carnation Drive at Depot Street, zoned R-2 and contains approximately .60 acres. The applicant requests final plat revision and approval to remove the private driveway easement across and for lots 36, 37, 39 & 40. Requested by Mark E. Sawyer.

5. **PPL 649-2019**: Submitted by Thomas & Hutton for Southern Springs Ph. 7 & 8. The property is zoned R-4 and contains 87.27 acres. The applicant requests preliminary plat approval for 201 single family lots. A neighborhood concept plan (NCP 489-2018) was approved at the April 9, 2018 meeting of the Planning Commission. Requested by Jon Claxton.

6. **STP 650-2019**: Submitted by Gresham Smith for Crossings – Lot 7. The property is zoned C-5 and contains approximately .97 acres. The applicant requests site plan approval for a 7,200 sq./ft retail development. The site concept plan underwent final review and comment at the February 11, 2019 meeting of the Planning Commission. Requested by Joe Johnston.

7. **SPm 651-2019**: Submitted by Remick Moore Architecture for Belshire Village/ Belshire Condominiums. The property is zoned C-4 and contains 16.05 acres. The applicant is requesting building elevation modifications as a site plan minor modification. The site plan (STP 606-2018) was approved at the November 11, 2018 meeting of the Planning Commission. Requested by Rachel Allen.
K. OTHER BUSINESS


2. **Resolution 19-15**
   2019 Major Thoroughfare Plan. This item will be voted on during the Special Called Meeting of the Planning Commission on March 25, 2019.

3. The site plan minor modification for Spring Hill Oral Surgery (SPm 642-2019) has been approved administratively.

L. BOARD COMMENT

M. STAFF COMMENT

N. ADJOURN
SPRING HILL  
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY FEBRUARY 11, 2019  
5:30 P.M.

Chairman Paul Downing called the meeting to order at 5:42 PM.

**Members Present:** Alderman Matt Fitterer, Chairman Paul Downing, Jared Cunningham, Todd Benne, James Golias and Vice Chairman Paula Hepp. Mayor Rick Graham was not present.

**City Staff Present:** City Attorney Patrick Carter, Planning Director Steve Foote, Associate Planner Logan Elliott, City Engineer Tom Wolf, Assistant City Administrator Chuck Downham, Fire Marshall Tony Wallace and Planning Assistant Austin Page.

**Public Comment (Non-Agenda Items):** No comment

**Public Comment (Agenda Items):**
1. Peggy Lee Roman of 801 Belle Drive (lives at 725 Lancaster) spoke in opposition to RZN 633-2019.
3. Angela Privett of 1911 Kittemer Lane spoke in support of RZN 633-2019.

**Approval of the January 14, 2019 combined Work Session and Regular Meeting Minutes:** Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve the January 14, 2019 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 6-0.

**Approval of the Agenda:** Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve the agenda as presented. Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion Passed 6-0

**CONSENT AGENDA:**
Planning Director Steve Foote recommended that PPL 636-2019 should be approved with five (5) staff conditions of approval (1, 2, 3, 5, 6), with condition four (4) being taken out because it was not intended to be in this report.


   **Staff Conditions:**
   1. A detailed technical review of the construction plans is in process in advance of forwarding same to TDEC for their review and approval.
   2. Incorporate the new ADA ramp with truncated domes detail on construction plans (one ramp per corner).
   3. Dimension the PUDEs with underground infrastructure between Lots 99 – 100, 212 – 213 and 140 – 141.
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4. Add a note that all open space shall be a PUDE to allow for maintenance of said open spaces or provide width restricted access and utility easements.
5. Provide approved Fire Department turnarounds for access roads that exceed 150’ in length (minimum 96’ diameter pavement) or Temporary turnarounds may be hard packed gravel.
6. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time the applicant/developer shall obtain all necessary permits, complete all applicable improvements, and submit final plat applications for review and approval.
7. Modifications to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to submittal of a final plat application.

2. **PPL 636-2019**: Submitted by S&ME, Inc. for Harvest Point, Phase 6B. The property is zoned R-2 PUD and contains approximately 8.61 acres. The applicant requests preliminary plat approval for 34 single-family lots. Requested by Zac Davis.

**Staff conditions:**
1. A detailed technical review of the construction plans is in process in advance of forwarding same to TDEC for their review and approval.
2. Incorporate the new ADA ramp with truncated domes detail on construction plans (one ramp per corner).
3. Label all sanitary and storm sewer pipe diameters and materials of construction.
4. Prior to approval the applicant shall revise the preliminary plat to include landscaping consistent with the approved master plan and submit this revision to the Spring Hill planning department.
5. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time the applicant/developer shall obtain all necessary permits, complete all applicable improvements, and submit final plat applications for review and approval.
6. Modifications to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to submittal of a final plat application.

*Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve the Consent Agenda with staff associated conditions of approval including the correction made by Mr. Foote. Motion seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp. Motion passed 6-0.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. **STP 627-2018**: Submitted by S&ME for Harvest Point, Phase 16 Townhomes. The property is zoned R2-PUD and contains approximately 15.18 acres. The applicant requests site plan approval for 75 townhome lots. Requested by Eric McNeely.

**Staff Conditions:**
1. Incorporate the new ADA ramp with truncated domes detail on construction plans (one ramp per corner).
2. Number of units in Section 1 does not exceed the threshold requiring two (2) access points to the development. Section 2 will exceed the threshold and provisions need to be made for a second access at site plan submittal.
3. Label the diameter of the temporary cul-de-sacs.
4. The 90-degree parking stalls provided measure 9 feet by 19 feet. City standards measure 9 feet by 18 feet minimum.
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5. A detailed technical review of the construction plans is in process in advance of forwarding same to TDEC for their review and approval.

6. Site plan approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time all required permits shall be obtained. Modification to the approved site plan may require Planning Commission approval.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve STP 627-2018 with conditions one (1) through three (3) and five (5) through six (6). Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 5-0 with Commissioner Cunningham abstaining.

2. **PDC 637-2019**: Submitted by Civil Site Design Group for Derryberry Mixed-Use. The property is zoned C-4 and contains approximately 46.85 acres. The applicant requests Planned Development Concept Plan review and comment for a mixed-use development. Requested by Joe Haddix.

   This request is a non-voting item. The purpose of this process is to offer information and guidance to the applicant. Therefore, no recommendation is made.

3. **SPC 638-2019**: Submitted by Gresham Smith & Partners for Crossings – Lot 7. The property is zoned C-5 and contains approximately 0.97 acres. The applicant requests Site Plan Concept review and comments for a 7,200 sq. ft retail development. Requested by Joe Johnston.

   This request is a non-voting item. The purpose of this process is to offer information and guidance to the applicant. Therefore, no recommendation is made.


   **Recommendation**: Staff recommends denial of rezone application RZN 633-2019. Should the Planning Commission recommend approval of the application, staff recommends that the development of the site be in substantial compliance with the concept plan provided and that the applicant provide a row of transition lots on-site that match the minimum width and area of those adjoining lots in the Autumn Ridge and Rubens Landing subdivisions, or a substantial buffer.

   Alderman Fitterer made motion to favorably recommend RZN 633-2019 to the Board of Mayor and Alderman. Motion seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp. Motion failed 2-4 with Chairman Downing and Commissioners; Cunningham, Benne and Golias dissenting.

   Chairman Downing made motion to not recommend RZN 633-2019. Motion seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Motion passed 4-2 with Alderman Fitterer and Vice Chairman Hepp dissenting.

5. **RZN 634-2019**: Submitted by Anderson, Delk, Epps & Associates, Inc. for a property rezone along Buckner Road. The property is zoned R-2 and contains approximately 17.00 Acres. The applicant requests a rezone from R-2 to R-5. Requested by Joe Epps.

   **Recommendation**: Staff recommends denial of rezoning application RZN 634-2019 or that the request be tabled until the zoning ordinance is amended in a manner to allow townhome uses.

*P.C. Regular Meeting Minutes 2-11-2019*
Alderman Fitterer made motion to favorably recommend RZN 634-2019 to the Board of Mayor and Alderman and ask them to consider including the sketch exhibit dated 1-31-2019 as a condition of their approval. Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 5-1 with Chairman Downing dissenting.

6. Development Code Text and Map Amendments

Alderman Fitterer recommended to approve Resolution 19-13 and then one (1) by one (1) motion to amend individual items and go through the list and proceed to the next resolution.

a. **ZTA 639-2019**: Consider zoning text amendments to Article 1-14 and the Table of Contents of the UDC. Said amendments further refine the new document, add clarity and remove inconsistencies (Resolution 19-13).

**RZN 640-2019**: Consider several corrections to the Municipal Zoning Map of Spring Hill. Proposed changes correct errors performed in translating zoning designations from the prior zoning map and/or ordinances during the UDC adoption.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve Resolution 19-13. Motion Seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Item 5 in Article 8, to strike number 1, Amusement Facility and strike number 3, Place of Worship. Motion was not seconded.

Vice Chairman Paula Hepp made a motion to amend Item 5 in Article 8, to strike number 3, Place of Worship. Motion Seconded by Alderman Fitterer. Motion failed 3-3.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A by striking Item 6. Motion seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Motion passed 6-0.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 12 to replace the references of 8 dwelling units to 12 dwelling units. Motion was not seconded.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 12 to replace 1 visitor space per 8 dwelling unit to 1 space per 10 dwelling units. Motion Seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp. Motion failed 3-3.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 13 by striking it entirely. Motion Seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Motion passed 6-0.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 14 by striking it entirely. Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 4-2 with Chairman Downing and Commissioner Cunningham dissenting.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 5 to replace the word “required” with “should”. Motion seconded Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 5-1 with Commissioner Cunningham dissenting.

_P.C. Regular Meeting Minutes 2-11-2019_
Alderman Fitterer made motion to amend Exhibit A, Item 23 to replace the word “including” with “may include”. Motion seconded by Commissioner Benne. Motion passed 6-0.

Motion to approve Resolution 19-13 passed 6-0.

b. **ZTA 639-2019**: Consider zoning text amendments to Article 15-17 of the UDC. Said amendments further refine the new document, add clarity and remove inconsistencies (19-14).

Vice Chairman Hepp made motion to strike letter v from Item 6. Motion seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Motion passed 6-0.

Commissioner Cunningham made motion to amend Item 4 to leave the 96” diameter as is and other staff conditions to remain as is. Motion seconded by Chairman Downing. Motion passed 6-0.

Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve Resolution 19-14 as twice amended. Motion seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp. Motion passed 6-0.


Alderman Fitterer made motion to approve Design Review Commission Resolution 19-01. Motion seconded by Vice Chairman Hepp. Motion passed 6-0.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Alderman Fitterer asked for an update on the Arby’s site plan modification. City staff has contacted the applicant and are awaiting a response.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about cul-de-sac that was brought up during December 10, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting related to Silver Cloud Way.

Assistant City Administrator Chuck Downham mentioned how the developer would be coming back to staff with a request and no request has been made.

**BOARD COMMENT:**

Planning Director, Steve Foote thanked staff for the amount of work and effort that goes into getting these packets together.

Associate Planner, Logan Elliott mentioned how staff will cut down on the waste of paper and get the commission the accurate documents ahead of time.

**STAFF COMMENT:**

1. SKP 551-2018: Preserve at Spring Hill has been withdrawn.

_P.C. Regular Meeting Minutes 2-11-2019_
ADJOURN

Chairman Downing moved to adjourn at 8:56 PM.

________________________________  __________________________________
Paul Downing, Chairman               Steve Foote, P.C. Secretary
DATE: February 19, 2019
REQUEST: Release the performance bond and establish a maintenance bond for Southern Springs Phase 3C Sanitary Sewer Pump Station
SUBMITTED BY: Thomas S. Wolf, P.E. – City Engineer

OVERVIEW:

- A performance bond was established for the installation of a sanitary sewer pump station in Phase 3C in the amount of $550,000.00 in August 2018.
- The pump station was brought online January 31, 2019 and passed all inspections by city staff.

PC ACTION REQUESTED:

- Approve PC Resolution 19-16 to release the performance bond and establish a maintenance bond for Southern Springs Phase 3C Sanitary Sewer Pump Station
RESOLUTION 19-16 OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE

A RESOLUTION TO RELEASE THE EXISTING PERFORMANCE BOND AND
TO ESTABLISH AS A MAINTENANCE BOND FOR
SOUTHERN SPRINGS PHASE 3C SANITARY SEWER PUMP STATION

WHEREAS, a Performance Bond is in place guaranteeing the completion of certain improvements for Southern Springs Phase 3C in the amount of $550,000.00; and

WHEREAS, the following improvements are required pursuant to the Final Plat:
Sanitary sewer pump station; and

WHEREAS, to date, the improvements have been completed and approved through inspections by the City and therefore a Maintenance Bond letter of credit is required; and

WHEREAS, a Maintenance Bond letter of credit is guaranteeing the workmanship and materials of certain improvements for Southern Springs Phase 3C and the repair of such should damage occur during covered period; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the City Engineer that the Letter of Credit in the amount of $550,000.00 be reduced to 30% according to Section IV 4.3 Spring Hill Subdivision Regulations, establishing a Maintenance Bond letter of credit in the amount of $165,000.00 for a minimum of twelve (12) months from date of final topping.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Spring Hill Planning Commission that the existing bond letter of credit be reduced to establish a Maintenance Bond letter of credit for Southern Springs Phase 3 Sanitary Sewer Pump Station in the amount of $165,000.00 is hereby approved.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019.

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
CERTIFICATE OF SATISFACTORY COMPLETION

Date: 2/14/19

Pulte Homes
Southern Springs
Phase 3C Sewer Pump Station

Development Name: Southern Springs
Phase or Section of Construction: Phase 3C Sewer Pump Station
Public Improvements: Sewer Pump Station

I hereby certify that I have supervised and inspected the improvements to ensure that the design intent has been achieved.

Record Drawings have been submitted by Applicant's engineer to the City pursuant to ordinance requirements.

Further, Developer must establish a Maintenance Surety with the City to guarantee defects in workmanship or materials for a one year period.

James J. Vrdoljak
City of Spring Hill Sewer Collections Superintendent (signature)

Approved By:
Thomas S. Wolf
City of Spring Hill Engineering Dept. (signature)
DATE: February 19, 2019

REQUEST: Recommend acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14

Release the maintenance bond for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14

SUBMITTED BY: Thomas S. Wolf, P.E. - City Engineer

OVERVIEW:

- A maintenance bond is in place for Sections 12, 13 and 14 in the amount of $35,021.58.
- Roads were final topped in September 2017.
- All certificates of satisfaction have been signed off on by Public Works department staff.

PC ACTION REQUESTED:

- Approve PC Resolution 19-17 to recommend acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14
- Approve PC Resolution 19-18 to release the maintenance bond for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14
RESOLUTION 19-17 OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE AND DEDICATION OF ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THE EXISTING PLAT FOR
WADE’S GROVE SECTIONS 12, 13 AND 14

WHEREAS, John Maher Builders, Inc. has a recorded Final Plat for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14 in Williamson County Plat Book P63, Pages 5, 6 and 116; and

WHEREAS, said Plat show Public Rights-of-Way proposed for dedication to the City of Spring Hill; and

WHEREAS, an Offer of Dedication, Deeds of Conveyance and a Maintenance Surety have been submitted pursuant to the Subdivision Regulations; and

WHEREAS, a Certificate of Satisfactory Completion has been furnished by the City of Spring Hill indicating that through inspections of the Road Rights-of-Way, the design intent has been achieved; and

WHEREAS, the developer is required under Article III, Section 6.3 of the Subdivision Regulations to submit an “as-built” survey of the public improvements including water, sewer and drainage; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission deems it in the best interest of the City of Spring Hill that the Offer of Dedication of the Road Rights-of-Way and Public Improvement’s be accepted and the same become a part of the Public Street system of the City of Spring Hill.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Spring Hill Planning Commission that dedication and acceptance of Road Rights-of-Way and Public Improvements within Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14 as shown on the recorded plats is hereby recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019.

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
A RESOLUTION TO RELEASE THE MAINTENANCE BOND FOR WADE’S GROVE SECTIONS 12, 13 AND 14

WHEREAS, a Maintenance Bond is currently in place for said development; and

WHEREAS, the existing Letter of Credit, considered a “maintenance surety” based on current subdivision regulations, guaranteed that the following improvements, which may include but not be limited to, sewer lines, water lines, storm water drainage and detention pond, curbs and streets with asphalt base course and final topping, would be constructed as per the approved design and function properly; and

WHEREAS, to date, the improvements noted heretofore have been constructed and have been functioning properly for a minimum period of twelve (12) months; and

WHEREAS, release of said maintenance bond shall be contingent upon the Board of Mayor and Alderman approving a resolution for acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for said development; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the City Engineer that the Maintenance Bond for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14 in the amount of $35,021.58 be released.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Spring Hill Planning Commission that release of the Maintenance Bond for Wade’s Grove Sections 12, 13 and 14 in the amount of $35,021.58 is hereby approved.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
CERTIFICATE OF SATISFACTORY COMPLETION

Date: 21519

John Maher Builders

Wade's Grove

Phases 12, 13, 14

Development Name: Wade's Grove

Phase or Section of Construction: Phases 12, 13, 14

Public Improvements: Water, sewer, storm water drainage and basins, streets, curbs, sidewalks, street signs, street lights, final topping

I hereby certify that I have supervised and inspected the improvements to ensure that the design intent has been achieved.

Record Drawings have been submitted by Applicant's engineer to the City pursuant to ordinance requirements.

Further, Developer must establish a Maintenance Surety with the City to guarantee defects in workmanship or materials for a one year period.

Chris Crowley
City of Spring Hill Utility Inspector (signature)

Chris Crowley
Printed name

Approved By:

Thomas S. Wolf
City of Spring Hill Engineering Dept. (signature)

Thomas S. Wolf
Printed name
DATE: February 19, 2019

REQUEST: Recommend acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site

Release the maintenance bond for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site

SUBMITTED BY: Thomas S. Wolf, P.E. - City Engineer

OVERVIEW:

- A maintenance bond is in place for the amenity site in the amount of $1,449.00.
- Roads were final topped in September 2017.
- All certificates of satisfaction have been signed off on by Public Works department staff.

PC ACTION REQUESTED:

- Approve PC Resolution 19-19 to recommend acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site
- Approve PC Resolution 19-20 to release the maintenance bond for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site
RESOLUTION 19-19 OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE AND DEDICATION OF ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THE EXISTING PLAT FOR
WADE’S GROVE AMENITY SITE

WHEREAS, John Maher Builders, Inc. has a recorded Final Plat for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site in Williamson County Plat Book 54 Page 89; and

WHEREAS, said Plat show Public Rights-of-Way proposed for dedication to the City of Spring Hill; and

WHEREAS, an Offer of Dedication, Deeds of Conveyance and a Maintenance Surety have been submitted pursuant to the Subdivision Regulations; and

WHEREAS, a Certificate of Satisfactory Completion has been furnished by the City of Spring Hill indicating that through inspections of the Road Rights-of-Way, the design intent has been achieved; and

WHEREAS, the developer is required under Article III, Section 6.3 of the Subdivision Regulations to submit an “as-built” survey of the public improvements including water, sewer and drainage; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission deems it in the best interest of the City of Spring Hill that the Offer of Dedication of the Road Rights-of-Way and Public Improvement’s be accepted and the same become a part of the Public Street system of the City of Spring Hill.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Spring Hill Planning Commission that dedication and acceptance of Road Rights-of-Way and Public Improvements within Wade’s Grove Amenity Site as shown on the recorded plats is hereby recommended to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019.

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
RESOLUTION 19-20 OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE

A RESOLUTION TO RELEASE THE MAINTENANCE BOND FOR WADE'S GROVE AMENITY SITE

WHEREAS, a Maintenance Bond is currently in place for said development; and

WHEREAS, the existing Letter of Credit, considered a “maintenance surety” based on current subdivision regulations, guaranteed that the following improvements, which may include but not be limited to, sewer lines, water lines, storm water drainage and detention pond, curbs and streets with asphalt base course and final topping, would be constructed as per the approved design and function properly; and

WHEREAS, to date, the improvements noted heretofore have been constructed and have been functioning properly for a minimum period of twelve (12) months; and

WHEREAS, release of said maintenance bond shall be contingent upon the Board of Mayor and Alderman approving a resolution for acceptance and dedication of road rights-of-way and public improvements for said development; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the City Engineer that the Maintenance Bond for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site in the amount of $1,449.00 be released.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Spring Hill Planning Commission that release of the Maintenance Bond for Wade’s Grove Amenity Site in the amount of $1,449.00 is hereby approved.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
CERTIFICATE OF SATISFACTORY COMPLETION

Date: 216119

John Maher Builders
Wade's Grove
Amenity Center

Development Name: Wade's Grove

Phase or Section of Construction: Amenity Center

Public Improvements: Water, sewer, storm water drainage and basins, streets, curbs, sidewalks, street signs, street lights, final topping

I hereby certify that I have supervised and inspected the improvements to ensure that the design intent has been achieved.

Record Drawings have been submitted by Applicant’s engineer to the City pursuant to ordinance requirements.

Further, Developer must establish a Maintenance Surety with the City to guarantee defects in workmanship or materials for a one year period.

City of Spring Hill Utility Inspector (signature)  
Chris Crumley

Printed name

Approved By:
City of Spring Hill Engineering Dept. (signature)  
Thomas S. Wolf

Printed name
DATE: February 19, 2019
REQUEST: Establish a performance bond for Barclay Port Royal Subdivision
SUBMITTED BY: Thomas S. Wolf, P.E. - City Engineer

OVERVIEW:
- Final plat was approved on the November 2018 Planning Commission meeting agenda.
- Developer has submitted application and corresponding documentation to establish bonds.

PC ACTION REQUESTED:
- Approve PC Resolution 19-21 to establish a performance bond for Barclay Port Royal Subdivision
RESOLUTION 19-21 OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A PERFORMANCE BOND FOR
BARCLAY PORT ROYAL SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, a Performance Bond is required to be established for this development prior to recording of a Final Plat; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Bond is guaranteeing the construction of certain improvements on 2 lots (lot split); and

WHEREAS, the following improvements are required pursuant to the Final Plat:
Water line and Sewer line; and

WHEREAS, to date, the improvements have not been completed and/or accepted by the City and, therefore, a Performance Bond is required; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the City Engineer that a Performance Bond be established in the amount of $136,658.00; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that the date of completion for the above referenced public improvements will be within the time prescribed for the bond and it is required that an automatic renewal clause, to the benefit of the City of Spring Hill, be included within the bond in case such improvements are not completed in a timely manner; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the public improvements listed above, the Developer will be required to file a “maintenance” bond guaranteeing performance of the public improvements for a minimum of an additional one year period with the Planning Commission after the dedication and acceptance of such public improvements by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Spring Hill Planning Commission approves the establishment of a Performance Bond for Barclay Port Royal Subdivision in the amount of $136,658.00.

Passed and adopted this 11th day of March, 2019

Paul Downing, Chairman

Steve Foote, Secretary
Utility Information Sheet

Development RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 2
(BARCLAY PORT ROYAL SUBDIVISION)

# of lots 2

Cost to install (Performance Bond)

Sewer Line $9,300.00
Water Line $114,935.00

TOTAL = $124,235.00

+ 10% OF TOTAL = $12,423.00

BOND AMOUNT = $136,658.00
**Application for Surety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong></td>
<td>RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 2 BARCLAY PORT ROYAL SUBDIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lots Approved:</strong></td>
<td>TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lots Remaining:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surety Type:</strong></td>
<td>Maintenance X Performance Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posted With:</strong></td>
<td>Letter of Credit Performance Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surety Amount:</strong></td>
<td>$136,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expiration Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automatic Renewal Clause included with Surety:</strong></td>
<td>Yes / No (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of Surety:</strong></td>
<td>RECORD THE SUBDIVISION PLAT AND PROVIDE SURETY FOR THE 8&quot; WATERLINE EXTENSION AND ONE SAN SEWER SERVICE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Financial Institution:</strong></td>
<td>Nationwide Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Person:</strong></td>
<td>Randall Cronk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>4918 Main St., Suite 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City, State, Zip:</strong></td>
<td>Spring Hill, TN 37174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number:</strong></td>
<td>(615) 302-3456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax Number:</strong></td>
<td>(615) 302-3460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Owner/Developer or Representative:</strong></td>
<td>William Robert Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>2560 Antim Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City, State, Zip:</strong></td>
<td>Columbia, TN 38401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number:</strong></td>
<td>(615) 796-0455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax Number:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Request**

I (we) request that the following action be taken:

- [X] Establish New Surety
- [ ] Request Final Inspection and Release of Surety
- [ ] Request Reduction of Surety Amount
- [ ] Request extension of surety for (1) year
- [ ] Request Maintenance Bond
  (Please provide proof of difficulty below)

**Explanation for Proof of Difficulty:**

---

**Applicant Signature:**

**Date:** 2/5/19

---

**City Staff Signature:**

**Date:**  

---
OWNER:
SLOWFIRE LAND CO., LLC
2566 ANTAKM CIRCLE
COLUMBIA, TN 38401
615-796-6153

LOCATION MAP

SITE

LOCATION MAP

LEGEND

• IRON PIN FOUND
• IRON PIN SET
• EXISTING SEWER MAINLINE
• EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
• EXISTING STORM DITCH BASIN
• TEMPORARY ELECTRIC METER
• EXISTING LIGHT POLE
• EXISTING POWER POLE
• OVERHEAD TELEPHONE SERVICE

- WATER SERVICE
- OVERHEAD ELECTRIC SERVICE
- SETBACK LINE
- PROPERTY LINE

TOTAL AREA=98,141.4 SQ. FT. OR 2.25 ACRES
ROW DEDICATION=846.91 SQ. FT. OR 0.02 ACRES
NOTE: ANY ADDITIONAL ACCESS TO OLD PORT ROYAL ROAD SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE SPRING HILL PLANNING COMMISSION AT THE CONCEPT OR SITE PLAN APPROVAL STAGE.

RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 2
BARCLAY PORT ROYAL SUBDIVISION
OLD PORT ROYAL ROAD
SPRING HILL, MAURY CO., TN.

SCALE 1"=50'

Ahler & Associates, LLC
CONSULTING ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS
P.O. BOX 6556
SPRING HILL, TN 37164
PH: 615.461.3109
FAX: 615.523.8777
Spring Hill Planning Commission Regular Meeting

TO: Spring Hill Planning Commission
FROM: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director
Logan Elliott, Associate Planner
MEETING: March 11, 2019
SUBJECT: PPL 645-2019 (Harvest Point Phase 8B & 9)

**PPL 645-2019:** Submitted by S&ME for Harvest Point Phase 8, Section B, and Phase 9. The property is zoned R-2, PUD, and contains 18.84 acres. The applicant seeks a preliminary plat approval for 55 single-family lots to be processed under the provisions of the approved PUD.

**Property Description:** This property is located within the Harvest Point development and is the most north portion of the development that abuts Cleburne Ave. This current phase is for 55 single-family lots, a common open space, and a drainage pond.

**Streets and Sidewalks:** The applicant proposes an extension of local street Ewell Farm Drive with a 50’ dedicated right-of-way and two new local roads interior to the property that also provide 50’ of dedicated right-of-way. The applicant is providing 5’ sidewalks on both sides of the proposed streets.

**Landscaping and Buffering:** The landscape plan provides for street trees, a landscape buffer along the northern property boundary, and a landscape buffer between the drainage pond and lots. There also will be a continuation of the landscape buffer in place to the south of this phase, that runs along Cleburne road and will serve to buffer this phase of the development, including the drainage pond, from Cleburne Road.

**Bulk and Area:** Based on staff’s review of the information provided, this proposal is compliant with the minimum bulk and area requirements of the City’s PUD provisions and the master development plan approved for the project.

**Bicycle and Greenway Plan:** The Harvest Point PUD master plan proposes almost 4.5 miles of internal trails to provide for internal multi-modal circulation and connections outside of the neighborhood, particularly to the Spring Hill Middle School. Phase 8B and 9 do not include any of these trails.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat application PPL 645-2019, Harvest Point Phase 8B & 9, subject to the following conditions:

1. Submit landscape plan for Cleburne Road buffer to match phases to the south.
2. A detailed technical review of the construction plans is in process in advance of forwarding same to TDEC for their review and approval.
3. Incorporate on preliminary plat and construction plans and construct new ADA ramp(s) with truncated domes in accordance with new detail (one ramp per corner).
4. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time the applicant/developer shall obtain all necessary permits, complete all applicable improvements, and submit final plat applications for review and approval.
5. Modifications to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to submittal of a final plat application.
TO: Spring Hill Planning Commission
FROM: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director
        Logan Elliott, Associate Planner
MEETING: March 11, 2019
SUBJECT: PPL 648-2019 (Somerset Springs – Townhomes Phase 2, Section 4)

PPL 648-2019: Submitted by Wes Engineers & Surveyors for Somerset Springs Townhomes. The property is zoned R-6, but was approved under the former R-4, High Density Residential district, and contains approximately 1.27 acres. The applicant requests final plat approval for 20 townhomes under the provisions of the Master Plan that was processed under the old zoning code. Requested by Allen O’Leary.

Property Description and History: This development is south of the east/west portion of Port Royal Road. The Master Plan was approved in 2007. This phase of the development is interior to the Master Plan and provides for 20 townhome units in groups of 4 and 6. The lot layout and configuration is consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Landscape and Buffering: The landscaping on site shall comply with the approved Master Plan from 2007.

Streets and Sidewalks: The property is developed with private internal streets. One private street is being extended and two additional private streets are being created and will be extended in a later phase. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the streets being provided.

Access: All townhomes are planned to have separate curb cuts and driveways onto the private street.

Summary: Staff and the Planning Commission had no comments on this application at the work session.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of Preliminary Plat application PPL 648-2019, Somerset Springs – Townhomes Phase 2, Section 4, with the following conditions:

1. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time the applicant/developer shall obtain all necessary permits, complete all applicable improvements, and submit final plat applications for review and approval.
2. Modifications to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to submittal of a final plat application.
Final Plat
ANX 643-2019: Submitted by Crunk Engineering, LLC for property located at 3233 Cleburne Road. The property is zoned Maury County A2 - Rural Residential and contains approximately 103 acres. The applicant requests annexation of this property into the City of Spring Hill. Requested by Wayne Hardison.

Property Description and History: This property is located west of Cleburne Road and is south of and adjacent to the Harvest Point PUD. The southern boundary of the property is The Petty Lane/Cleburne Road intersection with Petty lane approximately following the western boundary line. The property is contiguous to the City's limits and the property lies within the City's established urban growth boundary, in Maury County. Their currently exist one single-family home on the property.

Access: Primary access to the site is via Cleburne Road. The applicant has provided a concept plan for the site which indicates single family residential development with two access points on Cleburne Road and a proposed connection to the Harvest Point PUD.

Traffic and Transportation: A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required at the Site Plan stage of development. The Cleburne Road cross-section is to be consistent with the County and Harvest Point. The applicant will need to verify the CSX Right-of-Way limits.

Utilities: Public sanitary sewer service is not directly available to the property. The property owner/developer shall be solely responsible for extending sanitary sewer service to the property. The property owner/developer shall be solely responsible for extending water service to the property and any required Water Main extensions. These services are addressed more fully in the attached plan of services.

Land Use and Zoning: Upon annexation, the zoning classification will be designated as AG, Agricultural, until Planning Commission consideration and Board of Mayor and Aldermen approval of a rezoning request, should one be requested. The applicant has provided a concept plan with a density of residential lots that would require a minimum of R-4 zoning.

Spring Hill Rising: 2040: The Spring Hill Rising: 2040 comprehensive plan classifies the area as a Mixed Use Neighborhood Area. Mixed Use Neighborhood Areas are primarily residential but may include low to moderate intensity balanced mixture of retail and office uses based on traditional, compact small town form, offering Spring Hill the ability to live, shop, work, and play in their own neighborhood.

Plan of Services: Staff has prepared a draft Plan of Services in coordination with all applicable city departments. This document is included in your packet for your review.

Summary: The applicant has addressed all comments and questions made by Staff and has agreed to the attached Plan of Services.

Recommendation: Staff recommends forwarding annexation application, ANX 643-2019, to the Board of Mayor and Alderman with a recommendation for approval.
Cleburne Road Tract
CONCEPT MASTER PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Tabulations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>+/- 193 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated CCR ROG</td>
<td>+/- 7 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Floodplain</td>
<td>+/- 21.5 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Site Area</td>
<td>+/- 74.5 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55'x125' (8800 sf) lots:
216

Density: Based on Total Site
Total Open Space Provided: +/- 35.5 ac

Contact plan is conceptual in nature and is based on GIS topographic site maps. Actual site conditions may vary. Cleburne Road Tract does not represent an approved entitlement plan.
RESOLUTION – 19-22

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A PLAN OF SERVICES FOR AND ANNEXING A PORTION OF MAURY COUNTY KNOWN AS MAURY COUNTY TAX MAP 029 PARCELS 011.00 AND 011.01, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 103 ACRES INTO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE.

(ANX 643-2019, CLEBURNE ROAD ANNEXATION)

WHEREAS, Tennessee Code Annotated Section 6-51-102, as amended, requires that a Plan of Services be adopted by a municipal governing body prior to the passage of an annexation resolution; and

WHEREAS, the property owner has requested annexation in order to ensure the value and availability of this property for future uses; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Spring Hill; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Spring Hill; and

WHEREAS, the property will be zoned Agricultural (AG) upon the effective date of annexation; and

WHEREAS, this resolution shall bind the Owners and subsequent Owners of the Property; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill has prepared a Plan of Services for the property that describes how and when municipal services will be provided to the property and identifies the property owner/developer responsibilities for extending public infrastructure to the site; and

WHEREAS, the Spring Hill Planning Commission has reviewed and forwarded a recommendation on the Plan of Services and annexation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on March 11, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill contemplates annexation of the property known as Maury County Tax Map 029, Parcels 011.00 and 011.01, consisting of 103 acres as described herein; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE, BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN, that pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Title 6, Chapter 51, Section 102, approves the Plan of Services contained herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF SPRING HILL, TENNESSEE, BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN, that pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Title 6, Chapter 51, the property shown as part of Maury County Tax Map 029, Parcels 011.00 and 11.01, consisting of approximately 103 acres,
as shown and described in Exhibit A, along with the adjacent right-of-way for Cleburne Road, is hereby annexed to the corporate limits of the City of Spring Hill, Tennessee, and made a part thereof.

SECTION 1: PLAN OF SERVICES

Police Protection: The parcel(s) shall be subject to and benefit from City police protection upon the effective date of annexation. These services include, but are not limited to, patrolling, response calls for service, crime prevention services, traffic control and other routine police services. Radio operations are normal and uninhibited within the area. Based on the current use of the property (a single-family residence) services will be provided using existing personnel and equipment.

Fire Protection: The City of Spring Hill will assume primary responsibility for Fire Protection immediately upon the effective date of annexation, with mutual assistance provided by Maury County Fire Department. Development of the property or a change of use on the property may require that the property owner/developer extend and provide appropriately sized water mains and/or fire hydrants to serve the site according to City of Spring Hill standards. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) is provided by contract through the City of Spring Hill and will be available to the property upon the effective date of annexation. Other services provided through Mutual Aid may apply.

Additionally, fire protection services such as those made available through the City's Fire Marshal and Fire Investigation offices will be available on the effective date of annexation.

Electrical Service: For domestic and commercial use electrical service is already and will continue to be provided by Columbia Power and Water Service (CPWS).

Public Water Service: Public water service in the vicinity is provided by the City of Spring Hill Water Systems. The property owner/developer shall be solely responsible for extending water service to the property and any required water main extensions. All utility installations shall be in compliance with applicable State of Tennessee and City of Spring Hill standards.

Public Sanitary Sewer Service: The property is currently on septic. Public sanitary sewer service is not directly available to the property. The property owner/developer shall be solely responsible for extending sanitary sewer service to the property and any required extension shall be in compliance with City of Spring Hill standards. Once sewer service is within 300 feet of the property the site shall be converted from septic to public sewer. All sanitary sewer inside city user rates and charges shall be applicable to the area inside the annexation area.

Solid Waste Collection: Spring Hill currently provides its businesses and residents refuse collection services via a city-wide contract with a private solid waste collection company. Residential collection may include recycling for single family dwellings. These services will be extended to the annexed area within 90 days of the effective date of annexation.

Road and Street Construction and Repair: If any new public streets are constructed and appropriately dedicated in accordance with City standards on the property, the City will provide
ongoing and routine maintenance similar to other streets within the jurisdiction of the City. The annexation shall include Cleburne Road, in whole, adjacent to the property of Tax Map 029 Parcels 011.00 and 011.01. Maintenance of Cleburne Road shall become the responsibility of the City of Spring Hill upon the effective date of annexation. The property owner shall be required to dedicate right-of-way to achieve a “Collector” street classification as designated on the City’s adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan. Should the property be developed as a residential subdivision following annexation, the owner/developer shall be responsible to improve Cleburne Road to the latest approved City standards and specifications (i.e., width, pavement material, etc.) at the sole cost of the owner/developer with all required improvements to Cleburne Road to be completed within two (2) years of construction commencing on residential subdivision.

**Signs and Lighting:** Additionally, as new streets are developed within the site, traffic control and directional signage as well as street lighting will be furnished and installed by the property owner/developer according to established city policy or regulations.

**Recreational Facilities and Programs:** There is one existing dwelling within the proposed annexation area. All of the recreational areas and programs, current or future, provided for City residents will be made available upon the effective date of annexation to any current or future residents of the annexed area in the same manner as current citizens of the City of Spring Hill. The Spring Hill Bicycle and Greenway Plan depicts Cleburne Road as a recommended location for a future multiuse trail in order to provide an off-road pedestrian connection between residential areas and other public areas of interest. This improvement will be the responsibility of the property owner at the time of future development.

**Planning and Zoning Services:** The City’s planning and zoning jurisdiction will be extended to the annexed area upon the effective date of annexation. When a property is annexed into the city, it is automatically zoned as AG, Agricultural. The Future Land Use Designation of the property on the 2040 Spring Hill Rising plan is Mixed Use Neighborhood Area.

**Storm Water and Drainage:** The City of Spring Hill operates a Storm Water program in accordance with Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) requiring the management of all storm water discharge within its jurisdiction. Annexation of the area expands the program into the annexed area thus making it subject to the current rules and regulations of TDEC pertaining to storm water runoff and discharge. All storm water user rates and charges inside city shall be applicable to the area inside the annexation area.

**Inspection/Code Enforcement:** The City of Spring Hill Codes Department provides plan review services, inspection and code enforcement services (i.e. building, plumbing, gas and unsafe building services, land use (zoning) and development, including flood plain NFIP/FEMA requirements, neighborhood services for housing, litter, overgrowth, illegal dumping) to all areas of the City of Spring Hill. These same services will be provided to the newly annexed area immediately upon the effective date of annexation.

**Animal Control:** The City of Spring Hill does not provide Animal Control. For the subject property Spring Hill relies on Maury County for this service.
Schools: The entire annexation area is served by Maury County Schools.

Library: The City of Spring Hill public library will be available to residents of the property upon the effective date of annexation.

SECTION 2: ANNEXATION. The property described herein below and as shown and further described on Exhibit A attached hereto, is hereby annexed into the City of Spring Hill. The annexed land will be subject to the provisions and requirements of Ordinance 18-21 the Unified Development Code, as amended, and all other applicable ordinances, rules, and regulations of the City of Spring Hill.

SECTION 3: ZONING. Ordinance No. 18-21 (Zoning Map), adopted August 20, 2018, is hereby amended and altered by changing the zoning classification of those certain parcels of real property described below and on Exhibit A (attached), from Maury County A2 to City of Spring Hill AG (Agricultural). In the State of Tennessee, County of Maury, and City of Spring Hill, Tax Map 029, Parcels 011.00 and 011.01, consisting of 103 acres and being more particularly described in Exhibit A, attached hereto:

Exhibit A (attached)

SECTION 4: In case conflict between this resolution or any part hereof, and the whole or part of any existing resolution of the City, the conflicting resolution is repealed to the extent of the conflict but no further. If any section, clause, provision or portion of the resolution is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect any other section, clause, provision or portion of the resolution.

Passed and adopted by the City of Spring Hill, this ___ day of __________, 2019.

This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption by the Board of Mayor and Alderman of the City of Spring Hill.

______________________________
Rick Graham, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
April Goad, City Recorder

LEGAL FORM APPROVED:

______________________________
Patrick Carter, City Attorney
EXHIBIT A
ANX 643-2018

ANNEXATION OF THE CLEBURNE ROAD TRACT
CONSISTING OF 103 ACRES AND
CURRENTLY KNOWN AS MAURY COUNTY
TAX MAP 029 PARCELS 011.00 AND 011.01

This sheet is an Exhibit to Resolution No. ______ adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Spring Hill, TN on the _____ of ________, 2019. The following described property is hereby annexed by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Spring Hill and rezoned according to the attached Resolution.

Property Description: Said land consist of the following property, also shown graphically below:

1. The 103 acres of Tax Map 029 Parcels 011.00 and 011.01 adjacent to Cleburne Road, shown below.

April Goad
City Recorder
City of Spring Hill
PDC 644-2019: Submitted by Catalyst Design Group for Tennessee Children's Home mixed-use redevelopment. The property is zoned C-1, Local Commercial District, and contains approximately 102.13 acres. The applicant requests Planned Development Concept Plan review and comment for a mixed-use development being processed under the UDC. Requested by Jack Parker.

Property Description and History: The subject site is the property with Ferguson Hall and the Tennessee Children’s Home. This site generally lies east of Main Street and School Street, south of McLemore Avenue, west of Elm Street and Old Kedron Road, and north of Kedron Parkway.

Spring Hill Rising: 2040: The future land use classification for this site Downtown/City Center. Downtown/City center is characterized by a compact, walkable environment typical of town centers. Development creates and promotes our sense of place and community, and it encourages active living and community interaction. Future development emphasizes connectivity and uses that generate a high level of activity. The applicant is proposing a development that aligns with the property’s future land use designation.

Analysis: The concept plan consists of 132 single-family lots, 108 townhomes, 40 residential cottages, 315 multi-family apartments, 100 assisted living/condo residences, 130,000 square feet of retail/office space, 20,000 square feet of retail restaurant space, 69,000 square feet of corporate office space, and two hotel sites totaling 250 rooms. This development may entail a build-out period of ten or more years. Forecasting market conditions is difficult over this long of a period and the developer is requesting to have flexibility in several areas and are as follows:

1. The assisted living units may be substituted to residential condo flats.
2. That the retail/office space remains flexible as approved commercial square footage.
3. That a floating build-out total of 40,000 square feet of commercial office space and 50 residential condo units be allowed within certain retail/office buildings for the purpose of allowing certain buildings designed with second or third floors and provide increased mixed-use.
4. That the hotel adjacent to the floodway has the flexibility to be residential condo flats or office space.

Staff finds the retail/office flexibility and floating build out totals to be a reasonable request. Allowing flexibility in the use of the commercial space allows for the buildings to be used in their highest and best commercial use. The underlying zoning designation of C-1 would allow by-right for this kind of flexibility. The build-out totals would also allow for an increased level of mixed-use with residential units over the commercial space and would further the comprehensive plan’s goal of promoting walkable and dense development with a high level of activity in this area of the city. The requested assisted living space and hotel space flexibility is something that Staff suggest conditioning upon a Planning Commission application for a Planned Development minor modification. This application would need to ensure that the additional multi-family single use buildings, in an originally commercially zoned district, would be developed in compliance with the purpose of the Planned Development district.

The applicant has also provided a modified version of Table 8-1 from the UDC that they would like to approve through the Planned Development Process. The applicant is proposing to add, remove, and modify the uses allowed in the C-1 district.
Open Space & Amenities: The applicant proposes a community park fronting an existing lake. The applicant expressed this lake front park will be open to the public. The existing lake is also wrapped by a paved pedestrian trail that extends along the southern side of the development from the commercial area to the multi-family area of the property. The single-family area shows a community clubhouse and amenity center. The multi-family area shows a pocket park and pool & clubhouse area. The existing lawn and mature trees in front of Ferguson Hall is proposed to remain largely undisturbed.

Landscaping & Buffering: The landscaping of the site will be addressed at the Planned Development Preliminary application phase.

Bicycle & Greenway Plan: The Bicycle and Greenway Plan shows Main Street as a proposed bike lane roadway. This improvement will require approval from TDOT. A greenway is shown along the south boundary of this property (Kedron Road). Old Kedron Road is shown as a proposed multi-use trail.

Transportation & Parking: The applicant is utilizing the City’s shared parking provisions and has provided an example land use scenario with the shared use parking requirements indicated. The developers request of floating build out totals and land use designation flexibility will need to be demonstrated compatible with the provided parking. Compliance with parking requirements will ultimately be verified at successive site plan reviews.

Adequacy of Utilities: The applicant has met with City staff to discuss adequacy of utility infrastructure to serve the proposed development. City staff has identified the need for extension of off-site utility improvements that may include replacement or upgrading of utility mains in order to provide sufficient capacity to serve the mix of land uses proposed with the development. A detailed utility analysis will be required with the submittal of the Planned Development Preliminary Plan that provides a detailed capacity analysis and identification of specific off-site utility improvements that will be necessary to serve the project along with a corresponding phasing plan identifying the sequence and timing of construction of utility improvements.

Traffic Impact Study: The applicant met with City staff to discuss potential traffic impacts associated with the development project. A traffic impact study will be required with the next stage in the Planned Development process. The traffic impact study should address internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation as well as external impacts upon surrounding street network including Main Street and Kedron Road that are both classified as Arterial Streets according to the adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan. Specifically, the study will need to address necessary road improvements along Main Street, Kedron Road, and Old Kedron Road/Miles Johnson Road including right-of-way dedication, street improvements that provide for widening and the construction of deceleration and/or turn lanes where necessary as well as intersection improvements including signal systems that may be necessary to address off-site traffic impacts. A corresponding phasing plan identifying the sequence and timing of construction of street and intersection improvements will be provided by the applicant.

Historic Commission: This Historic Commission held a meeting on March 7, 2019 and made the following recommendations on the project:

1. The buffer zone on the north side of the property between the single-family lots and the Spring Hill Cemetery should be sufficient in size to respect the cemetery.
2. An archaeological study of the site should be done due to the extensive history of the site. There also may be two cemeteries on site and their locations should be identified, memorialized, and the remains handled properly.
3. The historic battlefield heritage should be preserved and incorporated into the development as much as possible.
4. Middle Tennessee State University and Maury County Archives should be engaged as they may have historical documents or information relevant to the property.
5. No work should disrupt the National Register status and all work should conform with the Secretary of the Interior standards.
6. The trees within the single-family area should be identified and should reflect the historic nature of the site.
7. The history, stories, and significant people related to the site should be preserved and maintained through the development.
8. This new downtown development should blend well with the surrounding downtown area.
SPRING HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

COMMUNITY CLUBHOUSE & AMENITY CENTER

LEGEND
- RETAIL / FLEX OFFICE (150,000 SF)
- OFFICE (69,000 SF)
- HOTEL/CONDominiums (230 Rooms)
- TOWNHOUSES (3 STORY/108 UNITS)
- MULTIFAMILY (315 UNITS)
- CONDO, COTTAGE HOMES (40 UNITS)
- SENIOR ASSISTED LIVING (100 UNITS TOTAL)
- SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (135 LOTS TOTAL)

PARKING

TENN. CHILDREN'S HOME PROPERTY
MORE INTENSIVE USES ALONG MAIN STREET (HIGHER TRAFFIC COUNTS, SURROUNDING BUSINESS USES, GREATER BUILDING HEIGHTS ETC.)

NOTE:

TENNESSEE CHILDREN'S HOME TO REMAIN IN OPERATION ON THIS PROPERTY UNTIL NEAR CAMPUS IS BUILD AND OPERATIONAL

PHASING PLAN

TENNESSEE CHILDREN'S HOME PROPERTY 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Use</th>
<th>P = Permitted Use</th>
<th>S = Special Use</th>
<th>T = Temporary Use</th>
<th>Blank = Use not allowed in the district</th>
<th>Use Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Correction Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Facility - Indoor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Facility - Outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care Facility - Large Animal</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care Facility - Small Animal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Kennel/Breeder</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Studio</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Modification Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Facility TV/Radio - With Antennas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Facility TV/Radio - No Antennas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Use</th>
<th>P = Permitted Use</th>
<th>S = Special Use</th>
<th>T = Temporary Use</th>
<th>Blank = Use not allowed in the district</th>
<th>Use Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Shelter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-Through Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alcohol Treatment Facility, Residential</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Above the Ground Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Article 8. Uses

## Table 8-1: Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL USE</th>
<th>PERMITTED USE</th>
<th>SPECIAL USE</th>
<th>TEMPORARY USE</th>
<th>USE NOT ALLOWED</th>
<th>USE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Accessory Dwelling Unit: 900sf or Less in GFA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Accessory Dwelling Unit: 90'1sf or More in GFA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Manufactured Home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Multi-Family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Townhouse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Single-Family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Three-Family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - Two-Family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facility - Primary or Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facility - University or College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facility - Vocational</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institution</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institution, Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course/Driving Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office/Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse/Nursery - Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Facility/Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Retail, Rental, and Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment - Secondary Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Spring Hill
August 20, 2018
### Article 8. Uses

#### Table 8-1: Use Matrix

| Principal Use                          | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| Lodge/Meeting Hall                     | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| Parking Lot (Principal Use)            | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| Reception Facility                     | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| Sexually-Oriented Business             | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S |
## Article 8. Uses

### Principal Use

| Principal Use                                      | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-M | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | C-9 | C-10 | USE STANDARD |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Vehicle Repair/Service - Major                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | S   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.X |
| Vehicle Repair/Service - Minor                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.X |
| Warehouse                                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.X |
| Wholesale Establishment                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.X |
| Wind Energy System                                 | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.Y |
| Winery                                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | S |
| Wireless Telecommunications                        | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | Sec. 8.3.Z |

### Temporary Use

| Temporary Use                                      | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-M | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | C-9 | C-10 | USE STANDARD |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Farmers' Market                                   | T   | T   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.4.A |
| Mobile Food Sales                                  |     |     | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.4.B |
| Real Estate Project Sales Office/Model Unit        | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | Sec. 8.4.C |
| Temporary Contractor Office and Contractor Yard   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | Sec. 8.4.D |
| Temporary Outdoor Entertainment                     | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | Sec. 8.4.E |
| Temporary Outdoor Sales                            | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | Sec. 8.4.F |
| Temporary Outdoor Storage Container                | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | T   | Sec. 8.4.G |
Spring Hill Planning Commission Regular Meeting

TO: Spring Hill Planning Commission
FROM: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director
         Logan Elliott, Associate Planner
MEETING: March 11, 2019
SUBJECT: PDP 646-2019 (Derryberry Mixed-Use)

PDP 646-2019: Submitted by Civil Site Design Group for Derryberry Mixed-Use development. The property is zoned C-4 and contains approximately 46.85 acres. The applicant requests Planned Development Concept Plan review and comment for a mixed-use development being processed under the UDC. Requested by Joe Haddix.

Property Description and History: The subject site is located at the north-east corner of Port Royal Road and Derryberry Lane. The property extends on the east to the Woodland Terrace townhome development and on the north to Jim Warren Road. The site is undeveloped with no significant topography changes or any natural features. The site is mostly square with two small parcels projecting inwards to the site on the north-west corner. Marvin wright elementary school is located across Derryberry Lane at the south-east corner of the site.

Spring Hill Rising: 2040: The future land use classification for this site is Community Commerce area which aims to provide regional commercial services for Spring Hill and our neighboring communities. Secondary land uses include multi-family development. The applicant is proposing a mixed-use development that aligns with and achieves the city’s vision based on the property’s future land use designation.

Analysis: The concept plan consists of 280,000 SF of retail, commercial, office & restaurant space, 298 multi-family units, and 104 multi-family units in an age-restricted active adult community.

The applicant would like to reserve the right for the age-restricted units to be built as regular apartment units without age restrictions, depending on market conditions. The Planning Commission may want to specify that this type of change will require approval by the Planning Commission as a Planned Development minor modification per Article 13 of the UDC.

Planned Development: Prior to the adoption of the UDC the way to achieve a mixed-use development would have been under the B-1 or B-4 commercial districts or through the PUD process. The UDC revised the PUD regulations to better streamline the review and approval process and the result was the Planned Development District. In addition, the UDC removed the former loophole of allowing multi-family apartments in the commercial districts. Under the new code, residential is only permitted in the commercial districts when located above the ground floor or in the C-D district by Special Use.

The Planned Development’s purpose is to allow for more creative and flexible development of land than is possible under district zoning regulations and should only be applied to further those applications that provide enhanced amenities or design features to the City. The Derryberry Mixed-Use project is utilizing a more flexible zoning and design approach by providing residential use buildings in the C-4 zoning district. The C-4 zoning district only allows for residential uses to be above the ground floor (commercial) so the proposed site design is only possible through a Planned Development. Aside from this aspect, the applicant has not expressed a desire to modify any of the other underlining C-4 zoning district regulations. The PD district is the proper avenue to accomplish the mixed-use development.

Streets and Sidewalk: The plan calls for the extension of Tom Lunn Road, a designated local street, from its current western terminus at Port Royal Road and continues it to the eastern limit of the property. The applicant is proposing parallel parking and sidewalks on both sides of the extended Tom Lunn Road and the right-of-way dedication has increased to 60’. Sidewalks are provided along the public streets abutting the property (Jim Warren Rd., Port Royal Rd., Derryberry Ln.). The interior of the property is also highly connected with sidewalks and the multi-family area has a walking trail. The
applicant is proposing to construct sidewalk across the frontage of the adjacent development (Woodland Trace) on Derryberry Lane. This will provide access to the existing sidewalk across from the school entrance.

**Access:** The west side of the concept plan fronts on Port Royal Road and is accessed by the extension of Tom Lunn Road. An additional access drive onto Port Royal Road is provided to the commercial area. The applicant provides access to Derryberry Lane via two commercial access drives, one being in alignment with Soaring Eagle Way, and a third access point which serves as the main entrance to the multi-family units. The applicant proposes a secondary access from Jim Warren Road to the active adult community on the northern side of the property, with the main entrance to this community being internal from Tom Lunn Road. The applicant has provided pedestrian access to abutting streets via sidewalks. All access points have been aligned to avoid off-set driveways.

**Utilities:** The applicant has submitted a utility plan including phasing plan for the installation of water and sanitary sewer services serving the project including off-site improvements necessary for water and sewer. The phasing plan provides a sequence for the installation of water mains and sewer mains to serve each phase of development. The water system plan upon full buildout will provide adequate water service and fire flows for each of the various land uses proposed. Similarly, the sewer system upon buildout will provide for the installation of a gravity sewer system serving the majority of the site with a small portion to be served with the installation of a force main. The sewer system will be connecting into an interceptor system that has sufficient capacity to accommodate the flows anticipated from the mix of land uses proposed within the development. The utility phasing plan appears to match up well with the other phasing plan that is part of the submittal package that identifies various road and intersection improvements so that utility and road infrastructure are being installed simultaneously with each phase.

**Access Management Plan:** The Board of Mayor and Alderman adopted Resolution 18-32 (attached), an Access management Plan for the Port Royal Road corridor south of Saturn Parkway. This plan includes management strategies and traffic control measures that include land use planning, roadway design and capacity, access management and traffic management for the corridor. The proposed development will need to comply with the requirements of the Access Management Plan. Specifically, the plan requires all new development along the Port Royal corridor dedicate 95 feet of ROW for the future widening of the corridor. The plan also provides that the intersection of Port Royal Road and Jim Warren and Port Royal and Derryberry Lane be upgraded for signalization. All new development in the corridor shall be required to construct dedicated auxiliary turn lanes into their property. Lastly, the recommended minimum spacing distances for commercial access onto Port Royal Road shall be 660 feet and if this space is lessened access shall be limited to right-in and right-out movement and no driveway shall be closer than 275 feet from a signalized intersection.

**Traffic Impact Study:** The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study for consideration by the City. The study provides recommendations for street and intersection improvements including signalization of select intersections. The recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. Intersection of Port Royal and Derryberry Lane warrants installation of a traffic signal with recommendations for signal phasing to be installed in conjunction with the first phase of development.
2. Extension of Tom Lunn Road from Port Royal Road to east boundary of project to include a southbound left turn lane comprising a minimum of 250 feet of storage constructed on Port Royal Road at Tom Lunn Road and a westbound left turn/through land and separate westbound right turn lane at the intersection with Port Royal Road as well as a new northbound right turn lane comprising a minimum of 100 feet constructed on Port Royal Road at Tom Lunn Road. The intersection is warranted for installation of a traffic signal during second phase of development in response to commercial development.
3. Intersection of Port Royal and Jim Warren to include a dedicated southbound left turn lane and a separate westbound right turn lane are warranted but should be installed by the City of Spring Hill or in conjunction with other development that will impact this intersection rather than proposed project.
4. Jim Warren Road to include construction of a 4-foot shoulder on the south side of Jim Warren along with adequate dedication of right-of-way for future widening to a three-lane cross-section to be completed in conjunction with third phase of proposed development.
5. Project access drive onto Port Royal Road to include separate westbound left and right turn lanes at the intersection with Port Royal Road constructed to include a minimum of 100 feet of storage as well as Port Royal Road to be widened to a three-lane cross-section from Tom Lunn Road to the existing southbound left turn lane at Derryberry Lane in order to provide storage for southbound left turns into the project access drive to be constructed with second phase of development when access drive is installed. A new northbound right turn lane should be constructed on Port Royal Road at the project access that includes a minimum 100 feet storage installed in conjunctions with the new project access and widening of Port Royal Road to a three-lane cross-section from Tom Lunn Road to north of Derryberry Lane.

6. Derryberry Lane to include installation of eastbound left turn lanes at the main access for the commercial portion of proposed development and the access for the multifamily development to include a minimum of 75 feet of storage.

7. All street and intersection improvements including signalization to be designed and constructed to AASHTO standards.

The access drive proposed onto Port Royal Road serving the commercial portion of the proposed project does not comply with the City’s adopted Access Management Plan as it is located less that 275 feet from the signalized intersection of Port Royal and Derryberry. The adopted Access Management Plan for Port Royal recommends no driveway access be permitted that is separated by less than 275 feet from a signalized intersection. If this access drive is to be permitted contrary to the adopted policy, consideration should be given to requiring the access drive be limited to right-in and right-out.

Jim Warren Road is classified as an Arterial street in accordance with the City’s adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan. The Planning Commission will need to determine whether the ROW dedication and limited improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study for Jim Warren Road are sufficient in relation to the proposed development where responsibility for future widening and improvements is noted to be the responsibility of the City or other development rather than a proportionate share of such improvements being provided by the proposed development. Consideration should be given to requiring the applicant provide an improved street section including curb and gutter and sidewalk as well as construction of a center northbound turn lane on Jim Warren Road at its intersection with Port Royal Road and construction of a southbound deceleration lane at the secondary entrance serving the multifamily residential area fronting upon Jim Warren Road each constructed to AASHTO standards including adequate storage length.

Phasing Plan: The applicant has provided, per the Planning Commission’s request, a phasing plan that includes in Phase 1 the construction of Tom Lunn Road from the western property boundary fronting upon Port Royal Road to the east property boundary. While this provides an important vehicular linkage to Port Royal serving residential portions of the property, the Traffic Impact Study submitted by the applicant provides for additional street and intersection improvements to be completed with Phase 1 as well as subsequent street and intersection improvements that will need to be synchronized with the remaining two phases of development to ensure timely delivery of street and intersection improvements to accommodate traffic generated by the project. Phase 1 also includes the multi-family units, the multi-family clubhouse and walking trails, and a portion of the age restricted multi-family residential units. Phase 2 of the project is the commercial space and Phase 3 is the remainder of the age restricted multi-family residential units.

Bulk and Area: The underlying zoning district regulations apply to a PD unless specifically modified through the PD approval process. The underlying zoning of this development is C-4 and Staff finds it appropriate that the commercial area be governed by the C-4 zoning regulations unless modified through the PD approval process. However, the underlying zoning of C-4 does not address dimensional standards of stand-alone multi-family buildings and staff recommends that the multi-family and age-restricted areas of the development be held to the R-6 zoning district unless modified through the PD approval process. The applicant has expressed willingness to apply the R-6 zoning to the multi-family portion of the development. There is one R-6 code requirement that the development does not comply with and this is the maximum length of a multi-family structure. The R-6 zoning district allows for a building length of 175’, while the application shows building lengths exceeding 200’ with one building exceeding 300’ in length. Staff recommends that these building lengths be considered a waiver from the R-6 zoning district regulations and that this waiver only be approved if it provides enhanced amenities or design features to the City, as described in the Planned Developed UDC code.
Building & Site Design: The elevations provided show a typical development with a cohesive design pattern. The elevations show brick and other unidentified materials. The site design is pedestrian oriented with good connectivity from the residential to the commercial areas and within the commercial area. The proposal is of high quality and demonstrates compliance with a majority of the design standards in the commercial zoning districts.

Open Space & Amenities: On-site open space consists of a walking trail around a detention pond, a clubhouse and pool associated with the multi-family units, and a pool associated with the active adult community. The commercial area of the property has a pedestrian plaza that provides for connectivity and a public space that is lined with retail/commercial space. The median of the traffic calming circle is a prominent feature of the commercial area of the development and the plans show a Magnolia Virginiana, “Sweet Bay” to be planted in the center of the circle. The applicant is now providing fountains in the retention ponds. The applicant has also provided for a larger parking lot landscape island on the east side of the Derryberry Lane commercial access drive for the purpose of providing a sidewalk connection from Derryberry Lane to the Pedestrian Plaza space in the Commercial area. At a minimum, multi-family development, exclusive of the age restricted portion, shall meet or exceed the applicable use standards in Section 8.3K.

Landscaping & Buffering: The applicant proposes adequate buffering around the perimeter of the development with typical buffer details provided in the plans. The interior of the development, including the parking lots, have sufficient shade trees and the applicant has provided sufficient plant species diversity. The parking lots show sufficient islands and has provided for a median between rows in the large parking lot on the corner of Derryberry Lane and Port Royal Road.

Mail Kiosk: Mail delivery for the multi-family and active adult areas of the development and is subject to review and approval by the USPS. Provisions should be made within the development plan to accommodate the placement and utilization of a centralized mail kiosk system.

Bicycle & Greenway Plan: All three public roads that abut this property (Jim Warren Road, Port Royal Road, and Derryberry Lane), as well as the extension of Tom Lunn Road, are proposed bike lane roadways. These off-site improvements will be addressed during site plan review and approval.

Transportation & Parking: The applicant is providing 697 parking spaces for the multi-family units, which exceeds the UDC requirement of 634 by 63. The applicant is providing 221 parking spaces for the active adult community with meets exactly the UDC requirement. The applicant is providing 1,122 parking spaces for the commercial space and while the exact parking requirement cannot be calculated without the use of each tenant space identified, the applicant has demonstrated a fully occupied scenario where there is an excess in UDC required parking.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Planned Development Preliminary Plan application PDP 646-2019, Derryberry Mixed-Use, to the Board of Mayor and Alderman, subject to the following conditions:

1. The multi-family and age-restricted residential units be held to the R-6 zoning standards, unless modified through the Planned Development approval process.
2. The commercial portion of the development be held to the C-4 zoning standards, unless modified through the PD approval process.
3. That a change of the age-restricted living units to regular multi-family units require an application to the Planning Commission as a Planned Development Minor Modification.
4. Multi-family development, exclusive of the age restricted portion, shall meet or exceed the applicable use standards in Section 8.3K.
5. It is not the intention of this approval to reduce or modify any requirement for buffering between this development and adjacent uses and all perimeter buffers required by the UDC shall be met or exceeded.
6. Install a traffic signal at the intersection of Port Royal and Derryberry Lane with proper signal phasing to be installed in conjunction with the first phase of development.
7. Extend Tom Lunn Road from Port Royal Road to east boundary of project to include a southbound left turn lane comprising a minimum of 250 feet of storage constructed on Port Royal Road at Tom Lunn Road and a westbound left turn/through lane and separate westbound right turn lane at the intersection with Port Royal Road as well as a new northbound right turn lane comprising a minimum of 100 feet constructed on Port Royal Road at Tom Lunn Road. Install a traffic signal with proper signal phasing at beginning of second phase of development in response to commercial development.

8. Construct at the intersection of Port Royal and Jim Warren a dedicated southbound left turn lane and a separate westbound right turn lane to be constructed as part of first phase to serve multifamily development.

9. Construct an improved street section including curb and gutter and sidewalk on southern side of Jim Warren Road as well as construction of a center northbound turn lane on Jim Warren Road at its intersection with Port Royal Road as well as construct a southbound deceleration lane on Jim Warren Road at the secondary entrance serving the multifamily residential area fronting upon Jim Warren Road.

10. Project access drive onto Port Royal Road does not comply with adopted Access Management Plan for Port Royal Road. Access drive onto Port Royal Road should be eliminated in compliance with adopted Access Management Plan or if permitted, the access drive should be limited to a right-in and right-out design configuration. Project access drive onto Port Royal Road to include separate westbound left and right turn lanes at the intersection with Port Royal Road shall be widened to a three-lane cross-section from Tom Lunn Road to the existing southbound left turn lane at Derryberry Lane to be constructed with second phase of development.

11. Derryberry Lane to include installation of eastbound left turn lanes at the main access for the commercial portion of proposed development and the access for the multifamily development to include a minimum of 75 feet of storage. Construction of turn lanes to coincide with residential and commercial phases of development.

12. All street and intersection improvements including signalization to be designed and constructed to AASHTO standards.

13. Utilities must be installed in the order and sequence illustrated on the utility phasing plan for water and sewer system improvements including required off-site improvements as described and illustrated on the plan.

14. The preliminary plan approval expires if a complete application for approval of a final plan has not been filed within three years after the date the Board of Mayor and Aldermen grants preliminary plan approval.
Derryberry Mixed-Use (PDP 646-2019)

Residential Acres = 23.43

Units = 402 (298 MF, 104 Active Adult)

Density = 16.48 du/ac

Data from submitted plans for 2-25 PC Work Session
1. Woodland Trace (R-2 PUD)
   Acres = 23.85
   Units = 141
   Density = 5.99 du/ac

   Left side (STP 196-2016) Woodland Trace Villas (TH)
   Acres = 8.18
   Units = 88
   Density = 10.75 du/ac

   Right Side (SF)
   Acres = 15.67 (GIS)
   Units = 53
   Density = 3.38 du/ac

2. Worthington Glen Apartments (R-7)
   Acres = 40.72 (GIS)
   Units = 564 (Master Residential Index, MRI)
   Density = 13.85 du/ac

3. Reserve at Spring Hill (R-2 PUD)
   Acres = 30.02 (GIS)
   Units = 408 (MRI)
   Density = 13.59 du/ac

4. Cobblestone Village (R-2 PUD)
   Acres = 29.07 (GIS)
   Units = 87 (MRI)
   Density = 2.99 du/ac

5. Abbington Downs (R-2 PUD)
   Acres = 15.38
   Units = 63 (MRI)
   Density = 4.10 du/ac

6. Meadowbrook (R-2 PUD)
   Acres = 160.48
   Units = 480 (340 SF, 140 TH)
   Density = 2.99 du/ac

   Villas at Meadowbrook (R-6)
   Acres = 11.54 (GIS)
   Units = 140 (MRI)
   Density = 12.13 du/ac
TO: Spring Hill Planning Commission  
FROM: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director  
Logan Elliott, Associate Planner  
MEETING: March 11, 2019  
SUBJECT: FPL 647-2019 (Carnation Place Lots 36 - 40)

**FPL 647-2019**: Submitted by Sawyer Land Surveying, LLC. for Carnation Place. The property is zoned R-4, High Density Residential, and contains approximately 0.60 acres. The applicant requests final plat modification for 4 single family lots. Requested by Mark Sawyer.

**Property Description and History**: This property is located north of the intersection of Beechcroft Road and Depot Street. In October of 2015, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen rezoned the property from B-3, Intermediate Business, to R-4, High Density, for the purpose of future single-family detached development. In February of 2016, the Planning Commission approved neighborhood concept plan application (NCP 126-2016) allowing for 40 single-family residential lots. Preliminary Plat approval was granted by the Planning Commission in August, 2016, subject to the following conditions:

1. Access to Lots 37, 39, and 40 shall be limited to the shared driveway indicated on the plat. Owners of Lots 37, 39, and 40 shall be responsible for the maintenance of the shared driveway.
2. Right-of-way for Depot Street shall be dedicated in the amount of 37.5 feet from centerline.
3. Sidewalk construction along Depot Street shall be completed with Phase 1 of the development.
4. Prior to submittal of a final plat application, all engineering/public works comments and revisions shall be addressed.
5. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of two (2) years, during which time a final plat application shall be submitted in accordance with the plan approved and all associated conditions.
6. Modification to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to the submittal of a final plat application.

In January, 2017, the Board of Zoning Appeals granted relief from the collector road front setbacks for the lots along Depot Place (a reduction to 30' from 40').

On April 10, 2017, the Planning Commission approved a final plat for Carnation Place. The minutes are below:

1. **FPL 334-2017**: Submitted by Sawyer Land Surveying, LLC. for 2511 Depot St. The property is zoned R-4, High Density Residential, and contains approximately 10.99 acres. The applicant requests final plat approval for 40 single family residential lots.

   **Staff Conditions**:
   1. Final Plat approval shall remain valid for a period of two (2) years, during which time all signatures shall be obtained and the plat recorded.
   2. Modification to the plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to recordation.

Alderman Duda made a motion to approve FPL 334-2017 with staff conditions. Motion seconded by Alderman Fitterer. Motion passed 5/1.

In July, 2018, the applicant is requested to modify the plat via Final Plat application FPL 557-2018, originally approved in April, 2017, by eliminating the private driveway and access easement between lots 36 and 37 and behind lot 39 and, subsequently, requested permission to allow lots 39 and 40 direct access from Depot Street. The applicant withdrew this request after the July Work Session. Comments concerning this project from this meeting revolved around:
1. Concerns with an additional curb-cut on Depot St.
2. Concerns with an applicant requested landscape island separating the shared use driveway.
3. Concerns with front entry garage on Depot St.

Summary: A comment was made at the February 25, 2019 Work Session that a fence existed on one of the subject lots and was in the access easement and in the PUDE. The fence does not block access to the drainage pond and does not create an issue with the drainage situation. However, the fence is in the access easement and would need to be removed should FPL 647-2019 not be approved.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of Final Plat application FPL 647-2019, Carnation Place lots 36-40, with the following conditions:

1. Incorporate on preliminary plat and construction plans and construct new ADA ramp(s) with truncated domes in accordance with new detail (one ramp per corner).
2. Final plat approval is valid for one (1) year from the date of approval, during which time the applicant shall obtain all required signatures and record the plat.
Final Plat
PPL 649-2019: Submitted by Thomas & Hutton for Southern Springs Phase 7 and 8. The property is 87.27 acres and is designated as R-4. This property is being processed under the requirements of the prior B-4 zoning district. The applicant requests preliminary plat approval for 201 single-family lots. Requested by Jon Claxton.

Property Description and History: This property is located west of Kedron Road and south of Saturn Parkway. The Neighborhood Concept Plan (NCP 489-2018) for this property was processed under the old zoning code and was approved on April 9, 2018,

Landscape Buffer and Screening Fence: The applicant is proposing to install a raised earthen berm of varying height along the outer perimeter of the development facing Saturn Parkway. In prior phases of Southern Springs, the applicant installed an extensive earthen berm along with landscape measures that were later supplemented further with the installation of a wooden screening fence that will include stone columns constructed on approximate 300-foot centers along with offsetting the fence for visual interest given its length. The applicant is proposing similar landscape and screening fence treatments with those approved for earlier phases fronting along Saturn Parkway. The applicant is planning to preserve portions of the existing tree line located along the perimeter.

Streets and Sidewalks: The street and sidewalk layout is typical to the rest of the Southern Springs development. Sidewalks are included on both sides of all streets and all streets are public with 50’ of R/W. Street connections and sidewalk connections are provided to adjacent commercial development on Kedron Road. Phase 8 was revised to allow for two points of access to satisfy emergency access requirements.

Bulk and Area Requirements: The proposed lots are compliant with the bulk and area criteria of the Neighborhood Concept Plan and the allowances of the B-4 zoning district.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of Preliminary Plat application PPL 649-2019, Southern Springs Phase 7 & 8, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall preserve portions of the existing tree line located on the perimeter of the property in an effort to protect the existing tree line and better buffer the development.
2. A detailed technical review of the construction plans is in process in advance of forwarding same to TDEC for their review and approval.
3. Incorporate on preliminary plat and construction plans and construct new ADA ramp(s) with truncated domes in accordance with new detail (one ramp per corner).
4. Phase 1 Erosion controls plans looks like it may require diversion ditches or smaller sediment ponds in areas which direct discharge. The sediment ponds do not appear to receive the runoff. There are no notes or phasing plans to direct contractor in the proper order of installation.
5. Preliminary plat approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time the applicant/developer shall obtain all necessary permits, complete all applicable improvements, and submit final plat applications for review and approval.
6. Modifications to the preliminary plat may require Planning Commission approval prior to submittal of a final plat application.
Overall site
STP 650-2019: Submitted by Gresham Smith & Partners for Crossings – Lot 7. The property is zoned C-5 and contains approximately .97 acres. The applicant requests Site Concept Plan (SPC) review and comments for a 7,200 square foot multi-tenant commercial development being processed under the UDC.

Property Description and History: This property is located in the Crossings development and is an out-parcel with the recorded address of 2014 Crossings Circle. The site is located between two built-out lots (Cracker Barrel & Panera Bread) and is proposing cross-access to the north lot. The applicant received a variance (BZA 613-2018) to have a 5’ side yard landscape buffer requirement in lieu of the 10’ requirement in the UDC.

Access: The proposal includes access from Crossings Blvd and cross-access to the lot to the north (Panera Bread). The building is proposed to have a drive-through window and the site has a drive-through lane and by-pass lane around the south-west side of the building. The Fire department has confirmed that the site design provides for adequate fire access.

Parking and Loading: The provided parking exceeds the minimum require parking. The applicant is providing 52 parking spaces where are 49 spaces required. The site includes the required bike rack in an appropriate location. The applicant is providing 13 pervious pavement parking spaces in order to meet the required impervious area maximum. The UDC code allows for pervious paving to be calculated at a reduced impervious coverage percentage as follows:

2. When pervious paving is used, it is calculated at a reduced percentage of impervious coverage, as follows:

   a. Pervious concrete and open grid paving systems are calculated as 50% impervious surface, provided that no barrier to infiltration is installed beneath the material. Open grid pavers must be installed on a sand base, without an impervious liner, to qualify.

   b. Other types of pervious surfaces, such as permeable pavers, porous asphalt, or gravel-crete, are credited based upon field performance data and coefficients of permeability provided by the manufacturer.

The applicant is requesting to use permeable pavers, as mentioned above in subsection b., and has provided performance data and coefficient of permeability by the product manufacturer. The paving product appears to provide the level of permutation necessary to be considered pervious.

Ground Mounted Signage: The site plan consists of a monument sign along Main Street and provides the required setback.

Building and Site Design: The building is composed of brick veneer wrapping all four sides of the building. There is an architectural base and cap to the building. The building has parapet walls over the entry to each tenant space. The site is mostly hardscape with a small landscape strip around the perimeter. There is a small patio area south of the tenant space labeled “restaurant” that appears to be intended for outdoor dining. The restaurant will require a grease trap that is in compliance with Spring Hill’s requirements.
Landscaping and Buffering: There is a landscape strip around the perimeter of the property with shrubs and trees shown to comply with the UDC Design Guidelines. The parking lot has landscape islands which provide adequate shade trees and ground coverage.

Bicycle and Greenway Plan: The site is not impacted by the requirement of the Bicycle and Greenway Plan.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of Site Plan application STP 650-2019, subject to the following conditions:
1. Site plan approval shall remain valid for a period of three (3) years, during which time all required permits shall be obtained. Modification to the approved site plan may require Planning Commission approval.
2. The pavers be maintained in a sufficient manner to maintain their permeability.
Landscape Plan
MULTI TENANT PAD SHOPS
SPRING HILL, TN
2019_03_04
SPm 651-2019: Submitted by Ragan-Smith for Belshire Village. The property is currently zoned C-4, but qualifies to be processed under the former B-4, Central Business District, regulations. The site contains 20.54 acres. The applicant requests Site Plan minor modification for the revision to the architectural elevations of 36 condominium units and 36 flat units.

History and Property Description: This property is located west of Belshire Village Drive behind the recently approved Bee Safe Storage. Surrounding zoning is B-4 to the north, east, and south, R-1 to the north, and R-2 to the west. A Sketch Plan (SKP 519-2018, 5021 Main Street) was approved by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2018. The sketch plan included two office tracts and proposals for 138 residential units (flats, condominiums, townhomes). The Site Plan approval, STP 606-2018, was granted on November 13, 2018. A relevant condition of approval for 606-2018 is:

1. All facades and residential buildings in the public right-of-way shall have no exposed plain brick, plain concrete or concrete block. Acceptable durable materials shall be provided for all foundations visible to the public right-of-way. All regional and on-site trails shall be completed prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the 69th unit (50%).

Building & Site Design: The applicant is providing two building coloration pallets with variation within these unit types. Each of the two building coloration types are being requested to have the same façade modifications. The extent of the proposed façade modifications is:

1. The first floor is now proposed to be at grade, so the facade base is smaller and the window heights are lower on the first floor.
2. The first floor no longer has a raised patio with handrail enclosing the space.
3. The transom windows have been removed from the windows and doors on all sides of the building.
4. The Accent Brick on the front elevation has been removed from the stepped-in portions of the building and replaced with a Hardieplank Lap Siding.
5. The rear elevation is changing from the same brick as the front and side elevations to Hardieplank lap siding.
6. The rear elevation has removed the brick caps from the windows and doors.
7. The rear elevation has had windows removed.
8. The side elevation has had windows moved, windows changing size, and the brick window caps removed.

Bulk and Area: Bulk and area data is compliant with the requirements of the B-4 zoning district.

Summary: The applicant is proposing to modify to approved plans of STP-606-2018 to “water down” the architecture in an effort to reduce building cost. The application was processed under the design guidelines which states that “Rear and side facades, if visible from public streets, shall be similar to the primary façade in their architectural treatment.”. Staff does not find the application to comply with this design guideline.

Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of Site Plan minor modification application SPm 651-2019, Belshire Village – Condominiums.
ZTA 639-2019: Consider revisions to the vesting provisions in Article 13 of the Unified Development Code. The following revisions to the Unified Development Code are part of the ongoing amendments initiated by the Planning Commission and compiled/prepared by staff.

Zoning Text Amendments: The Unified Development Code was adopted by the Board of Mayor and Alderman on August 20, 2018. Since that time staff has begun implementing the requirements contained in the new regulations. During the course of this activity many areas were observed that needed revision to correcting existing wording, removing conflicts, addressing issues, and unintended consequences. A set of revisions were reviewed by the Planning Commission in the January work session and February voting meeting, and forwarded to the Board of Mayor and Alderman for consideration. The limited revisions contained in the attached document were intended to have been included in the Planning Commission’s recent meeting packets for consideration. Staff took the delay as an opportunity to solicit additional comments from individuals who worked on the vesting legislation at the state. These comments have been addressed in the attached Exhibit A (highlighted).

Approval standards for zoning text amendments, as found in the Unified Development Code, Article 13, are below:

E. Approval Standards

The Board of Mayor and Aldermen decision on any zoning text or map amendment is a matter of legislative discretion that is not controlled by any particular standard. However, in making their recommendation and decision, the Planning Commission and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen must consider the following standards. The approval of amendments is based on a balancing of these standards.

1. Approval Standards for Map Amendments
   a. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan and any adopted land use policies.
   b. Whether the proposed amendment corrects an error or omission, adds clarification to existing requirements, or reflects a change in policy.
   c. The extent to which the proposed amendment creates nonconformities.
   d. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the intent and general regulations of this Code.

Staff believes that all of the proposed revisions satisfy one or more of the above criteria (a, b, and d) and do not anticipate the creation of nonconformities inconsistent with the adoption of the UDC.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward the attached text revisions identified in Exhibit A – UDC Vesting Revisions to the Board of Mayor and Alderman with a recommendation for approval. Exhibit A consists of Article 13 pages that contain new vesting revisions.
ARTICLE 13. ZONING APPLICATIONS

13.1 GENERAL PROCESSES
13.2 ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENT
13.3 SPECIAL USE
13.4 VARIANCE
13.5 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
13.6 SITE PLAN REVIEW
13.7 ZONING INTERPRETATION
13.8 SIGN PERMIT
13.9 TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
13.10 ZONING APPEALS

13.1 GENERAL PROCESSES

A. Application Process

1. Filing, Pre-Application Conference, and Referrals
   a. All zoning applications must be filed with the Planning Department. The application must be on forms provided by the City and filed in such quantity and with such submittals as required by the instructions.
   b. Prior to formal submittal of an application, the applicant is strongly encouraged to schedule a pre-application conference with the Planning Department. This pre-application conference is optional. The purpose of a pre-application conference, which does not require a formal application or fees, is to provide informal advice and assistance to the applicant. Any opinions or advice provided are not binding with respect to any official action that may be taken on the formal application.
   c. Prior to final decisions on the applications, during the review and recommendation process, the application may be referred to other city, county and state or federal governmental authorities for review and comment.

2. Applications In Proximity to Historically Significant Sites
   Any site the subject of a zoning application that is located within 300 feet of a property designated historically significant site, as designated by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen or on the National Register of Historic Places, must be reviewed and a recommendation made by the Spring Hill Historic Commission prior to the final decision on the application.

3. Completeness
   a. An application must include all information, plans, and data as specified in the application requirements. The Planning Department will examine all applications within ten days of filing to determine completeness. If the application does not include all the submittal requirements for the application, the Planning Department will reject the application and provide the applicant with the reasons for the rejection in writing. The Planning Department will take no further steps to process the application until all deficiencies are remedied.
   b. After an application is determined to be complete and before action is taken on the application, any substantive change made by the applicant to the application requires resubmittal of the entire application and a new completeness review. However, such revisions do not require an additional payment of fees.
   c. If the Planning Department requests additional information outside of the specific application requirements, this additional information does not disqualify the application as being complete if all other requirements have been provided. The applicant may choose to contest the requirement of such additional information to the Planning Commission.

4. Fees
   Each application must be accompanied by the required filing fee, as established and modified, from time to time, as provided in the Municipal Code. The failure to pay such fee when due is grounds for refusing to process the application and renders the application incomplete. If an application is submitted by the City then all fee requirements are considered waived.
Article 13. Zoning Applications

b. Upon a finding by the City that the applicant intentionally supplied inaccurate information or knowingly made misrepresentations material to the issuance of a building permit or approval of a development plan or did not construct the development in accordance with the approved building permit or the approved development plan or an approved amendment for the building permit or the development plan.

c. Upon the written determination by the City of the existence of a natural or man-made hazard on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject property, not identified in the development plan or building permit, and which hazard, if uncorrected, would pose a serious threat to the public health, safety, or welfare and the threat cannot be mitigated within a reasonable period of time.

d. Upon enactment or promulgation of a State or Federal law, regulation, rule, policy, corrective action, or other governance that is required to be enforced by the City and that precludes development as contemplated in the approved development plan or building permit, unless modifications to the development plan or building permit can be made by the applicant, within 90 days of notification of the new requirement, which will allow the applicant to comply with the new requirement.

4. For a Planned Development Final Plan or Site Plan listed in Table 13-2, provided the applicant obtains and maintains all permits necessary for site preparation and commences site preparation within three (3) years, the vesting period in Table 13-2 shall be extended an additional two (2) years for a maximum of five (5) years. In order to maintain vesting during the additional two year period, the applicant shall maintain all permits necessary for construction and shall commence construction within the two (2) year extension period.

5. For a Planned Development Final Plan or Site Plan listed in Table 13-2, provided the applicant commences construction during the initial (three year) vesting period, the development standards applicable during the vesting period remain in effect until a final certificate of occupancy is issued; provided, the total vesting period of the project cannot exceed ten (10) years from the date of application approval for non-phased developments or fifteen (15) years for phased development, as specified in Table 13-2, during which time the applicant must maintain all necessary permits during this period to remain vested.

### Table 13-2: Vesting Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Vesting Period</th>
<th>Total Vesting Period (No Phasing)</th>
<th>Required Actions</th>
<th>Phasing No/Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Concept Plan</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>BOMA Approval</td>
<td>Date of approval</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Site Preparations; Commence Construction Receive Final Plan Approval</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Final Plan</td>
<td>Planning Commission Approval</td>
<td>Date of approval</td>
<td>3 years 1/5 years with construction</td>
<td>10 years (with construction)</td>
<td>Site Preparations; Complete construction; and Maintain permits</td>
<td>10/15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>Planning Commission Approval</td>
<td>Date of approval</td>
<td>3 years 1/5 years with construction</td>
<td>10 years (with construction)</td>
<td>Site Preparations; Complete construction; and Maintain permits</td>
<td>10/15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. An amendment or revision to an approved plan by the developer must be reviewed per this Article, as applicable, and approved by the Planning Commission or Board of Mayor and Aldermen in order to retain the protections of the vested property right. An amendment or revision may be denied based upon a finding that the amendment or revision does one or more of the following:

a. Alters the proposed use

b. Increases the overall area of the development

c. Alters the size of any nonresidential structures included in the development plan
13.6 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

A. Purpose
Planned Developments (PD) are intended to encourage and allow more creative and flexible development of land than is possible under district zoning regulations and should only be applied to further those applications that provide enhanced amenities or design features to the City. The underlying zoning district dimensional, design, and use regulations apply to a PD unless specified modified through the approval process. Through the flexibility of the planned development technique, a PD is intended to:

1. Encourage flexibility in the development of land and in the design of structures.
2. Encourage a creative approach to the use of land that results in better development and design than might otherwise be accomplished under the strict application of other sections of this Code.
3. Allow for the design of developments that are architecturally and environmentally innovative, and that achieve better utilization of land than is possible through strict application of standard zoning controls.
4. Combine and coordinate architectural styles, building forms, and structural/visual relationships within an environment that allows mixing of different uses in an innovative and functionally efficient manner.
5. Provide for the efficient use of land to facilitate a more effective arrangement of land uses, structures, circulation patterns, and utilities.
6. Encourage land development that, to the greatest extent possible, preserves natural vegetation, respects natural topographic and geologic conditions, and refrains from adversely affecting flooding, soil, drainage, and other natural ecologic conditions.
7. Facilitate the implementation of adopted City land use policies, particularly with respect to areas planned for potential redevelopment.

B. Initiation
The entire property proposed for the planned development must be in single ownership or under unified control. All owners of the property must be included as joint applicants on all applications and all approvals will bind all owners.

C. Authorization

1. A planned development is authorized in all zoning districts with the following exceptions:
   a. It is prohibited in the R-MH, AG, PR, and NA Districts.
   b. A planned development is authorized in the R-A District but only as a conservation design in accordance with item G below.

2. A planned development must be granted in accordance with the procedures and standards of this section. Unless specifically approved as part of the planned development approval, the requirements of the underlying district apply.

3. Planned development approval is separate from subdivision approval. PD approval may be granted first, whereby subdivision approval would be granted subsequently in compliance with the approved lot layout design.

D. Exceptions From District Regulations

1. A planned development is subject to the underlying district dimensional, design, and use regulations unless an exception is specifically granted. The Planning Commission may recommend and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen may grant exceptions to the zoning district dimensional, design, and use regulations where a planned development is located.

2. Exceptions from district regulations may be granted for planned developments, if the exceptions:
   a. Enhance the overall merit of the planned development.
   b. Promote the objectives of both the City and the development.
2. Neighborhood Meeting (Optional)
A prospective applicant, prior to submitting a formal application for a planned development, is encouraged to conduct a neighborhood meeting.

a. The prospective applicant should provide written notice to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the subject property at least 15 calendar days prior to the scheduled neighborhood meeting. The notice should contain a description of the proposed project, meeting place, time, date, and contact information of the prospective applicant.

b. The notice should be sent through regular mail by the applicant. The applicant should submit the list of attendees and the list of property owners who were sent notice of the neighborhood meeting, as well as an example of the type of notice sent.

c. The applicant should present and have available the material required for the concept plan meeting (Item 3 below) to the public.

d. Following the neighborhood meeting, the applicant should provide to the Planning Director a summary of the comments heard at the meeting. Such summary will be provided to the Planning Commission as part of the concept plan.

e. The neighborhood meeting does not require formal application, fee, or filing of a planned development application. Any opinions or advice provided by the public or any officials in attendance are in no way binding with respect to any official action that may be taken on the subsequent formal application.

3. Concept Plan
Before submitting a formal application for a planned development, the applicant must present a concept plan before the Planning Commission for the purpose of obtaining information and guidance prior to formal application.

a. The concept plan will be presented at a public meeting and no notice is required. At minimum, the concept plan must consist of the following:

   I. A map (or maps) in general form containing the proposed land uses, the natural features of the development site, the character and approximate location of all roadways and access drives proposed, the location of all adjacent public streets, public utilities, and schematic drawings showing the size, character, and disposition of buildings on the site.

   II. A written statement containing a general explanation of the planned development, including a statement of the present ownership of all the land within said development and the expected schedule of construction.

   III. A summary of the comments heard at the neighborhood meeting, if applicable.

b. The Planning Commission will review the concept plan, and provide such information and guidance as it deems appropriate. Any opinions or advice provided by the Planning Commission is in no way binding with respect to any official action the Planning Commission may take on the subsequent formal application. The review of the concept plan is not a public hearing. No decision will be made on the application. Therefore, no vesting is applicable to this plan.

4. Preliminary Plan

a. Action by Planning Department
An application for a preliminary plan for a planned development must be filed with the Planning Department. Once it is determined that the application is complete, the Planning Department will schedule and review by City departments prior to scheduling the application for consideration by the Planning Commission.
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b. Action by Planning Commission

i. Upon receipt of a complete application, the Planning Commission will consider the preliminary plan at a public hearing.

ii. The Planning Commission will review the application based upon the evidence presented at the public hearing, pursuant to the approval standards of this section. The Planning Commission may recommend either approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the preliminary plan, table the preliminary plan, or defer the preliminary plan.

iii. Following the close of the public hearing at which the Planning Commission makes a recommendation, the Planning Commission will forward its recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

c. Action by Board of Mayor and Aldermen

The Board of Mayor and Aldermen will review the preliminary plan upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, and may approve, approve with conditions, deny, table, or defer the preliminary plan. If the Planning Commission has recommended denial, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen must approve with a favorable two-thirds vote.

d. Conditions

The Planning Commission may recommend, and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen may impose, such conditions and restrictions upon the establishment, location, construction, maintenance, and operation of the planned development as may be deemed necessary for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare. Such conditions and restrictions must be reflected in the final plan.

e. Approval Standards

The recommendation of the Planning Commission and decision of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen must make a finding that the following standards for a planned development have generally been met.

i. The consistency of the proposed planned development with the Comprehensive Plan and any adopted land use policies.

ii. The proposed planned development meets the purpose of a planned development.

iii. The proposed planned development will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity.

iv. The proposed planned development will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property.

v. There is provision for adequate utilities and road infrastructure, drainage, off-street parking and loading, pedestrian access, and all other necessary facilities.

vi. There is provision for adequate vehicular ingress and egress designed to minimize traffic congestion upon public streets.

vii. The location and arrangement of structures, parking areas, walks, landscape, lighting, and other site design elements, are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and adjacent land uses.

f. Expiration (see also Table 13-2)

i. The preliminary plan approval expires if a complete application for final plan has not been filed and approved, permits for site preparation received and site preparation commenced, within three (3) years after the date the Board of Mayor and Aldermen grants preliminary plan approval. As part of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approval of the preliminary plan, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen may extend this period of time including approval of a phasing plan where the validity period is longer than three (3) years for the PD.

ii. An extension of the total vesting period may be requested by the property owner following commencement of site preparation within the initial three (3) year vesting period and qualifying for the two year extension, subject to approval by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for good cause shown. The applicant must request the extension in writing prior to the expiration date of the approval. A public hearing
notice for an extension of time of a preliminary plan is not required.

5. Final Plan
Following the approval of the preliminary plan, an application for a final plan for a planned development must be filed with the Planning Director.

a. Action by Planning Director
The Planning Director will review the final plan upon receipt of the complete final plan application and take the following action:

i. If the final plan is in substantial compliance with the approved preliminary plan, the Planning Director will recommend approval of the final plan to the Planning Commission. The Planning Department will certify to the Planning Commission that the final plan is in substantial conformance with the previously filed preliminary plan.

ii. If the final plan is not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary plan, the Planning Director must inform the applicant as to specific areas found not to be in compliance, and the applicant must resubmit the final plan to the Planning Department with changes to those areas found not to be in substantial compliance and the validity of the preliminary plan remains in effect. If the revised final plan remains noncompliant with the approved preliminary plan as determined by the Planning Director, the applicant may appeal the determination of the Planning Director to the Planning Commission to make a determination on whether the final plan complies with the approved preliminary plan.

b. Action by Planning Commission
Upon receipt of the Planning Director recommendation, the Planning Commission must review the final plan. The Planning Commission must approve or deny the final plan. If denied, the applicant may reapply by submitting a new final plan and the validity of the preliminary plan remains in effect.

c. Effect of Approval
After final plan approval, the final plan will constitute the development regulations applicable to the subject property. The planned development must be developed in accordance with the final plan, rather than the zoning district regulations otherwise applicable to the property. Violation of any condition is a violation of this Code and constitutes grounds for revocation of all approvals granted for the planned development.

d. Expiration (see also Table 13-2)

I. Development plan approval expires if the applicant does not obtain and maintain all permits necessary for site preparation, nor commence site preparation within three (3) years from the date of final plan approval. As part of the Planning Commission approval of the final plan, the Planning Commission may extend this period of time including approval of a phasing plan where the validity period is longer than three (3) years for the PD.

ii. All required actions to retain vesting shall be per Table 13-2.

III. If the planned development is to be developed in phases, the applicant need only file a final plan for the first phase of development within three (3) years, as indicated in the development schedule. The final plan for the remaining phases must be filed in accordance with the development and construction schedule. Phased development vesting of up to fifteen (15) years is available, if required actions, as noted in Table 13-2, are achieved and maintained.

F. PD Application Requirements
Table 13-3: PD Submittal Requirements contains submittal requirements for planned developments. Plans and plats must be drawn in a legible manner, at a scale suitable to the size of the lot being developed or subdivided. All plans must be drawn at a standard engineering scale, and submitted in paper and digital form, as listed on the application. The information must be submitted to the Planning Department for review, unless waived by the Planning Director, Planning Commission, and/or Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The Planning Director, Planning Commission, and/or Board of Mayor and Aldermen may request additional information including but not limited to a traffic study to provide evidence that the circulation system is adequate.
13.6 SITE PLAN REVIEW

A. Purpose
The site plan review process is intended to promote orderly development and redevelopment in the City, and to assure that such development or redevelopment occurs in a manner that is harmonious with surrounding properties, is consistent with City's adopted land use policies, and promotes the public health, safety, and welfare of the City. This section provides standards by which to determine and control the physical layout and design to achieve compatibility of land uses and structures, efficient use of land, minimization of traffic and safety hazards, and incorporation of stormwater management and sustainable design techniques.

B. Authority
The Planning Commission will conduct site plan review. The Planning Department may convene a technical review committee, comprised of City staff, as the Planning Department deems appropriate to review plans for completeness and compliance with City regulations.

C. Required Site Plan Review
When required, no building permit may be issued until site plan approval has been granted. In addition, all other requirements of all other applicable City codes must be met. Site plan review and approval is required for the following developments:

1. New townhouse, multi-family, all types of non-residential, and mixed-use development construction.
2. Additions to townhouse, multi-family, non-residential, and mixed-use development that increase the gross floor area by 3,000 square feet or more.
3. Parking lots of 10 or more spaces.
4. Drive-through facilities.
5. Changes to vehicle ingress or egress for existing residential subdivisions, townhouse, multi-family, non-residential, and mixed-use development.

D. Procedure
1. Pre-Application Consultation
   a. Prior to formal submittal of an application, a pre-application conference with the Planning Director is encouraged.
   b. At a pre-application consultation, the applicant must provide information as to the location of the proposed development, the proposed uses, proposed improvements, and any other information necessary to explain the development.
   c. The purpose of the pre-application consultation is to provide advice and assistance to the applicant before preparation of formal site plan, so that the applicant may determine whether the proposed development is in compliance with the provisions of this Code and other applicable regulations, and whether the proposed development aligns with the adopted land use policies of the City.
   d. The pre-application conference does not require formal application, fee, or filing of a site plan review application. Any opinions or advice provided by the Planning Department are in no way binding with respect to any official action that may be taken on the subsequent formal application. No decision will be made on the application.
2. Concept Plan
   The applicant may request review of a concept plan before the Planning Commission for the purpose of obtaining information and guidance prior to formal application.
   a. The concept plan is presented at a public meeting and no notice is required. At minimum, the concept plan must consist of the following:
      i. A map (or maps) in general form containing the proposed land uses, the natural features of the development site, the character and approximate location of all roadways and access drives proposed, the
**Table 13-4: Submittal Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submittals</th>
<th>Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show location and dimensions of all property proposed to be set aside for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park, playground, or other public/private use, with designation of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose and conditions of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other data or reports as deemed necessary for project review by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director or Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G. Modifications to Approved Site Plans**

1. An application for a modification to an approved site plan must be submitted to the Planning Department. Modification applications must include a written description of the proposed change, including the reason for such change, and a notation of the location on the approved site plan.

2. The Planning Director may approve the following minor modifications to approved site plans:
   
   a. Minor changes required during construction, as related to final engineering issues such as topography, drainage, underground utilities, structural safety, or vehicular circulation.
   
   b. Exterior renovations to a building facade.
   
   c. The modification of existing accessory structures or the addition of new accessory structures when in conformance with the requirements of this Code and any conditions of approval.
   
   d. The construction of additional bicycle or parking spaces.
   
   e. The addition of any open space.
   
   f. A reduction in the amount of bicycle or parking spaces so long as the remaining number of spaces is in conformance with the requirements of this Code and any conditions of approval.
   
   g. Modifications to the approved landscape plan and site features that does not result in a reduction of the total amount of plant material required and remains in conformance with all landscape requirements.
   
   h. The modification of existing signs or the addition of new signs when in conformance with the requirements of the Code and any conditions of approval.

3. Any modification not considered a minor modification must be approved by the Planning Commission in a public meeting. Applications must include a written description of the proposed change, including the reason for such change, and a notation of the location on the approved site plan. No public hearing or notice is required. The Planning Director may also choose to forward any minor modification, regardless if it fits the above criteria, to the Planning Commission for approval; in such case, no additional fees are required.

**H. Expiration and Vesting**

1. The site plan approval expires if the applicant does not obtain and maintain all permits necessary for site preparation, and commence site construction within three (3) years of site plan approval. The site plan is vested within this Code, as per Table 13-2.

2. All required actions to retain vesting shall be per Table 13-2.

3. If the site plan is to be developed in phases, the applicant need only file a building permit for the first phase of development within three (3) years, as indicated in the development schedule. The building permits and applicable site preparation permits for the remaining phases must be filed in accordance with the development and construction schedule. Phased development vesting of up to fifteen (15) years is available, if required actions, as noted in Table 13-2, are achieved and maintained.
PURPOSE:
To approve Resolution 19-15 to adopt the City of Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan (February 2019).

BACKGROUND:
The City of Spring Hill adopted the 2040 Major Thoroughfare Plan in May 2015. The plan was prepared by City staff and provided a comprehensive plan addressing long-term transportation system improvements including arterial and collector streets while also emphasizing connectivity throughout the community. The plan specifically identified arterial, collector and local street improvements necessary to support the continued growth and development of the community. The plan provides guidelines for street improvements including ROW dedication and the inclusion of bike and pedestrian facilities with various road segments. The plan recommended adoption of street standards that are now reflected in the Unified Development Code adopted by the City in 2018.

Since the adoption of the current Major Thoroughfare Plan by the City in 2015, the City has continued to experience significant growth and development. Typically, communities experiencing rapid growth are advised to update comprehensive plans including transportation elements every 3 to 5 years. In 2018, the City engaged Volkert, Inc. to prepare a Major Thoroughfare Plan for the City. The scope of work including both the preparation of an updated Major Thoroughfare Plan as well as performing a financial study on the traffic impact fee structure of the City. Adoption of the Major Thoroughfare Plan is within the responsibilities of the Planning Commission as prescribed in Tennessee Code Annotated. The financial study for traffic impact fees will be presented to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for their consideration as the Major Thoroughfare Plan is being adopted by the Planning Commission. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen may also decide to adopt the Major Thoroughfare Plan as they did by Resolution for the most recent plan adopted in 2015.
The process of preparing the Major Thoroughfare Plan included opportunities for public input in the form of public meetings and posting comments to the City’s website that are contained in the draft Major Thoroughfare Plan. The consultant team also worked closely with City staff in the preparation of the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

On February 19, 2019, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) approved Resolution 19-01, a resolution from the TAC to the Spring Hill Planning Commission recommending the adoption of the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

In accordance with Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-4-201 and 13-4-202, it is the function and duty of the Planning Commission to make and adopt a general plan for the physical development of the City. The Major Thoroughfare Plan is considered an element and component of the City’s comprehensive plan. The City has published in accordance with Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-4-202 (a) an advertisement for a public hearing to be held on March 25, 2019 prior to consideration of adoption of the Major Thoroughfare Plan. Staff has prepared Resolution 19-15 for consideration by the Planning Commission outlining the adoption of the Major Thoroughfare Plan (February 2019) that is an attachment to the resolution.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve Resolution 19-15 to adopt the City of Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan (February 2019).
RESOLUTION 19-15

A RESOLUTION OF SPRING HILL PLANNING COMMISSION TO ADOPT
CITY OF SPRING HILL MAJOR THOROUGHFARE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is a standing subcommittee of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen established to assist in the development of a strategic transportation plan and to recommend annual transportation improvements and priorities for Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) funding; and

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2019 the Transportation Advisory Committee approved Resolution 19-01, a Resolution of the Transportation Advisory Committee to recommend adoption of the City of Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan by the Spring Hill Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-4-201 and 13-4-202, it is the function and duty of the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission to make and adopt a general plan for the physical development of the municipality; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission has previously adopted the Major Thoroughfare Plan in 2011 and 2015 including subsequent amendments thereto; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill initiated an update to the current adopted and amended Major Thoroughfare Plan in response to continued significant growth and development being experienced since its initial adoption by the Planning Commission by Resolution 15-26 in May 2015; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill with assistance from public input and City staff along with the engagement of Volkert, Inc., a transportation planning consultant, has prepared a Major Thoroughfare Plan which is attached hereto to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission has, pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-4-202 (a), advertised and held a public meeting regarding the adoption of the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission hereby adopts the Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan dated February 2019 attached hereto.

Passed and adopted by the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission on this 25th day of March, 2019.

______________________________
Paul Downing, Chairman

______________________________
Steve Foote, AICP, Secretary
RESOLUTION 19-01

A RESOLUTION OF TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF SPRING HILL MAJOR THOROUGHFARE PLAN BY THE SPRING HILL PLANNING COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is a standing subcommittee of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen established to assist in the development of a strategic transportation plan and to recommend annual transportation improvements and priorities for Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) funding; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-4-201 and 13-4-202, it is the function and duty of the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission to make and adopt a general plan for the physical development of the municipality; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill Planning Commission has previously adopted the Major Thoroughfare Plan in 2011 and 2015 including subsequent amendments to the later for the City of Spring Hill;

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill initiated an update to the current adopted and amended Major Thoroughfare Plan in response to continued significant growth and development being experienced since its initial adoption by the Planning Commission by Resolution 15-26 in May 2015; and

WHEREAS, the City of Spring Hill with assistance from public input and City staff along with the engagement of Volkert, Inc., a transportation planning consultant, has prepared a Major Thoroughfare Plan which is attached hereto to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed the Major Thoroughfare Plan and provided input in the preparation of this strategic transportation plan for the City of Spring Hill.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Transportation Advisory Committee hereby recommends the Spring Hill Planning Commission adopt the Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan attached hereto.

Passed and adopted by the Transportation Advisory Committee of the City of Spring Hill, Tennessee on this 19th day of February, 2019.

Matt Fitterer, Chairman

Doug Holtz, Vice Chairman
CHAPTER 1. EXISTING CONDITIONS

This chapter provides an overview of existing conditions within the City of Spring Hill study area. This information is the baseline data that enables City Staff, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, the Planning Commission, City of Spring Hill Citizens, the development community, and other stakeholders to better understand the current function of the City's transportation system and to plan for its future growth. Existing land use, population, employment, and congestion levels have all been evaluated to assess opportunities for improvement to the transportation system for Spring Hill residents. The current transportation network will be analyzed to decide which future improvements can be recommended by determining those areas in need of improvement, deficient traffic conditions, or other inadequacies.

STUDY AREA

The study area for this Major Thoroughfare Plan includes the City Limits of Spring Hill, Tennessee. The City of Spring Hill is located in the southern portion of Williamson County and the northern portion of Maury County. Spring Hill is approximately 13 miles south of downtown Franklin and 12 miles north of downtown Columbia. A Study Area Map is shown as Figure 1.1 below. Spring Hill has an incorporated area of 26,442 square miles inside the Spring Hill city limits. US Highway 31 (Columbia Pike/Main Street) is the primary north/south route within the City and State Route 396 (Saturn Parkway) is the primary east/west route into the city from I-65. The City also has a number of Arterial and Collector Streets, which are described in greater detail below, with the rest of the street network functioning as local access roads.
Figure 1.1:
Study Area
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Population and Employment

This section highlights current population and employment data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, Nashville Area MPO, and the City of Spring Hill. The base year for all population and employment data utilized for this Major Thoroughfare Plan is 2010. The year 2010 is used in order to more closely correlate any transportation improvements with the Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Long Range Transportation Plan, which also utilizes 2010 as the base year for planning purposes. However, in any instance wherein more up-to-date data is available, it is incorporated into both the Existing Conditions and Future Conditions Analyses and Reports included in this Plan.

The data is configured by UGB, City, and Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). TAZs are geographic areas defined by roadways or other physical features and represent land uses and activity centers in each defined area, which help assess and predict existing and future traffic conditions and Levels of Service (LOS).

Population

Spring Hill, due to its location and high quality of life, has experienced rapid growth in the past couple of decades. The 2000 US Census certified a population of 7,715 persons within the City of Spring Hill and the 2010 US Census certified a population of 29,036 persons within the City of Spring Hill. The population of Spring Hill was last certified at 40,436 after a special census in 2018. From the 2000 US Census to the 2018 special census, the average yearly growth rate equates to nearly 25% per year. This equates to a growth of over 11,000 persons in only eight years, indicating that the growth of the Nashville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is impacting the City of Spring Hill.

The following information focuses on the 2010 Base Year information and is drawn from the U.S. Census Bureau. It is also depicted in Figure 1. Indicative of the youthful make-up of the Town, the 2010 Median Age was 31.9. The racial and ethnic make-up of the Town is reflective of Williamson County, with a majority of the population constituted by white persons (89.1%). Hispanics are the second highest racial category (5.6%), followed by African Americans (5.4%). In 2010, there were 9,861 households in Spring Hill, with 79.9% of those being Family Households. The
Average Family Size is 3.33 persons. The owner-occupied rate in the City is high at 82.3%. While the Homeowner Vacancy Rate is low at 3.3%. The Rental Vacancy rate is 11.7%.

As seen from the U.S. Census Bureau and Special Censuses, the City of Spring Hill has experienced substantial population growth from 2000 to 2017. The City’s population has quintupled from 2000 to 2017 as represented in the graph below. This level of growth puts additional strains on the City’s existing transportation network and presents many challenges as the City continues to experience growth pressures.

**Level of Service**

The increasing population and employment within the City of Spring Hill has a significant impact on commuting patterns, travel mode choice, daily traffic volumes, and levels of service on area roadways. Level of service (LOS) is a term used to represent different traffic conditions and is defined by the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) as a “quantitative stratification of a performance measure or measures that represent quality of service”. LOS is used to describe how well traffic operates on a roadway segment, and is based on the capacity of a roadway and the actual traffic volume for the roadway. LOS utilizes a letter grading system to indicate how well a roadway operates with letters ranging from “A” to “F” – “A” being excellent and “F” failing (see the image below). LOS C is generally acceptable for typical roadway function while some communities with larger traffic volumes consider LOS D satisfactory.
Following is a graphic depiction of the Level of Service Concept:

The Highway Capacity Manual generally describes each LOS as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Free flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reasonably free flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Stable flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Approaching unstable flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unstable flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Forced or breakdown flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating existing population, employment, and commuting characteristics of the Spring Hill area reveals information about the demand for transportation throughout the study area and establishes the basis for future traffic flow projections.
LAND USE AND ZONING
To determine the access and mobility needs of the City of Spring Hill, it is important to coordinate the City's land use and transportation plan. Future roadway extensions, new alignments, and the location and design of major intersections influence future development patterns across the City. Land use and zoning should be taken into consideration to ensure the efficient use of infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and municipal services match the land use travel patterns.

Existing Zoning
Land use and growth patterns within the City of Spring Hill’s UGB have played an integral role in the demand for and development of Spring Hill’s transportation system. The Spring Hill RISING: 2040 Comprehensive Plan outlines future land uses with different character areas to provide general guidance for land use decisions to shape the development growth for the next twenty years. The Future Land Use Plan incorporated in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan provides guidance for how a property should develop to support the desired community character and development pattern. Figure 1.2 below is a map of the City’s Existing Zoning.
Figure 1.2: Current Zoning
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EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

An inventory of the roadways and other transportation facilities was conducted to determine the roadway's classification, number of lanes and lane widths, roadway width, and pedestrian and bicycle facility availability of the existing study area. This information was incorporated into the Nashville area MPO's travel demand model.

The existing transportation facilities in the Spring Hill study area are each classified according to the amount of access and mobility the roadway provides, or how it functions. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) categorizes streets and highways into different functional classifications according to the character of service the roadway is intended to provide. According to the FHWA agencies should assign functional classifications based on how the roadway is operating during the current year only. The functional classification of a roadway can change as land access and traffic movement increases or decreases.

The functional classification of existing facilities is significant because it specifies the desired amount of access control or locations where vehicles can enter or leave a roadway. When there is no access control, intersecting roads or driveways may connect to the main road at any point. Typically, local roads have no access control. With partial control of access, points of access to the main road are more limited. With full control of access, connections are only allowed at major crossroads, such as interchanges along an interstate. Full or partial control of access helps reduce traffic conflicts and allows traffic to move more freely.

The schematic below shows how various street classifications relate to each other in terms of movement and access. As land access increases, traffic movement decreases on the lower classified roadways and vice versa – as land access decreases, traffic movement increases along the higher classified roads.
The following is a brief description of the four primary functional classes of roadways within the study area.

**Interstates and Freeways**
Interstates and Freeways are the highest classification of roadways utilized for long-distance travel. Interstates and freeways are typically a divided highway of uninterrupted flow serving major traffic movements (high-speed, high volume) for exclusive use of traffic in each direction and full control of access. Interstates and freeways typically have two or more lanes in each direction. Interstate 65 and Saturn Parkway travel through the Spring Hill study area and function as interstates and freeways.

**Arterial**
A class of roads serving large traffic movements for moderate lengths of travel. Arterials emphasize a high level of mobility for through movement. While they may provide access to abutting land, their primary function is to serve traffic moving through the area; therefore arterials require a much higher level of access control than collectors or local streets. Columbia Pike, Buckner Road, Buckner Lane, Lewisburg Pike, Duplex Road, Kedron Road, and Reserve Boulevard are classified as Arterials within the study area.

**Collector**
As the name suggests, collector roadways have the primary purpose of collecting traffic from local roadways and distributing it to its destination or to an arterial roadway. Collectors offer a compromise between mobility and access. Collector streets include New Port Royal Road, Port Royal Road, Wilkes Lane, Campbell Station Parkway, Miles Johnson Parkway (note: this classification will change to arterial in the Recommended Plan section of this report), Wall Street, Commonwealth Drive, Town Center Boulevard, Ray Williams Drive, Mahlon Moore Road, Greens Mill Road, Rice Road, Denning Lane, and Derryberry Lane.

**Local**
Local streets are not considered major roadways, as their primary function is to provide direct access to land with little emphasis on the movement of through traffic so are, therefore, not classified. Any roadways not listed above as an Arterial or Collector is classified as a Local Street by this Plan.

Figure 1.3 shows the functionally classified roadways, updated by the City in March 2018, within the City of Spring Hill study area.
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Figure 1.3:
Existing Functional Classification
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Current Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes (AADT)
The current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes for roadways within the study area were gathered from annual counts conducted by TDOT. There are multiple TDOT count stations located within the Spring Hill Study Area as shown on the map below.
The table below includes the TDOT Traffic Count Stations within the City of Spring Hill study area with traffic ADT data from 2012 to 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000006</td>
<td>SR 247 - W of Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>5,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000007</td>
<td>SR 6 - SW of Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>18,797</td>
<td>19,490</td>
<td>20,074</td>
<td>20,410</td>
<td>20,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000009</td>
<td>SR 6 - NE of Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>15,724</td>
<td>15,726</td>
<td>15,657</td>
<td>16,292</td>
<td>16,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000010</td>
<td>SR 247 - E of Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>9,652</td>
<td>10,024</td>
<td>11,176</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>9,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000090</td>
<td>Kedron Rd - SE of Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>9,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000126</td>
<td>SR 247 - W of I-65</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>6,338</td>
<td>6,503</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>8,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000170</td>
<td>Kedron Rd - Near Williamson Co Line</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,192</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>7,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000195</td>
<td>I-65 - S of Saturn Pkwy</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>26,450</td>
<td>30,977</td>
<td>31,499</td>
<td>35,246</td>
<td>39,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000196</td>
<td>SR 396 - Near Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>23,554</td>
<td>25,083</td>
<td>25,832</td>
<td>24,940</td>
<td>25,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000202</td>
<td>I-65 - S of SR 840</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>55,810</td>
<td>56,593</td>
<td>57,205</td>
<td>57,777</td>
<td>58,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000222</td>
<td>SR 396 - W of I-65</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>28,268</td>
<td>30,186</td>
<td>29,295</td>
<td>30,176</td>
<td>29,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000223</td>
<td>SR 396 - Near Spring Hill</td>
<td>Maury</td>
<td>21,687</td>
<td>23,466</td>
<td>22,575</td>
<td>23,291</td>
<td>22,821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Area TDOT Traffic Counts Stations from 2012 to 2016**

Local ADT Counts in the study area were provided by the City of Spring Hill with count dates ranging from 2016 to 2018. Relevant TDOT and City of Spring Hill AADT counts are shown in Figure 1.4.
Figure 1.4: Existing Traffic Counts
Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan
Existing Transportation System Capacity
In order to determine the Existing LOS, TDOT and City of Spring Hill traffic volumes were analyzed according to HCM methods using the Highway Capacity Software. The existing Levels of Service for the TDOT and City counts are displayed in Figure 5. Figure 1.5 reveals that existing roadway conditions result in a range of LOS A to LOS E.
Travel Demand Model
For the purposes of transportation planning, a travel demand model (TDM) is used to provide existing and future traffic volumes for a given year (2015 and 2040 in this case). The TDM utilizes population and employment data as its primary data inputs. The TDM is a tool developed by the Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to model traffic volumes for a 7-county region in Middle Tennessee. The MPO also provides functional classifications for the various municipalities within its region. The City of Spring Hill is within Maury and Williamson Counties and falls within the MPO region.

The base existing functional classifications provided by the MPO for the City of Spring Hill are displayed in Figure 1.6. These MPO functional classifications are according to the Federal functional classification system under MAP-21.
Existing Transportation Plans and Other City Growth Guidelines
To get a complete understanding of Spring Hill's existing transportation system, it was necessary to review the City's previous Major Thoroughfare Plans, GIS data, the Spring Hill RISING: 2040 Comprehensive Plan, current development regulations, and recently approved documents.

Access Management Plans have been developed for Highway 31 (Main Street/SR 6) and Port Royal Road which set forth goals and strategies for traffic management, operations, and safety.

The City of Spring Hill's Unified Development Code (UDC) incorporates the Zoning Ordinance, Official Zoning Map, Subdivision Regulations, and Design Review Guidelines was adopted August 20, 2018. This provides guidelines and procedures for all new construction, reconstruction, and reconfiguration of public rights-of-way. The UDC promotes the orderly development of the City in accordance with the Spring Hill Rising 2040.

Traffic Impact Study Requirements were established by the City of Spring in April 2018 which states an applicant shall undertake a traffic impact study if a development will generate 100 new peak hour vehicle trips on the adjacent street. This is consistent with typical municipality standards.

All of these documents and information will be reflected in future conditions analysis and recommendations.

Existing Pedestrian Facilities and Bicycle Facilities
Existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, such as sidewalks and paved trails, are currently limited throughout the City of Spring Hill. According to the 2015 Major Thoroughfare Plan, new developments are required to address and accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic. In October of 2015, the City adopted the Spring Hill Bicycle and Greenway Plan to provide recommendations and policies for future bike lanes, greenways, and multi-use pedestrian trails.
Conclusion
In order to prepare for future growth in the Spring Hill area, the condition of the existing transportation system has been analyzed to determine areas in need of improvement and assess potential impacts from features such as land use, population, employment, and the condition of transportation infrastructure. In the future conditions analysis, projected traffic volumes will be analyzed to complete the picture of the transportation systems' needs. It is an in-depth understanding of the City's current and existing conditions that a more complete view of the needed improvements to Spring Hill's transportation network can be reached.
CHAPTER 2. FUTURE CONDITIONS

In order to identify the future transportation needs for the City of Spring Hill, it is necessary to analyze projected traffic volumes in comparison with the ability of the roadways to handle it. This analysis will not only indicate roads with potential congestion issues, it also helps identify corridors where additional facilities and connections could benefit the overall network. In order to accomplish this, 2040 traffic projections from the Nashville Area MPO travel demand model for the region are utilized.

Projected population and employment data for 2040 is based on the information detailed in the Existing Conditions Chapter, projections established by the MPO, and supplemented by the growth identified by the City's future land use plan.

This information is utilized along with planned roadway improvements within the study area to provide the Existing plus Committed (E+C) transportation network. The E+C transportation network utilizes the projected population and employment data and roadway improvement projects that are currently funded for construction and assigns projected traffic volumes to the various roadways in the City. This process is explained in more detail later in this chapter. Roadway segments that are projected to be congested in 2040 (LOS D or worse) are identified and highlighted. These areas within the network will be in need of improvement. Specific improvements to address the area's anticipated transportation deficiencies are discussed in the Recommendations chapter.
NASHVILLE AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)

The Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is a regional transportation planning organization that serves 7 counties within the Middle Tennessee region, including Maury and Williamson Counties and the City of Spring Hill. The MPO is responsible for the distribution and supervision of federal and state funding for transportation projects in the Nashville region. The MPO maintains a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a 25-year multimodal transportation vision that helps guide the investment of public funds in transportation projects to manage congestion and increase regional mobility options. On February 17, 2016, the MPO executive board adopted the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan, also known as Middle Tennessee Connected. The plan serves as the gateway to federal transportation funds that are distributed through the U.S. DOT Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and represents the region's top priorities for state funding. This Plan, and particularly the Recommendations chapter, will be key to ensuring that the City of Spring Hill's priority projects are consistent with the goals and objectives of the MPO while identifying strategies to best prepare the City for anticipated growth.

The MPO also maintains a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which consists of projects for which funding has already been allocated. The current TIP identifies projects that are programmed for the years 2017 through 2020. Projects included in the TIP are typically the most immediate projects to be completed and can include vehicular and multimodal improvements.

There are currently four projects in the TIP for the City of Spring Hill.

- **TIP Project #2004-051: SR 247 (Duplex Road) Widening.** This project will widen Duplex Road from two to three lanes, improve vertical and horizontal alignment, add curb-and-gutter, add sidewalk on the south side of the project and a multi-use path on the north side of the project. The City has currently added temporary signals at four previously unsignalized intersections, which will become permanent signals as part of the widening project. This project is currently under construction with an expected completion date of 2020.
• TIP Project #2017-61-032: Saturn Parkway (SR 396) Extension. This project will include the extension of Saturn Parkway (SR 396) from its existing terminus to Beechcroft Road (SR 247). A portion of SR 247 will be improved, and a structure, built to accommodate a future 5-lane, will be built over the existing railroad crossing. SR 247 from the new extension to Cleburne Road will be widened to 3-lanes. The intersection at Cleburne Road and SR 247 will be improved by including turn lanes. Additional intersection improvements will be made at SR 247 and Town Center Parkway and Stephen P. Yokich Parkway at US 31. The typical section will vary from a 2-lane arterial extending from Saturn Parkway, to a 3-lane curb-and-gutter section as it ties into Beechcroft Road (SR-247). This project is planned to begin construction in late summer/fall 2018.

• TIP Project #2009-85-012: Express Bus Service from Williamson County. This project will include express bus service from Spring Hill, Franklin, and Brentwood to Nashville and return.

These improvement projects are shown on the map in Figure 2.1. These projects are the “committed” transportation improvements of the “Existing plus Committed” transportation network discussed later in this chapter.
Figure 2.1:
MPO Transportation Improvement Plan
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FUTURE GROWTH

Spring Hill is a growing community within the rapidly expanding Middle Tennessee region. It is a community that faces the challenges of controlling the high demands for urban growth and depends heavily on the regional transportation system to move people efficiently and safely. The City is situated in both Williamson and Maury Counties and relatively close to Davidson County approximately 30 miles south of Nashville. The area is experiencing unprecedented growth and development.

Like many communities in the Middle Tennessee region, Spring Hill faces increasing development pressures that sometimes conflict with a strong desire to preserve, protect, and enhance its original small-town feel. The Major Thoroughfare Plan is a tool that aims to guide the community in managing its growth through the year 2040.

This growth presents tremendous opportunity for the City of Spring Hill to make informed decisions on future development and manage its increasing size. To determine future access and mobility needs of the City of Spring Hill, it is important to coordinate the City's future land use and transportation plan. Future roadway extensions, new alignments, and the location and design of major intersections influence future development patterns across the City. Land use and zoning should be taken into consideration to ensure the efficient use of infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and municipal services match the land use travel patterns.

Future Land Use

Land use and growth patterns within the City of Spring Hill's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) have played an integral role in the demand for and development of Spring Hill's transportation system. The Spring Hill RISING: 2040 Comprehensive Plan outlines future land uses with different character areas to provide general guidance for land use decisions to shape the development growth for the next twenty years. The Future Land Use Plan for the City of Spring Hill is shown in Figure 2.2.
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Future Population
A Special Census was conducted in 2018 and found that the official population of Spring Hill now stands at 40,436, a 10.7% increase from the 36,530 residents certified in 2016. Furthermore, a recent study conducted for the City's water demand projects the population to double by 2040 with a projected population of 81,287. This level of growth puts additional strains on the City's existing transportation network and presents many challenges as the City continues to experience growth pressures.
EXISTING PLUS COMMITTED (E+C) TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
The Existing plus Committed (E+C) transportation network for the year 2040 was generated using the MPO travel demand model as a basis. The travel demand model used the projected socio-economic data for the year 2040 to produce trip forecasts and estimate traffic conditions in the study area for the year 2040. The E+C network analysis is based on the completion of the committed projects listed on pages 2-3 of this document in addition to the existing roadway network. The network shown in Figure 3 does not include any projects reflected in the Long Range Plan or future road or transportation improvements, only projects that are under construction or have funding for construction. Future improvements that are planned for and/or needed (but not funded through the MPO) will be discussed in the Recommendations chapter.

The results of the E+C travel demand model analysis are presented in Figure 2.3, which shows the expected peak hour Level of Service (LOS) for the 2040 E+C network. As shown, traffic operations in the study area are expected to deteriorate through the planning horizon year of 2040, with traffic operations falling below acceptable levels on several segments of the area’s major roadways. Poor peak hour LOS (LOS D, E, and F shown in the orange and red colors) can be expected on segments of Main Street, Duplex Road, Beechcroft Road, Lewisburg Pike. Also, it should be noted that Thompson’s Station Road has a major impact on commuting traffic within Spring Hill and experiences poor peak hour LOS. The worsening traffic operations would indicate a potential need for capacity-adding projects in the future for these roads. Specific improvements to address these deficiencies are discussed in detail in the Recommendations chapter.
Figure 2.3: Nashville MPO 2040 Model
Levels of Service
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Table 1 shows the length of road miles by LOS for the 2010 network and the E+C 2040 network. As shown the number of road miles operating at or below LOS D will increase dramatically. For example, in 2015, the MPO indicates there are 0.12 road miles operating at LOS F, and only 13.08 miles operating at D or below. By 2040, however, there are 9.45 road miles operating at F and the amount of road miles operating a D or below grows to over 40 miles. These results show that traffic operations on the roadways within the study area are expected to begin to deteriorate unless additional roadway improvements are made.

### Table 1. LOS Comparison 2015 and 2040 (in miles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Base Year 2015</th>
<th>E+C Year 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>59.89</td>
<td>32.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Thorough analysis of the 2040 Existing plus Committed (E+C) transportation network reveals the need for future transportation improvements in the Spring Hill study area. Projected population and employment data along with planned roadway improvements from the Nashville Area MPO's Transportation Improvement Program make up the committed network and reveal future Levels of Service (LOS) on area roadways that are below an acceptable level. The increases in projected traffic are largely the result of a growing and vibrant community within the rapidly growing Nashville metropolitan region.

The Spring Hill Study Area in 2040 will experience significant roadway congestion according to the MPO model. The roadways that currently operate at LOS C will become increasingly congested and move to LOS D or worse. These increases are significant and result in increased pressures and demands on the roadway network in the Spring Hill study area. Specific improvements to address the area's anticipated transportation deficiencies are discussed in the Recommendations chapter.
CHAPTER 3. RECOMMENDED PLAN

The City of Spring Hill is a member of the Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – a regional transportation planning body made up of city and county governments within Davidson, Maury, Robertson, Rutherford, Sumner, Williamson, and Wilson Counties. The MPO is a federally mandated transportation planning organization that produces the region’s Long Range Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a plan for all regionally significant transportation-related projects, including roadway and multimodal projects that should be implemented within a 20 to 30-year time frame. The plan is based on several factors, including projected population and employment growth, funding availability, and project necessity (e.g., traffic congestion).

In February 2016, the MPO’s 2040 RTP was adopted by the MPO Executive Board, which is made up of elected officials from the MPO member jurisdictions discussed in the previous paragraph. In an effort to get recognition and funding of transportation projects within the City of Spring Hill, recommended roadway improvements must be identified. The purpose of this Major Thoroughfare Plan is to establish and identify those improvements. Just as important, this plan is intended to assist the City of Spring Hill in establishing its priority projects for the roadway network in an effort to respond to and prepare for the continuing growth and development in the community.

The recommended roadway improvements were developed based on existing and projected traffic volumes, access to and from key origins and destinations, safety and circulation, and actual observed congestion. The improvements are ranked in three priority levels. High priority are ones that are existing needs and should be implemented as soon as funding becomes available. Medium priority are projects that are currently experiencing some congestion and/or need additional access and should be implemented once all high priority projects have been fulfilled. Low priority projects would be beneficial and provide improved circulation and traffic flow, but are not urgent based on congestion or existing access and connectivity.

Table 3.1 lists the transportation projects that are proposed as part of this Major Thoroughfare Plan. Figure 3.1 illustrates those projects within the City of Spring Hill. Each individual project is detailed in the following pages.
### Table 3.1 MTP Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckner Lane</td>
<td>Duplex Road</td>
<td>Thompson’s Station Road</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4/5 lanes and realign</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buckner Road</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Buckner Lane</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4/5 lanes</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buckner Road</td>
<td>Buckner Lane</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Extend as 4-6 lane road</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crossings Boulevard</td>
<td>Crossings Boulevard</td>
<td>Crossings Circle South</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road with turn lanes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crossings Circle South</td>
<td>Crossings Circle South</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road with turn lanes</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Denning Lane</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Widen to provide standard 2 lanes &amp; correct alignment</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duplex Road</td>
<td>I-65</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 3 lanes &amp; correct alignment</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ferguson Road</td>
<td>Southern Terminus</td>
<td>Parkway Drive</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greensmill Road</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Widen to provide standard 2 lanes &amp; correct alignment</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heritage Bypass</td>
<td>Heritage Campus</td>
<td>Campbell Station Parkway</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jim Warren Road</td>
<td>Port Royal Road</td>
<td>Crafton Road</td>
<td>Widen to provide standard 2 lanes with turn lanes</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jim Warren Road Extension</td>
<td>Crafton Road</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joe Peay Road</td>
<td>Rice Road</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road with turn lanes</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Spring Hill: Major Thoroughfare Plan

**Table 3.1 MTP Project List (Con't)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Saturn Parkway</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 3 lanes</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Saturn Parkway</td>
<td>Port Royal Road</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turn lanes</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Port Royal Road</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes &amp; construct interchange</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kings Creek Connector</td>
<td>John Lunn Road</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/S Connector</td>
<td>Buckner Road Extension</td>
<td>Kedron Road (E of I-65)</td>
<td>Construct new 4 lane road</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Port Royal Road Extension</td>
<td>Northern Terminus</td>
<td>Thompson’s Station Road</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Petty Lane</td>
<td>Cleburne Road</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Port Royal Road</td>
<td>Duplex Road</td>
<td>Kedron Road</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ray Williams Drive Extension</td>
<td>Station Hill Drive</td>
<td>Old Kedron Road</td>
<td>New 2 lane road</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rice Road</td>
<td>Rice Road Terminus</td>
<td>Worthington Lane</td>
<td>New 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Saturn Parkway Extension</td>
<td>I-65</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Extend as 4 lane parkway with turn lanes</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Southern Springs Connector</td>
<td>Port Royal Road</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road, improve Royal Park/John Lunn Road</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Spring Station Connector</td>
<td>Thompson’s Station Road</td>
<td>Spring Station Drive</td>
<td>Construct new 2 lane road</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.1 MTP PROJECT LIST (CON’T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spring Station Drive Extension</td>
<td>Spring Station Drive</td>
<td>SR 106/US 431/ Lewisburg Pike</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road with turn lanes</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SR 247/ Beechcroft Road</td>
<td>Carters Creek Pike</td>
<td>Cleburne Road</td>
<td>Widen to provide standard 2 lanes with turn lanes</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SR 6/US 31</td>
<td>Miles Johnson Parkway</td>
<td>Buckner Road</td>
<td>Widen from 2 lanes to 4/5 lanes</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sugar Ridge Road Extension</td>
<td>Sugar Ridge Road western terminus</td>
<td>Dr. Robinson Road</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Town Center Parkway</td>
<td>Duplex Road</td>
<td>Wilkes Lane</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wall Street</td>
<td>Southern Terminus</td>
<td>Miles Johnson Parkway</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane road</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECT 1: BUCKNER LANE**

Project Location  
Termini: From Duplex Road to Thompson's Station Road  
Length: 2.72 miles  
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed and realign  
Functional Class: Arterial  
Priority: High

**Project Summary**  
This improved 4-lane arterial would provide a more efficient north-south route on the northeast side of the City. Buckner Lane parallels I-65 and provides access to numerous residential neighborhoods and Summit High School and Spring Station Middle School. This route is a major connector between Duplex Road and Thompson's Station Road and will become more heavily traveled with the proposed I-65 interchange at Buckner Road. This improvement will include realigning to intersect Thompson's Station Road. Without improvements, Buckner Lane is projected to operate at LOS F in 2040.
PROJECT 2: BUCKNER ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From SR 6/US 31/Main Street to Buckner Lane
Length: 1.91 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This improved 4-lane arterial would provide a more efficient east-west route on the north side of the City. Buckner Road provides access to numerous residential neighborhoods on both sides of the roadway and will serve as the primary east-west route to access the proposed I-65 interchange. Without improvements, Buckner Road is projected to operate at LOS E in 2040.
PROJECT 3: BUCKNER ROAD EXTENSION AND I-65 INTERCHANGE

Project Location
Termini: From Buckner Lane to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 2.00 miles
Improvement: New 4-lane roadway with 6 lanes at interchange
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: High

Project Summary
This proposed 4-lane arterial would provide an east-west connection from Buckner Lane to a major state route east of I-65. This project would also provide a new interstate access to I-65 via Diverging Diamond Interchange. The roadway would run through Gateway Land Use. This new roadway would provide much improved access to and from major routes on each side of I-65 and provide travel time benefits into and out of Spring Hill.
PROJECT 4: CROSSINGS BOULEVARD

Project Location
Termini: From Crossings Boulevard to Crossings Circle South
Length: 0.32 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway with turn lanes
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a north connection between The Crossings shopping center and the proposed Crossings Circle South. It would provide a practical connection for traffic without having to utilize SR 6/US 31/Main Street or Saturn Parkway.
PROJECT 5: CROSSINGS CIRCLE SOUTH

Project Location
Termini: From Crossings Circle South to Kedron Road
Length: 0.97 miles
Improvement: New 2- and 4-lane roadway with turn lanes as needed
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This proposed collector would provide an east-west connection between The Crossings shopping center and Kedron Road. This new road would run parallel to Saturn Parkway. It would provide a practical connection for traffic without having to utilize SR 6/US 31/Main Street or Saturn Parkway. This road would be 2 lanes between the existing terminus of Crossings Circle South and the proposed Crossings Boulevard and 4 lanes to Kedron Road.
PROJECT 6: DENNING LANE

Project Location
Termini: From SR 6/US 31/Main Street to Kedron Road
Length: 2.80 miles
Improvement: Widen to provide standard 2 lanes and correct alignment
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This improved 2-lane collector would provide improved east-west connection on the south side of the City. It would also correct the horizontal alignment and sight distance issues that currently exist. This roadway primarily provides access to residential properties and undeveloped land.
PROJECT 7: DUPLEX ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From I-65 to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 1.92 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 3 lanes and correct alignment
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This improved 3-lane arterial would provide improved east-west connection on the east side of I-65. It would also correct the horizontal and vertical alignment and sight distance issues that currently exist. This roadway primarily provides access to residential properties and undeveloped land. This segment of Duplex Road is expected to operate at LOS D in 2040 without improvements.
PROJECT 8: FERGUSON ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From southern terminus to Parkway Drive
Length: 1.05 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This new 2-lane collector would provide improved connection between Duplex Road and Chapman's Retreat Elementary School to Parkway Drive/Port Royal Road. This roadway would traverse mainly undeveloped land.
PROJECT 9: GREENSMILL ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Kedron Road to SR 6/US 31
Length: 6.13 miles
Improvement: Widen to provide standard 2-lanes and correct alignment
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This improved 2-lane collector would provide improved east-west connection on the south side of the City. It would also correct the horizontal alignment and sight distance issues that currently exist. This roadway primarily provides access to residential properties and undeveloped land.
PROJECT 10: HERITAGE BYPASS

Project Location
Termini: From Heritage Campus to Campbell Station Parkway
Length: 0.61 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an alternative north-south connection between the Heritage Schools campus and SR 6/US 31/Main Street. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped land and connect to Wilkes Lane. This roadway would run along the west side of SR 6/US 31/Main Street.
CITY OF SPRING HILL:
MAJOR THOROUGHFARE PLAN

PROJECT 11: JIM WARREN ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Port Royal Road to Crafton Road
Length: 1.74 miles
Improvement: Widen to provide standard 2 lanes with turn lanes and correct alignment
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This widened 2-lane collector would provide improved east-west access on the east side of the City, including crossing I-65. It would also improve the narrow lanes that currently exist. This roadway provides access to multiple residential properties and undeveloped areas.
PROJECT 12: JIM WARREN ROAD EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Crafton Road to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 1.62 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an east-west connection through the rural area that lies between Crafton Road and SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped properties. It would provide a logical connection from the City to a major highway.
PROJECT 13: JOE PEAY ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Rice Road to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 2.96 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway with turn lanes
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an east-west connection from SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike to near the proposed extension of Rice Road. This new road would provide an improved and alternative connection across I-65 on the southeast side of the City.
PROJECT 14: KEDRON ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From SR 6/US 31/Main Street to Saturn Parkway
Length: 1.28 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 3 lanes
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: High

Project Summary
This improved 3-lane arterial would provide improved access to the high-demand connection between Saturn Parkway and SR 6/US 31/Main Street. This roadway provides access to several local routes and residential properties. This segment of Kedron Road is expected to operate at LOS E in 2040 without improvements.
PROJECT 15: KEDRON ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Saturn Parkway to Port Royal Road
Length: 2.81 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turn lanes
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This improved 4-lane arterial would provide a more efficient north-south route on the south side of the City. This roadway traverses residential property and undeveloped areas. However, this route is a major connector between Saturn Parkway and Port Royal Road. Without improvements, Kedron Road is projected to operate at LOS E in 2040.
PROJECT 16: KEDRON ROAD

Project Location
Termeni: From Port Royal Road to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 4.70 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes and construct interchange
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This improved 4-lane collector would provide a more efficient north-south route on the southeast side of the City. This roadway traverses primarily undeveloped areas. However, this route would include an interchange at I-65 and would be a major connector between Port Royal Road and SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike. With the interchange, this roadway would run through future Gateway Land Use. Without improvements, a segment of Port Royal Road is projected to operate at LOS E in 2040.
PROJECT 17: KINGS CREEK CONNECTOR

Project Location
Termini: From John Lunn Road to Kedron Road
Length: 1.24 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a needed north-south connection through potential development between John Lunn Road and Kedron Road. The new road would traverse mainly undeveloped and residential properties.
PROJECT 18: N/S CONNECTOR

Project Location
Termini: From Buckner Road Extension to Kedron Road (E. of I-65)
Length: 6.95 miles
Improvement: New 4-lane roadway
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 4-lane arterial would provide a needed north-south connection through the rural area on the east side of I-65. The roadway would run through a multitude of existing and future residential land uses. This new roadway would help with connectivity once the Buckner Road extension and I-65 interchange is complete.
PROJECT 19: NEW PORT ROYAL ROAD EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Northern Terminus to Thompson’s Station Road
Length: 0.29 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane road
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a practical connection between the residential area along New Port Royal Road and Thompson’s Station Road. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped land. This roadway would provide an additional and alternative north-south route on the north side of the City.
PROJECT 20: PETTY LANE EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Cleburne Road to SR 6/US 31/Main Street
Length: 1.37 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane road
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a practical connection between Cleburne Road, which provides access to Beechcroft Road, and SR 6/US 31/Main Street. This roadway would provide an additional and alternative east-west route on the west side of the City.
PROJECT 21: PORT ROYAL ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Duplex Road to Kedron Road
Length: 4.06 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This improved 4-lane arterial would provide a more efficient north-south route on the southeast side of the City. This roadway traverses residential property and undeveloped areas south of Saturn Parkway and provides access to multiple commercial developments and residential properties north of Saturn Parkway. The improvement would also correct the horizontal alignment and sight distance issues that currently exist. This route is a major connector between Duplex Road and Kedron Road, and provides access to the new Port Royal Park. Without improvements, Port Royal Road is projected to operate at LOS F in 2040.
PROJECT 22: RAY WILLIAMS DRIVE EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Station Hill Drive to Old Kedron Road
Length: 0.79 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This new 2-lane collector would provide access to potential development and a logical connection from existing residential development to Old Kedron Road/Kedron Road.
PROJECT 23: RICE ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Terminus of Rice Road to Worthington Lane
Length: 1.60 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This new 2-lane collector would provide improved north-south access on the southeast side of the City. It would provide an alternative to traffic utilizing Port Royal Road. This roadway would traverse through mostly undeveloped property.
PROJECT 24: SATURN PARKWAY EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From I-65 to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 1.80 miles
Improvement: New 4-lane parkway
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This new arterial roadway would extend the existing Saturn Parkway to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike. This is a logical east-west connection that would only add to future east-west connections on the east side of I-65. This new roadway would traverse residential and undeveloped properties, as well as a couple of local roadways.
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PROJECT 25: SOUTHERN SPRINGS CONNECTOR

Project Location
Termini: From Port Royal Road to SR 6/US 31/Main Street
Length: 4.01 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane road, and improve Royal Park/John Lunn Road
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a practical east-west connection Port Royal Road and the new Southern Springs development. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped land to connect residential neighborhoods. This roadway would provide an additional and alternative east-west route on the south side of the City.
PROJECT 26: SPRING STATION CONNECTOR

Project Location
Termini: From Thompson’s Station Road to Spring Station Drive
Length: 1.60 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an alternative north-south connection between Summit High School and Spring Station Middle School and Thompson’s Station Road. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped land that is planned to be converted to a regional office and commercial development in the future. This roadway would run parallel to I-65 and would provide an additional and alternative north-south route on the northeast side of the City.
PROJECT 27: SPRING STATION DRIVE EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Spring Station Drive to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike
Length: 1.76 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway with turn lanes
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an east-west connection from Summit High School and Spring Station Middle School to SR 106/US 431/Lewisburg Pike. This new road would provide an improved and alternative connection across I-65 on the northeast side of the City.
CITY OF SPRING HILL:
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PROJECT 28: SR 247/BEEHCROFT ROAD

Project Location
Termini: From Carters Creek Pike to Cleburne Road
Length: 2.21 miles
Improvement: Widen to provide standard 3 lanes
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: Medium

Project Summary
This widened 3-lane arterial would provide improved east-west access on the west side of the City. It would also improve the narrow lanes that currently exist. This roadway provides access to multiple residential properties as well as access to I-840 via Carters Creek Pike. A portion of this segment of SR 247/Beechcroft Road is expected to operate at LOS E in 2040 without improvements.
PROJECT 29: SR 6/US 31/Main Street

Project Location
Termini: From Miles Johnson Parkway to Buckner Road
Length: 2.18 miles
Improvement: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed
Functional Class: Arterial
Priority: High

Project Summary
This improved 4-lane arterial would provide a more efficient north-south route on
the north side of the City. This roadway traverses multiple commercial and business
developments and provides access to numerous residential neighborhoods.
Without improvements, SR 6/US 31/Main Street is projected to operate at LOS F in
2040.
PROJECT 30: SUGAR RIDGE ROAD EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Sugar Ridge Road eastern terminus to Dr. Robinson Road
Length: 2.01 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide an improved and alternative east-west connection on the northwest side of the City. This new road would traverse mainly undeveloped land and some residential properties. The new extension would intersect Dr. Robinson Road across from Lakeview Road.
PROJECT 31: TOWN CENTER PARKWAY EXTENSION

Project Location
Termini: From Duplex Road to Wilkes Lane
Length: 2.02 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: Low

Project Summary
This new 2-lane collector would provide an additional north-south connection between Town Center Parkway near Kedron Parkway to Wilkes Lane and the commercial development near Campbell Station Parkway. This new roadway would likely go through several existing local roads and would parallel the railroad.
PROJECT 32: WALL STREET

Project Location
Termini: From Southern Terminus to Miles Johnson Parkway
Length: 0.61 miles
Improvement: New 2-lane roadway
Functional Class: Collector
Priority: High

Project Summary
This proposed 2-lane collector would provide a practical link between the commercial development along Belshire Way to Miles Johnson Parkway. The roadway would run through mostly undeveloped land. This roadway would provide a logical north-south connection on the north side of the City.
FUTURE CLASSIFICATION MAP

As described in the Existing Conditions report, four primary functional classes of roadways are provided within the study area. Interstates and Freeways are the highest classification of roadways utilized for long-distance travel. Arterials are a class of roads serving large traffic movements for moderate lengths of travel. Collector roadways have the primary purpose of collecting traffic from local roadways and distributing it to its destination or to an arterial roadway.

Figure 3.2 illustrates existing and proposed Roadway Functional Classifications within the City of Spring Hill.

Local streets are not considered major thoroughfares, as their primary function is to provide direct access to land with little emphasis on the movement of through traffic so are, therefore, not classified. However, there are several local connections that are important to the connectivity and circulation for the City of Spring Hill. These connections are identified in Figure 3.3, which details these future local connections that are recommended as development occurs and funding becomes available.
Figure 3.2
Proposed Classification
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APPENDIX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

SPRING HILL MTP COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC MEETING 10/30/18

- Increase speed limit from 31 East on Campbell Station Road until St. Hubbins. There are no residential driveway connections in this section.
- Buckner Road improvements. When made to 4/5 lanes instead of red lights along length of road propose multiple roundabouts. This will allow for one way travel, continuous flow and less backup. Should be clearly painted and signed for proper use.
- Request for speed limit change to 35 mph on Kedron Road from Saturn Pkway to 31
- Request to widen Mahlon Moore to 3 lanes with traffic lights at each end. Reduce speed limit on Greensmill at Mahlon Moore. Traffic light and turning lanes at Kedron and Whispering Woods. The safety of our children will be compromised when the Battle Creek School is complete, if we don’t complete these before the school opens. The surrounding roads are not meant to sustain 20+ school busses, twice a day.
- Project #4 Keep to 3/4 lanes max. We own a home on Buckner Road – 2801 Sutherland Drive – and our property will be affected.
- We love our home and don’t want to move but we are frightened by what might happen with project #4 (Buckner Road). We would like this to be no more than 3 lanes. We are frightened about not being treated fairly based on horror stories we hear about eminent domain.
- Turning south off of Saturn Pkwy and Port Royal is impossible. Please make a light or reconfigure the interchange.
- Strongly recommend having Beechcroft Road and Duplex Road join at 31 to eliminate one traffic light. Realizing 55 and up community have more accidents at intersections!
- Project 1 – Widening US 31 (Miles Johnson to Buckner)
  - Also need to include the road (US 31) from Miles Johnson to Duplex Road.
- My concern is someone from up here should note checking our foundation of our houses. A lot of dust and gravel getting on our court and trenches. And the dust is covering our houses.
- Improvements extension to Beechcroft from Tower Parkway to new conduct (?)
- Sidewalks on B/G Plan, Sidewalks near schools (near Spring Station School)
- Proj 17 – Mitchum Love to sewage easement given for sewage
SPRING HILL MTP COMMENTS VIA EMAIL AND ONLINE FORM

- I am unable to attend the Town Hall Planning meeting on Monday, October 29, however, I wanted to submit a definite concern and question for you. We live in Cobblestone Village, off of Jim Warren Road, off of Port Royal Rd. Since we moved here nearly 3 years ago, the traffic issues on Port Royal Rd. and the 396 interchange have continued to escalate. I don't know if this a TDOT issue, exclusively, or if the City of Spring Hill has any say in the matter, but we desperately need full traffic lights and turn lanes on both the east and west on and off ramps! And the more people move here, the worse it is becoming. I have seen nothing to address this very concerning issue in any of the newspaper articles which have talked about the various infrastructure improvements scheduled to be done. My 15 year old daughter will be getting her learner's permit soon and I am extremely concerned for her safety in driving through these intersections without the assistance of traffic signals. We cannot wait years for these traffic signals to be installed. These intersections are extremely hazardous. Thank you very much for submitting my concerns and for answering my questions.

- I looked at the website and filled out the comment form. One thing I'm curious about, is how this plan takes into consideration the lack of walkability we have here in Spring Hill. Does this plan address any road projects that will include sidewalks and bike paths? I would hope that any road project we look at doing include sidewalks and bike paths, in hopes we can promote the idea of leaving the car at home and riding a bike (or walking).

- A lot of these projects should have been addressed years ago, prior to the population growth. I'd suggest we start raising some fees/taxes to start paying for these roads now. Also, you're going to get varied priorities from citizens, mainly based on where they live and what roads they drive the most. Top priority needs to be the N/S pathways, including 31 and Buckner Ln (and even I65 once the interchange at Buckner Rd is put in). The sooner we can get these fixed the better. Also, I'd love to see Spring Hill become more of a walkable/bikeable community. Please keep this in mind.

- Top Three Priority Projects/Improvements: (1) Project #1 - Widen 31, (2) Project #3 - Widen Buckner Ln, (3) Project #9 - Widen Port Royal from Saturn Parkway to Duplex, (4) Project #4/#5 - Widen and extend Buckner Rd from 31 to 431, (5) Project #11 - widen Duplex from I65 to 431.

- Speaking for myself and my neighbors, we would like to see the roads improved in this order:
  1. highway 31 - but really from 840 to Saturn Parkway
  2. entrance/exits to the Crossings
  3. Port Royal Road
  4. Cleburne Road
  5. Buckner Road
6. Buckner Lane

- Thank you for conducting and participating in the public input meeting last night in Spring Hill. I am sending this note with an e-mail exchange (below) that I had with Alderman Fitterer out of frustration to show how... "the wheels keep spinning and the vehicle is going nowhere"... with respect to traffic issues in Spring Hill.

Alderman Matt Fitterer conducted a survey to collect information from residents on what the project priorities should look like (sounds like the purpose of last night's meeting --- correct?). It appeared that the overwhelming conclusion of Mr. Fitterer's survey was that Highway 31 needed to be addressed. I estimated that about 85% of respondents to his survey ranked this as the #1 priority. I think your meeting last night shows the same result (correct?).

- I agree with the #1 project. Definitely a need to have Main Street fixed. But I believe the #9 project should be bumped up to #2. This area has gotten ridiculous. You can't even get in and out of Kroger in a timely manner. Takes 30 minutes to get out of the parking lot! This road needs to be a priority since it is a major road to the interstate. As is, it's a nightmare.

Top Three Priority Projects/Improvements: #1 Main Street #2 Port Royal from Saturn to Duplex with the main focus being around Kroger.

- Lots of great projects that will improve our wonderful city. Thank you for including the community in your decisions!

Top Three Priority Projects/Improvements: 1. Project #1 2. Project #3 3. Project #4

- The one important piece of information is missing from the project list. When is the estimated start and completion date of each project.

Top Three Priority Projects/Improvements: Hi-way 31. Any other project carries about the same weight of importance as any other. Hi-way 31 is top on my list.

- The main issues I find are in the north-south travel as there are not enough routes and the ones that exist are two-lane roads. These are long over-due considering the population growth. Had those been completed, I would like to see better access to shopping areas such as The Crossings - the traffic circle is a nightmare and could use striping as two lanes as well as instruction to residents on how a traffic circle works.

Top Three Priority Projects/Improvements: Project 1 - Hwy 31 definitely needs to be widened. It would be great if it could go all the way up to the 840 (I realize that city limits are where this is plotted currently.) Project 3 - The north-south travel is currently dismal. Project 13 - Adding another major north-south connector is long overdue.
• My only comments are this, the projects that will accomplish the greatest traffic volume movement and flow efficiencies serves the greater good of 40,000 plus residents. These projects should come first. I don't have a dog in this fight with regards to which project or projects I personally want. My comments are not subjective or emotionally driven. I simply want what has the biggest and most effective impact upon my community. Coordinating and securing funding, working with federal and state authorities for project scheduling, etc. is what our elected officials and City staff are paid to do. Help our City with a cogent and effective plan based upon analysis and statistics. Then implement the Greater Good projects first. Thank you for your time and talents.

• Thank you for your interest in our opinions. I have lived in Spring Hill for almost 30 years. It's fast growth has been remarkable, but stressful for commuting. I have read the proposed projects and would like to give my opinion on a few of them.

(1) US-31 from Miles Johnson to Buckner Rd. As much as US-31 needs attention, I believe that if this project's only intention is between these two roads, then it is a waste of money. It is pointless to widen it for such a small stretch. It needs to be widened from Kedron Rd to 840, in order to be an efficient project.

(9) Port Royal from Saturn Pkwy to Duplex. Planned to widen from two lanes to three. If we are really thinking about growth between now and 2040, then 3 lanes will not be enough. We need five lanes. If we are going to spend the money to fix the roads, then why not do it right the first time and not have to go back and redo it in 10-15 years. Port Royal is a commercial business road that leads to thousands of people's homes. The businesses will do more business, if people aren't scared of sitting in traffic. If it's only widened to three lanes now, then when 5 lanes is needed, there may not be enough room to widen. Build it now, and more businesses will be attracted to this area.

(5) Buckner Rd Extension from Buckner Ln to Lewisburg Pk. When this project starts, I really hope that they have all the surrounding roads leading to it completed 100% first. Since this will become a main artery into the city, they need to widen the current Buckner Rd too. I also hope that they will widen I-65 to four or five lanes from 840 to Saturn Pkwy, either before or during it's construction. Also, put a light at Buckner and Lewisburg Pk. Once this project starts, it will cause another migration to Spring Hill. There will be more development than ever before and if we don't time it perfectly, it could be a huge disaster. This interchange is something the city really needs, but it needs to happen the right way.
Being a new mother, safety is my number one thought of driving. I am greatly concerned about the new schools that are currently being built on Mahlon Moore Rd. That road was not built to sustain the type of traffic that is received from school traffic, especially with big heavy busses. Those roads are dangerous and need to be widened. There also needs to be lights and turning lanes at each end of Mahlon Moore and Hummingbird Ln. There has been talk about this, but I noticed that it's not on the project list. The school is scheduled to open in August 2019, and nothing has been done to the roads yet. My children are zoned for this school. If nothing is done to the roads, then I will not be sending them on the bus. I may also consider moving, if the road safety factor doesn't prove well enough. I do believe that the (25) Kedron from Saturn Pkwy to Port Royal project will help with the flow of volume during peak hours, but Mahlon Moore will still need some work. Thank you again for listening. I hope it helps.

- The plan looks sound, however, there are several projects that need to be expedited.
- US31 Main Street Buckner Lane Buckner Road...especially with the pending Alexander Farms project Port Royal Road @ Saturn Parkway
- Comment in regards to project #6. If you’re going to consider widening this portion of Kedron Road from 2 to 3 lanes why not look at doing the same to Old Kedron Road and Miles Johnson Parkway. While project #6 will help move traffic, anyone going north on Main Street from Kedron Road will be stuck traffic and possible in a school zone depending on the time of day and year. Widening Old Kedron Road and Miles Johnson Parkway at the corner of Kedron Road and Old Kedron Road north over Duplex Road to the intersection of Main Street and Miles Johnson. This would help driver avoid the section of Main street between Kedron Road (northern part of project #6) and Miles Johnson Parkway (southern part of project #1), along with any traffic exiting Saturn Parkway heading north on Main Street. Project #25 & #26 would increase the amount of traffic heading north into town too. Drivers would be left with the same congested section of Main Street (between Kedron Road and Miles Johnson Parkway) that they have been use to.
- #1 #6 #21
- Project #3 Buckner Lane - Please ensure this project includes a traffic light at Buckner Rd and Buckner Lane (can we get a temporary sooner rather than later - I saw it on an earlier live stream of planned projects), as well as sidewalks along a widened Buckner Lane. We also hope this project includes making the intersection of Buckner Lane and Thompson's Station Road E permanent with left and right turn lanes. It would behove the city to make a longer than usual right turn lane for traffic going from Buckner Lane to traveling eastbound on Thompson's Station Road E, or a physical barrier or split to keep people from cutting in later from the left turn lane into the right.
Until the I-65 extension at Buckner Road is complete and I-65 S widened to at least 3 lanes past 840, people will likely still use the Thompson's Station Rd E/Pantall/Critz/431 options. And those parents taking children to school at Bethesda (Cherry Grove is still zoned and either must go this way or take Duplex around). We imagine that the 2 North Bound Buckner Lane lanes will just split, and thus have a long turn lane for both west and east bound traffic. Again, an engineered split or barrier to keep people from cutting in late to make a right turn should be considered. Trust me, the cutting in last minute will happen at as less people make a left in the morning. Project #4 - Buckner Road - Please ensure that this section of Buckner Road (31 to Buckner Lane) is kept from becoming a commercial route (e.g. weight restrictions) and take measures for trucking companies to continue using their existing routes today. The assumption is that as traffic will be lessened on 31 with a new Buckner Rd extension, there's no need for the truckers to come down Buckner Rd with an 840 to 31 route still being efficient and easier access. Please shave down the hill at the crest of Cherry Grove. And this intersection - Bunbury Dr and Maple Circle - will absolutely need some redoing for alignment or signalization. It is already a pain to try to have one person making a left out of Cherry Grove and another making a left out of Newport - so a center multi-lane is not going to solve that problem (regardless of the road widening; the road widening will exacerbate the problem further). Either realignment so a center lane can be option or a traffic light will be needed. I also hope that signalization will occur at New Port Royal and potentially Brixworth Dr. And this project will include sidewalks on both sides, or at least one side. It will be sad to see the trees go at Buckner Rd and Buckner Lane, but it has to happen. Project #5 - Buckner Road Extension - This new exit will be great. But will be useless in the evening commute if TDOT does not also widen I-65 southbound past 840 at the same time. I saw it was potentially going to start looking at that since the Federal Highway folks approved the Buckner Road exit and construction needing to start within 8 years of approval. Anyway, since I-65 S traffic backs up at 840 in the evenings, people will still likely use 840/431/Critz to get into Spring Hill. And I'm assuming that Thompson's Station has no plans to widen or change Thompson's Station Road E, Critz, or Pantall... And when scheduling construction on any of Project 1, 3 or 5, please minimize anything being simultaneous. I think 1 and 5 can be done at the same time, but not 1, 3, and/or 4. And definitely not 3 and 4 together (except for the intersection where they cross). And definitely not 1 and 3 together since that takes out any northbound routes for people. Project #9 - This may be too late to consider. But it would make sense to reduce the Buckner Lane/New Port Royal intersection down to a 3 way vs a 4 way. The thinking is to work with the two business properties so there is access to Daylight Donuts and those businesses through the business parking lot to its south. Having the additional need for the traffic signal to accommodate people coming out of
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the Daylight Donuts parking lot, or go straight into it doesn't seem like the most efficient flow of traffic, and instead giving them access through the adjacent business parking lot and their entrance would benefit residents more. While Daylight Donuts may disagree, I actually don't go to their business for this reason - I don't want to sit at the light, nor make people wait for me. And I hope Volkert and other services the city contracts be knowledgeable in Agile or Lean project practices. It's so frustrating to see government stall on much needed projects and then when finally going forward, doing the project that was needed 10 years ago and is now outdated.

- Priority 1 - Project #1 SR6/US31
- Priority 2 - Project #3 Buckner Lane
- Priority 3 - Project #5 Buckner Road Extension
- Other priorities, Project #8 - Hurt Road (this seems like it could be easy and quick relative to other projects and help keep more local neighborhood traffic off Buckner Lane) and Project #9 - Port Royal.

- We think that proposed plan is a one and realize that it may have change over the next 10 to 20 years with growth. All new developments should have an assessed up front impact fee for infrastructure. Top 5 projects recommended are #1, #6, #20, #21, and #9

- #1, #6, and #21

- Please find below, comments that I have prepared for consideration for the Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan Update. I welcome an opportunity to discuss these comments further should you have any questions.

It is my hope that my 12 years of past experience as City of Spring Hill Alderman, Planning Commissioner and 5 year member of the Transportation Advisory Committee would provide constructive insight into this important project.

My comments are focused more on what I hope the resulting Major Thoroughfare Plan will include.

1) The plan should be easily accessible and tell a clear story of where we are, projects that are needed, and a plan on how to achieve those goals. A bare minimum map with the title “Major Thoroughfare Plan” is not sufficient.

Today, there are no less than 3 versions of the Major Thoroughfare Plan accessible on the City’s website, and the text of the 2016 2040 Major Thoroughfare Plan (that includes critical policy language and a catalog of future project segments) isn’t on the website (see attached).

Spring Hill MTP Link on the Transportation Advisory Website (2011 outdated version):

http://www.springhilltn.org/DocumentCenter/View/148

Spring Hill MTP Link on website Search 1 (map dated 2014):

http://www.springhilltn.org/documentcenter/view/1029

Spring Hill MTP Link on website Search 2 (map dated 2018):

http://www.springhilltn.org/documentcenter/view/4451
2) The Proposed Projects graphic developed by Volkert for the public input segment appears to be very limited (26 projects) and removes major projects incorporated in the current MTP. How was this arrived at? There has been no discussions during public meetings how 26 projects made the cut, and many others were removed. Critical projects included in the current 2018 MTP, but now omitted include Saturn Parkway Extensions to 840 (North and West) and East of 65 to Lewisburg Pike, and interchange access to 65 at Kedron Rd. Projects in the current 2018 MTP appear to have been downgraded and decreased in capacity. Examples include: Jim Warren Rd, Crossings Circle South, Kedron Rd from Saturn Pwy to Main St, Port Royal from Commonwealth to Duplex, and a new Pantall Rd 2/3 Ln connector to Buckner Rd (previously in the 2660 Buckner Ln PZD identified as a 5 lane arterial – “Arterial C”).

3) Spring Hill Urban Growth Boundary in Williamson County East of Interstate 65 as represented on the Proposed Project Map does not exist. Source: Williamson County Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Element Map (Chapter 4, Page 42) https://www.williamsoncounty-tn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/16149/Williamson_CountyCTN_Plan_Adopted_Final_11-20-07

4) Project prioritization must include a component of Traffic Demand Modeling data and a thorough vetting of a project, not just “what the public would like to see”. The new MTP should include as a policy that TDM will be considered when the BOMA prioritizes and develops a CIP. Additionally, Individual Project Description “sheets” for every future project should be developed to identify key components like a description of the project, the need for the project, impact of the project to the transportation network if completed, fiscal estimates and other considerations. This is a typical tool used in other communities to aid in making decisions about which projects should be included in a CIP. Prior to 2015, the Transportation Advisory Committee maintained these types of project description sheets (See attached example for the interchange at Buckner Rd). The City should consider taking the opportunity with this MTP update to bring this practice back. See the City of Franklin 2016 major thoroughfare plan (Connect Franklin, pages 109 to 220 for an example): https://www.franklintn.gov/home/showdocument?id=24922
5A) Separate Collector category into Major Collector and Minor Collector classifications, and consider separating Arterial category into Major and Minor Arterial classifications. Separating these categories further would add additional flexibility for the City and Developers, and promote consistency. For instance, an Access Management and Control policy can be made and adhered to for Major Arterial road segments, while Minor Arterials would have more flexibility. Another example is implementing a policy limiting driveway curb cuts on Major Collectors, while permitting them on Minor Collector segments.

5B) Add Major Collector projects to the development of Traffic Impact Fees. Adding Major Collector category to the development of Traffic Impact Fees will require formation of “Zones” for the City, but it would greatly improve the ability of the City to complete these projects as development occurs as it would make construction of these roads eligible for Development Credits. Private entities build roads much more cheaply than the City, much more quickly, and there is a fundamental “fairness” accomplished when improvements necessitated by a specific development are completed by those that develop those projects.

6) Coordination of Major Thoroughfare Plan with the Town of Thompson’s Station, Columbia, Williamson County, Maury County and TDOT
The MTP should include policy about how the City, through its Planning Commission, BOMA or Staff, will coordinate the MTP with Williamson County and Thompson’s Station specifically, and other entities more generally. Specifically, Project N-12 on the most recent Williamson County MTP Update is the Buckner Rd Extension to Lewisburg Pike. That plan has the roadway a 2/3 lane, while the Spring Hill MTP has it as a 4/5 lane. Also, Williamson County MTP includes project N-21, Town Center Parkway Extension to Buckner Ln, not in the Spring Hill MTP (it should be in the Spring Hill MTP, by the way).

7) New Policies to consider including in the Major Thoroughfare Plan
• Formalize the role of the Transportation Advisory Committee (per Resolution 11-122, “to assist in the development of a strategic transportation plan and to recommend annual transportation improvements and priorities for Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) funding.”) What formal role has the TAC been in developing and recommending the annual CIP?
City of Spring Hill:
Major Thoroughfare Plan

- Bike / Ped “payment in lieu of completion” policy. Improvements for Bike / Ped facilities need to be completed with development just as any roadway improvement or other infrastructure improvements are required to be. The “payment in lieu” of improvements system is being abused, and there is not a system in place to complete improvements once a payment has been made to the City. Just because a project may be difficult to complete should not absolve the responsibility to complete it.
- Access Management policy
- Formalize a policy on Cross Easements between parking lots (between private property)
- Formalize a policy on Interconnectivity between subdivisions
- Traffic Signalization equipment standard – black decorative posts, and standardization of signal loop detector (radar or video), including LED lit street name signs
- Street Lighting standard – High efficiency LED down-lighting, versus standard “cobra head” mount
- ROW Maintenance Agreement policy – maintenance of landscaping in right of way (i.e. center island landscaping and signage)

- It’s hard to tell via the map on Facebook. There has been a lot of growth and several key projects
- The top priority needs to be siding 31 all the way through Spring Hill. If it isn’t the top priority something is wrong
- Looks good
- Buckner Rd, Buckner Ln, Interchange
- US-31 should be everyone’s first priority. I am amazed that we would have a city of this size with such poor roads.
- 1, 4, 3, 5
- Buckner Lane in the mornings at 7:00 is out of control! It takes me 45-60 minutes to get from one side of Buckner Lane to the other towards Thompson Station everyday. The other major problem is getting from Target to Kroger on Main Street. Please help us ASAP! Thank you.
- 1. Buckner Lane 2. Main Street 3. Buckner Road
- Taking neighborhood streets/backyards is not effective for traffic. It causes more traffic and dangerous situations (crossing streets, children playing in their yards, robberies) for the families living in these neighborhoods. Neighborhoods should not be main streets. Traffic has gotten worse on side roads and in neighborhoods with thru streets, as commuters are using these roads to avoid the two lane main streets that are already overcrowded. Spring Hill’s Main Street has become horrible. The extended portion, where Main Street has 5 lanes has NO traffic. Faster exit to 65 off of Main Street would seem to make the most sense. While building more houses, neighborhoods,
townhomes, etc is inevitable and obviously brings more business to our city, at this time the citizens are already struggling with traffic. More homes = more people = more traffic. Correcting the main roads should be top priority.

- 1, 3, 2
- I agree with the draft.
- #1, #4, #24
- Glad to see a plan.
- 1, 3, 4
- Unless 31 is improved all the way to 840 that there won't be much hope for traffic on 31. Please keep in mind other traffic while the improvements are made. There are a number of cyclists in the area, with the increased volume of traffic and not many good solutions cyclists put themselves at risk in order to ride and impede traffic and anger drivers that are already annoyed by the congestion. Pedestrian traffic should be considered as well for an overall long term solution. Improvements are much needed. I would prioritize new route options before improvements to existing roadways, however. The impact to congestion of working on existing roadways will be much less if there are good alternates already provided.

- I don't discount the need for major improvements along main roadways, but also feel like small improvements can be made in advance of those large projects to give drivers options. Project #7 is at the top of my list for that reason. And I would add connecting Hatteras Drive to Mercer Lane (New Port Crossing and Cameron Farms) to that as well. Second on my list would be Project #5, but I would also add access to I-65 Third on my list would be the NS Connector, Project #13 as this would provide a lot of alternate routes, but its value would be greatly lessened if there wasn't access off the Buckner extension to I-65.

- First of all, thank you so much for all of your hard work on this plan. My three selections for priority are all based on the fact that they are all roads used by most people in Spring Hill, they often become parking lots with almost no movement. It would be great for all the other projects to happen as well, but obviously, we can't do everything at once. Fixing the problem of the primary arteries of our town should be the first priority.

- 1, 9, 3
- HIGHWAY 31 MUST BE FIRST. IT'S A SAFETY ISSUE!! If we had some kind of major emergency or evacuation order, Spring Hill residents would not be able to quickly leave. More important than even the horrific traffic is the safety of our citizens. Highway 31 MUST be first; it is the main road through our city, and as development has been allowed to occur along this route it has made life miserable for those of us who want to shop locally and simply run errands. Highway 31 MUST be the #1 priority.

- 1, 3, 4
Connecting the neighborhoods will help traffic flow on alternative streets instead of funneling everyone on the same roads. I look forward to an alternative to traveling to Heritage Campus that will keep my vehicle off of highway 31 and non residents out of Tanyard Springs. I can't tell you the number of times I have almost had an accident because vehicles are traveling down the turn lane instead of waiting for the Trader Way left turn lane. (They start traveling down the turn lane anywhere from in front of Starbucks all the way to Trader’s Way or go into the Starbucks shopping center and out Williford Court) Please ask Spring Hill Police Department to patrol this area more during morning hours. Unfortunately this still only leaves us with 2 alternatives for interstate travel for commuting to work. Of those 2 interstate exits we can only control the traffic improvements at Saturn parkway.

Pressure on Thompson's Station to improve traffic flow in their area is a necessary step to keep Spring Hill traffic flowing. I see a direct correlation in easier traffic flow and better sales for local businesses. Because of traffic flow there are many times we will NOT shop/eat in Spring Hill because the traffic is to tedious to negotiate. I would love to keep my money local and support Spring Hill.

#24 (Heritage Bypass), #1 (Hwy 31), #3 (Buckner) And New interstate exit!!!!

All haste needs to be made on the HWY 31 and Interstate exit off of Buckner. Port Royal needs attention to. With Spring Hill as a major commuting town people need to be able to get to 65 quickly. Traffic in town is becoming a problem so much that people are giving that as a reason to move away to somewhere else. I also would like to see Spring Hill complete the road project for Battle Creek as originally planned. I've driven through the Whispering Woods and the neighborhood cannot take that capacity of cars on one road of it's own.

HWY 31, I65 Exit, Port Royal Rd

Priorities must be widening and expanding major thoroughfares through the city limits and connecting to Thompson's Station, I-65, Main Street, and Saturn Parkway. Improvements must happen to the Port Royal Rd/Saturn Parkway interchange to include traffic signals and/or rerouting of on/offramps to avoid conflicting turns.

#9, #1, #3

Plan looks good. Concerned with the potential approved growth added to this plan over the next 21 years.

Project 1, 3, & 5

The purpose for this email is the opportunity to respond to the Spring Hill Major Thoroughfare Plan Public Comment period. Firstly, the Greater Good of the 40,000 plus residents must be the guiding factor in the plan. In that, the proactive and effective traffic management of existing and near term traffic increases must be facilitated. The phasing of
projects to accomplish these first two challenges must be tied into a final phase of regional mitigation that this City can affect. Of the projects listed by the City, it is the task and duty of BOMA and City staff, working with the consulting firm of Volkert, to assess, identify, plan and execute these projects in deliberate phased work.

This plan must be engineered in a manner to piecing a large and expensive puzzle together. The engineering of traffic volume mitigation through expansion of existing roads and creation of new roads is tantamount. Willfully and cogently selecting road projects that directly and proactively address traffic volume flow and management of existing issues must come first. Then tying in projects that continue to positively affect volume flow and redirect in addition to affecting flow increases must come next.

Volkert is a preeminent firm that can map out and engineer solutions to positively impact current and existing traffic flow issues as well as engineer second and third phase projects that work towards mitigation of as many near term and long term traffic volume flow and redirect issues as possible while working with the federal government and state of Tennessee for regional traffic management that the City of Spring Hill must cooperatively affect.

The BOMA board must focus energies on adopting policies, codes, procedures and fee structures that afford this municipality to proactively maintain order and balance to the entire process guiding the City forward while construction of these projects nears as well as during construction phases.

Furthermore, a critical part of this process for BOMA will be assessing the available land parcels within the City limits and how development will impact the roads. New Zoning for remaining land parcels must have a graduated fee metric that directly relates to how the development will impact the adjoining and connecting roads is critical. Higher Traffic Impact Fees for development that necessitates the reclassification of a road must bear the financial impact of that change. In this process, it will no longer be acceptable for the City to accept fees in lieu of work. Every development that has a higher Zone Traffic Impact Metric must make the corrective measures to the impacted roads. The private sector can affect this work more quickly and at a lesser expensive than the public sector.

A final note with regards to Traffic Impact Fees as well as Sewer and Water connection fees, Spring Hill is an asset. An asset of great value. We must stop giving away this asset value for pennies on the dollar. City of Spring Hill development fees must reflect the known and true recognized value of this City. In comparing the current $521 impact fee to the City of Franklin, it is clear for all to see we have greatly and grossly undervalued our own worth. It is time to address this issue and make a clear and resounding statement. BOMA must legally increase development fees significantly to aid in funding of current and future traffic management mitigation.
In summation, the Greater Good of the 40,000 plus residents of Spring Hill must be proactively served by any Major Thoroughfare plan. Engineering these projects in phased work to address existing issues, mitigate near term increase use issues and ultimately phasing in projects that create proactive and progressive traffic management for the City is wholly required. How this is done is in the hands of BOMA and its consultants.

Thank you for your time and consideration

First, I would like to thank the City officials and the current administration for everything you’re doing to try to improve our traffic situation and plan for our future transportation needs. I believe that the widening of U.S. 31 to five lanes should remain a top priority, even if that means the City has to greatly share in the State’s cost to construct it, and even if that means a significant property tax increase for us as residents to make it possible. I’m OK with that. Included in that, as far as priorities as I see them, and the need to pay for them with additional taxes, is the building of an I-65 interchange at Buckner; widening Buckner Road and Buckner Lane to five lanes each; widening Port Royal Road from Saturn Parkway to Kedron Road; widening Kedron Road from 31 to Saturn Parkway, in that order. And I’m fine with the remainder of the projects listed on the map. So, basically, I agree with the way the projects are currently listed on this map. Thank you all for the opportunity to comment on this important planning process!

U.S. 31 widening through SH; I-65 interchange and related Buckner extension; and the widening of Buckner Road (which will be a necessity with the extension of Buckner Road for the interchange).

It’s about as good as it’s going to get. Extending all the way to 840 is ideal but I understand the difficulties with how the land flows, there’s so many other projects and trying to play catch up. I will hope this draft is also forecasting the growth during the time it will take to complete.

1. The first three listed on the draft are what they should be 2. Slow down the home developers so the road system can catch up 3. Slow down the home developers so the road system can catch up

Hwy 31 widening is the first priority but since it is not within the State of Tennessee’s 3 year plan, can the City look at using Miles Johnson/old Kedron Rd with the connection to Kedron Rd then on to 31/Kedron Pkwy as an alternative to 31S? Possibly make that section of 31 the “historic” district by having a majority of the traffic bypass this section? I am not sure why the plan stops at Miles Johnson, maybe because of historic significance or environmental restriction, but this could be an alternative to alleviate some of the congestion on 31. As an interim to the Buckner Rd extension across Buckner lane, can the City look at installing a traffic signal at this intersection? I believe many of the road suggestion on the proposal would help increase biking/walking, as long as they include sidewalks. A lot of families look for these when selecting a location to live and I believe that in
turn would be beneficial to the City and our local businesses. (Project #24, #9 & #4) Thank you for your continued dedication to improving Spring Hill’s roadways!

- See comments above
- You absolutely cannot redirect the traffic through a residential neighborhood. The neighborhoods were not meant to handle that kind of volume. That would be very dangerous to all of the houses involved to be that close to that volume of cut through traffic.
- Hwy 31 should be the top priority
- Good start to making improvements.
- 1) Add traffic light on Port Royal exit from 396 2) Add center and turning lanes at minimum (preferably 4 lanes) to every street to help move traffic 3) Build road infrastructure “before” adding new businesses such as Carothers Parkway in Franklin…traffic lights and additional turning lanes are added prior to completion of building construction
- Please provide the city updates on various road projects every quarter or so. This could be part of the transportation committee minutes that are published.
- Project 5 Project 9 Project 6
- Looks great, very excited about the new changes.
- Project 9, Project 9, Project 9
- From what I can tell, it’s a good plan and most of the projects can’t happen soon enough. As part of Project 9, I hope that left-turn lanes are added very soon at the stoplight in front of Daylight Donuts. This new stop light has actually worsened traffic since cars turning left cannot do so once the left-turn arrow is gone since the amount of oncoming traffic is so heavy. The left-turning vehicles just sit and wait which causes traffic behind them to back up.
- Project 1, Project 9, Project 3
- Hello, thank you for making this plan available. I live on Countess Ln. next to Port Royal. Outside of the major projects outlined, I wanted to voice a separate concern and that is the constant connection of side roads. Countess Ln. is not built to be a road you cut through. If it is connected to Port Royal via a light or a roundabout, people will use it to cut around the lights they hit on Port Royal to try and get to/from the highway faster. This would be very dangerous for our street, the families/children on our street, the cars that park on the side of the road, etc. There would be no way to stop people from cutting around, and Countess Ln. could easily become a parking lot of it’s own during high traffic times of day from people trying to avoid traffic. With cars on the side of the road, Countess becomes basically a 1 lane street, but it's fine and we all wait for each other, wave each other through, because it's simply our own traffic, not through traffic. Please consider NOT connecting Countess to Port Royal and instead extending it to a cul de sac. While other roads are used to cut around things from time to time, ours wasn't built for
it, and given the layout of things, it'll be used all day, everyday, by people who want to avoid as much of Port Royal as possible. When it comes to Port Royal, I didn't put that in my project priority list because a 3 lane widening from 2 would do little for the actual congestion. I assume the 3 lanes is creating a turning lane. However most people are not turning across traffic to enter businesses. Most are turning right into the connecting roads and parking lots. The issue is how many people are trying to get through Port Royal over to Buckner or Duplex. A turning lane would not cut that down or it would be negligible. Because of all the traffic getting off the highway, Port Royal in front of Kroger can be just as bad as 31. For people on this side of town, Port Royal IS our 31... in terms of traffic issues. That is why an exit off 65 farther north is needed, so Saturn Parkway and Port Royal is not the only way for people who take the highway to enter the heart of town. The exit would relieve stress on Port Royal, and Buckner as well as a cut through from Port Royal to Duplex. Thanks for your time.