Virtual Meeting Agenda

Due to the current Covid-19 Pandemic, this meeting will be held virtually. If you have any questions, comments or concerns regarding the agenda item(s) below or any other issue, please submit them to Austin Page in the Planning Department at apage@springhilltn.org no later than 12:00 PM on Tuesday June 16, 2020.

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE MAY 19, 2020 BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING MINUTES.

D. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The procedural rules for public comment will be as follows: The items will be taken in the order of the agenda. Audience members wishing to speak must be recognized by the Chairman and will have five minutes to address the Board of Zoning Appeals. No rebuttal remarks will be allowed.

E. OLD BUSINESS

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. **BZA 834-2020**: Submitted by James Whitlock for the development known as Great White Express Car Wash. The property is located at the corner of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive and contains approximately 1.37 acres. The applicant is requesting a Special Use consideration to operate a car wash in the C-4 district under the Unified Development Code. Requested by James & Debbie Whitlock.

2. **BZA 835-2020**: Submitted by Kris Thompson for 303 Jones Avenue. The property is zoned R-1, contains approximately .27 acres, and is located in the Jackson & Jones subdivision. The applicant requests a variance from the side yard setback requirements of the UDC to construct a carport. Requested by Kris Thompson.

3. **BZA 836-2020**: Submitted by Branch Atkisson for 2005 Gweneth Drive. The property is zoned R-2, contains approximately 1.41 acres and is located in the Campbell Station subdivision. The applicant requests a variance from the requirements of the UDC to construct a swimming pool in a regional stormwater detention area. Requested by Branch and Jenny Atkisson.

G. OTHER BUSINESS

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

I. ADJOURN
SPRING HILL
MUNICIPAL BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY MAY 19, 2020
5:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Terry Cantrell called the meeting to order at 5:32 PM.

B. ROLL CALL

Members present were: Chairman – Terry Cantrell, Alderman - Hazel Nieves, Jim Hagaman and Brandon McCulloch. Vice Chairman – Rob Roten was not present.

Staff present were: Planning Director - Steve Foote, and Associate Planner - Austin Page.

C. Consider approval of the April 21, 2020 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes.

Jim Hagaman made a motion to approve the April 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded by Alderman Hazel Nieves. Motion to approve passed 4-0.

D. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT

General Announcement – The procedural rules for public comment will be as follows: The items will be taken in the order of the agenda. Audience members wishing to speak must be recognized by the Chairman and will have five minutes to address the Board of Zoning Appeals. No rebuttal remarks will be allowed.

E. OLD BUSINESS

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. **BZA 824-2020**: Submitted by Jeff Westall for 8003 Brightwater Way. The property is zoned R-2, contains approximately .25 acres and is located in the Brixworth subdivision. The applicant requests a variance from the setback requirements of the UDC to cover and screen an existing patio. Requested by Jeff & Julie Westall.

   **Staff recommended conditions of approval:**
   1. Substantial consistency with the plans submitted and encroachment shown.
   2. The covered patio shall not be enclosed with any material other than screening.
   3. Subject to homeowner’s association approval as may be required for Brixworth.
   4. Per Section 13.4G of the Unified Development Code, an approved variance will expire one year from the date of approval unless a site plan review application has been submitted or, where site plan review is not required, a building permit is obtained. The Board of Zoning Appeals may grant an extension for a period of validity for no longer than an additional 6 months, so long as the applicant applies in writing for an extension of time at any time prior
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to the date of expiration. No public hearing is required for approval of such extension of time.

Jim Hagaman made a motion to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law found in the staff report and approve BZA 825-2020 with four (4) staff associated conditions of approval. Motion seconded by Alderman Hazel Nieves. Motion to approve passed 4-0.

2. **BZA 825-2020**: Submitted by Jim Hall for 2826 Windy Way. The property is zoned R-1, contains approximately .45 acres and is located in the Buckner Place subdivision. The applicant requests a special use to install a new antenna that will exceed the maximum height of a radio antenna tower by approximately twenty-five feet, from 47’ to 72’ feet high. Requested by Jim Hall.

**Staff recommended conditions of approval:**
1. Have general consistency with the plan and documents submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. The new radio antenna shall not exceed a height of 72’.
3. Per Section 13.4G of the Unified Development Code, an approved special use approval will expire within one year of the date of approval if the licenses or permits required for the operation or maintenance of the use have not been obtained. The Board of Zoning Appeals may grant an extension for a period of validity for no longer than an additional 6 months, so long as the applicant applies in writing for an extension of time at any time prior to the date of expiration. No public hearing is required for approval of such extension of time.
4. Provide certification or an inspection report from a licensed structural engineer explaining that the installation of the structure meets all applicable safety requirements for this type of structure.

Jim Hagaman made a motion to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law found in the staff report and approve BZA 825-2020 with three (3) staff associated conditions of approval and adding a fourth (4) condition of approval to read as above. Motion seconded by Alderman Hazel Nieves. Motion to approve passed 4-0.

3. **BZA 826-2020**: Submitted by Jim Hall for 2826 Windy Way. The property is zoned R-1, contains approximately .45 acres and is located in the Buckner Place subdivision. The applicant requests a special use to install a new antenna that will exceed the maximum height of a radio antenna tower by approximately twenty-five feet, from 47’ to 72’ feet high. Requested by Jim Hall.

**Staff recommended conditions of approval:**
1. Substantial consistency with the plans and documents submitted.
2. Subject to homeowner’s association approval as may be required for Buckner Place.
3. Per Section 13.4G of the Unified Development Code, an approved variance will expire one year from the date of approval unless a site plan review application has been submitted and, where site plan review is not required, a building permit is obtained. The Board of Zoning Appeals may grant an extension for a period of validity for no longer than an additional 6 months, so long as the applicant applies in writing for an extension of time at any time prior to the date of expiration. No public hearing is required for approval of such extension of time.

Jim Hagaman made a motion to adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law found in the staff report and approve BZA 825-2020 with three (3) staff associated conditions of approval. Motion seconded by Alderman Hazel Nieves. Motion to approve passed 4-0.
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G. OTHER BUSINESS

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public Comment

I. ADJOURN

Jim Hagaman made motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Alderman Hazel Nieves. Motion to adjourn passed 4-0.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:06 PM.

Terry Cantrell, Chairman
BZA 834-2020: Submitted by James Whitlock for the development known as Great White Express Car Wash. The property is located at the corner of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive and contains approximately 1.37 acres. The applicant is requesting a Special Use consideration to operate a car wash in the C-4 district under the Unified Development Code. Requested by James & Debbie Whitlock.

Property Description and History: This property is located in the Belshire Village subdivision and is located approximately 330’ west of the Belshire Way and Main Street intersection. The property is located in between Lowes and the Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant. The applicant intends to construct a car wash facility similar to the new car wash at 1075 Crossings Circle. The previous car wash received special use approval from the Board on February 19, 2019.

Proposed Site and Building Design: The applicant is proposing to construct an automated 145’ car wash tunnel with three automobile lanes at the entrance of the tunnel to queue vehicles. The applicant is also providing 18 self-serve vacuums with partially covered parking stalls to the west of the north-south oriented car wash tunnel. The site provides one handicap parking space and 11 regular parking spaces on the southern portion of the site. The building is designed with varying panel colors, a parapet, and flat roof sections with an opaque curved roof over the car wash tunnel. The applicant has expressed to staff that the façade will be approximately 50% glass and intends to use the same materials and color schemes as the original Great White Express Car Wash location in The Crossings. A dog washing location is intended to be near the rear exit on the site but is not shown on the provided Site Layout or Elevations.

The proposed site is situated at the corner of two streets and contains significant road frontage. The car wash bay also faces Belshire Way. It will be important for extensive landscaping to be provided around the site and to screen the visibility of the use from public roads. The main entry driveway is off-set from the adjacent Discount Tire and will be addressed by the Planning Commission and staff at Site Plan review. The exit is a shared use driveway which aligns with the driveway to Lowes.

Spring Hill Rising 2040: This property’s future land use designation is “Community Commerce Area”. Primary future land uses for this designation include professional and regional offices, eating places, large-scale retail, municipal services, community centers, automobile-related services, transportation hubs and large-scale entertainment. The Community Commerce Areas designation emphasizes uses that generate a high level of activity and staff finds the use of the site as a car wash is consistent with this intent. Street designs are primarily automobile oriented but accommodate all modes of transportation to promote safety for all users and has high pedestrian connectivity. This proposed use is automobile-oriented and it is located in a commercial center with other automobile-oriented uses such as a home improvement store, bank and a drive through restaurant. A sidewalk will be provided along Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. In consideration of these factors, staff finds that the proposed use, a car wash, is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Spring Hill Unified Development Code: The City’s Unified Development Code offers the following regarding special uses:

The listing of a use as a special use within a zoning district does not constitute an assurance or presumption that such special use will be approved. Rather, each special use must be evaluated on an individual basis, in relation to all applicable standards of this Code. Such evaluation will determine whether approval of the special use is
appropriate at the particular location and in the particular manner proposed. The decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals must make findings to support each of the following conclusions:

1. The consistency of the proposed special use with the Comprehensive Plan and any adopted land use policies.
2. The special use in the specific location proposed is consistent with the spirit and intent of this Code.
3. The proposed special use will not endanger the public health, safety, or welfare.
4. The proposed special use is compatible with the general land use of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity.
5. The special use in the specific location has sufficient public infrastructure and services to support the use.

Findings: Staff finds the application to meet all of the above criteria of approval for special uses and has listed the findings for the Board of Zoning Appeals below.

This lot is interior to an expanded highly trafficked auto-oriented commercial area. The site is one block off of Main Street minimizing impacts from traffic and visibility. The use is compatible with the adjacent auto-oriented commercial uses and has adequate public infrastructure to support this use. The transportation infrastructure around this site will adequately support the high level of activity related to this use.

Findings:
1. The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and adopted land use policies.
2. The use of a car wash on the subject site is consistent with the spirit and intent of this Code.
3. The proposed special use will not endanger the public health, safety, or welfare.
4. The proposed special use is compatible with the general land use of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity.
5. The special use in the specific location has sufficient public infrastructure and services to support the use.

Public Comment: Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, the city has not been able to hold public meetings. As a solution, the city has asked the public to submit comments to staff by 12:00 pm Tuesday of the meeting date. As of Friday June 12, 2020, Planning Staff has received 61 emails from residents of the Autumn Ridge subdivision expressing their opposition to the proposed car wash. Staff has received one email in support. A majority of these comments reference an already existing car wash located 250’ to the north on Belshire Village Drive and concerns with additional traffic. The UDC does not contain any regulations regarding distancing between car washes.

Recommendation: If the Board of Zoning Appeals agrees with staff’s findings and determines that the request meets the requirements for a special use, staff recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law found in this report and approve BZA 834-2020. Approval is recommended subject to the conditions listed below.

Possible Motion: Motion to adopt the finding of facts and conclusions of law provided in this report and to approve special use application BZA 834-2020 to permit a car wash facility, with the following conditions:

1. An approved special use will expire one year from the date of approval according to the provisions of Article 13.3.G of the UDC.
2. Development shall be reasonably consistent with the site plan submitted to BOZA, subject to changes requested by the Planning Commission.
3. Approval is further contingent upon site plan approval by the Planning Commission and shall comply with changes and conditions requested by the Planning Commission; including, but not limited to, dedicated turn lanes, buffering considerations, and noise limitations.
Austin,

Thank you for being willing to hear our concerns on this issue. We are adamantly opposed to turning that lot into another Car Wash. In fact, we wish the one that is there was somewhere else because of the idiots who back up the traffic on the street with no regard to others. We would much prefer the location become a Cheddar's, Whataburger, or even better, a locally-owned restaurant or business. Please convey our concerns to the board who will be voting.

Thanks,

Alicia Messick  cell  615-308-6419
Mark Messick  cell  615-796-4812
**External Email**

Good afternoon,

I am writing concerning the proposed car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. I live in the Belshire subdivision and feel this is way too close to the existing car wash. I would much rather see a restaurant or some kind of family activity here.

Thank you,

Meghan Cleckler

Sent from my iPhone

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
Afternoon Austin,

I heard that the agenda for the upcoming virtual zoning board meeting on June 16th was going to include special use approval for a car wash located on Belshire way. Since I live near this location and use this intersection frequently I wanted you to have my thoughts on the car wash.

I’m not supportive of another car wash in such close proximity of an existing one especially considering it would be the 4th of it’s kind in our city. I would rather see us encourage more diverse commercial and retail opportunities in this central location. I am also concerned of the additional traffic congestion this would add to an intersection that is at capacity as well as additional traffic generated through the Belshire neighborhood.

I appreciate all you do and for helping us grow our city in a responsible way. Please don’t hesitate to reach out if so can help provide any further thoughts on the matter.

Sincerely,

David Sowers
615-545-8701

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
Please don't approve another car wash. We want something fun or useful!

Thanks!

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
Thank you for sending the postcards for the topic of the new car wash proposed to be built on the corner of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. I do not want to see another car wash built in that area. One is enough and causes enough traffic issues, plus a new one just opened up further down the road by Target. I would rather see a restaurant or retail store open up in that area. We already have enough nail salons, dentist and eye doctors in the area. Doctors would be nice to have more options. Just my thoughts on the matter. Thanks for asking.

Diane Hubert

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
**External Email**

Austin Page,
I am very concerned about the proposed car wash at Belshire way and Belshire Village Dr. The increase traffic will negatively impact the residents of Belshire subdivision. It will also negatively impact our property values. We already have two car wash places with in a mile and three tire joints. Please do not let this happen to our largest investment of a home. Please don’t pass this!

Teresa W Edwards
6001 Trotwood lane
Spring Hill, TN 37174

Sent from my iPhone

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
Dear Mr. Page,

I am writing you today as a member of the Arbors at Autumn Ridge community. It has come to our attention that a special use approval has been requested for a second car wash in Belshire Village/Belshire Way. As homeowners and tax payers in this community, we are vocalizing our dissent and concern for an additional car wash so close to the Sudsy’s car wash. It would draw a tremendous amount of idling cars into an already very busy and backed up entrance and exit to other retailers and multiple communities. This location would further impact this bottleneck negatively. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Brooke and Peter Clark
1028 Alpaca Drive
Spring Hill, TN 37174
Good afternoon Austin,
We received notice today that a car wash business is interested in the lot at Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. There is already a car wash extremely close by to that location (within a couple hundred feet). Because of the traffic congestion at that intersection and also traffic that sits and waits to get into businesses along that stretch of road, we feel that a different type of business is better suited for that location. Other options would be a local restaurant (not a chain) or office space. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

--
Hayden Cross
615.598.5291
Austin

Thanks so much for the heads up about the new car wash. I would be one of the last persons to try and restrict competition of businesses but personally I would hate to see another car wash in that area. Too much traffic congestion. Why don’t they consider the south side of Spring Hill? This is an area better suited to heavy traffic.

Bertrand Taylor
203 Autumn Ridge Way
Spring Hill, TN

Sent from Mail for

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com
**External Email**

I would not like to see a car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. There is already too much traffic in that area from just the current car wash. I have witnessed a few close calls involving cars trying to get around the traffic waiting to get in the car wash.

Joe Barraco

---

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
As a resident of autumn ridge a nice restaraut on that side would be better don’t need two car washs tha close to each other
Hello Austin,

I am a Spring Hill resident who lives near the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive, and I wanted to communicate my concern about the potential addition of another car wash to that area.

I feel having another car wash so close to the existing car wash is redundant and unnecessary. Additionally, I fear it will only create more congestion to the adjacent streets.

I would vote that we have another (non-fast food) restaurant, coffee shop or something similar in that location.

Thank you for hearing my voice,

Zander Jones

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
I am against the proposed car wash. It would cause more traffic in an already congested area. Thank you.
**External Email**

Given current congestion in this area, I vote NO to another car wash facility.

Lorna Morrison  
1917 Kittemer Ln
Mr. Page,

This note is in response to an agenda item concerning a special use approval request at the June 16th SH Planning and Zoning Board Meeting. The approval references a proposed new car wash to be built at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. As home owners and residents in the Belshire SD, my wife and I are 100% against this proposal. It seems ridiculous and unnecessary to build a car wash next door to one that already exists. In addition, traffic is already a mess most of the time in that area and this type of business would only make it worse. We are confident that there is better retail use potential for this piece of property other than another car wash. We trust that the Planning and Zoning Board will not approve this request.

Sincerely,
Craig and Julie Wills
1084 Cantwell Place
Spring Hill, TN 37174
Hi Austin,
I live in Belshire and I suggest NOT ADDING ANOTHER CAR WASH in the area. Traffic already is really busy at that intersection and it doesn't make sense to have two car washes so close to one another.

I would also like to suggest increasing the time to get across main leaving Belshire. On a good day it allows for 5-6 cars max before the light turns red so leaving the area can be hard at time.

thank you!

Jacob

--

Jacob Court
CREATIVE DIRECTOR
BRANDING | DIGITAL | PRINT

(818) 571-3968
hello@jacobcourt.com
www.jacobcourt.com

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
Austin,

Our family is opposed to another car wash on Belshire Way. We travel Belshire Way often if not daily like other residents. Placing a high volume automobile business there would be disastrous. The current light at 31 traveling East/West only allows 4 or 5 cars to get through the intersection. Knowing that its timed as such to help 31 traffic to run quicker North and South as it should be. Perhaps a business with less Automobile frequency and volume would be better served. A Nothing Bundt Cakes would be perfect for that location, Traffic would be less and geared more toward pick up at non-working hours for special occasion with greatly reduced volumes. Does the planning committee ever reach out to solicit business to the area? I'm sure the distance from Cool Springs along with our demographics would support and substantiate having one in our town.

Sincerely,

Jerry and Suzanne Brokamp
From: revgolson@aol.com
To: Austin Page
Subject: [External] Neighborhood Concern
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 8:32:05 AM

**External Email**

I am not in favor of a car wash being built at Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive for the stated reason of traffic congestion. Additionally, I don't see the need to compact these similar businesses in such close proximity to each other. Our existing car wash has invested in our community and provided good service. I think it would be irresponsible, and unappreciative of the investment they have made, for the community to place a competitor in such close proximity. I am definitely opposed to the construction.

Rev. Dr. William T. Golson, Jr.
Director of Ministry Infrastructure and Innovation
First Baptist Church of Murfreesboro
(303) 918-5664 - cell
www.fbcmurfreesboro.org

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
Mr. Page,

As a Spring Hill resident whose home is located on Belshire Way, I am opposed to the addition of another car wash at the proposed location of Belshire Way & Belshire Village Drive for the following reasons.

- The volume of traffic on Belshire Way is already out of control as non-residents travel and speed through our subdivision in order to avoid traffic on Columbia Pike, creating potential risks to residents.
- The existing car wash (Sudsy’s) has significantly increased traffic flow and delays in this area making it difficult to gain easy access to other facilities in the area due to lines of traffic waiting to enter Sudsy’s from both directions.

I look forward to your support ensuring that construction of a new car wash at the proposed location is not permitted.

Regards,

Robin Calligaris
Mr. Page,

As a Spring Hill resident whose home is located on Belshire Way, I am opposed to the addition of another car wash at the proposed location of Belshire Way & Belshire Village Drive for the following reasons.

- The volume of traffic on Belshire Way is already out of control as non-residents travel and speed through our subdivision in order to avoid traffic on Columbia Pike, creating potential risks to residents.
- The existing car wash (Sudsy's) has significantly increased traffic flow and delays in this area making it difficult to gain easy access to other facilities in the area due to lines of traffic waiting to enter Sudsy's from both directions.

I look forward to your support ensuring that construction of a new car wash at the proposed location is not permitted.

Regards,

Rick Calligaris

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com
Austin,

Thanks for this information and a "heads up" up on the second car wash issue.

No, I do not want to see another car wash in our neighborhood.

Addionally, Spring Hill has an over abundance of nail salons, mattress stores, dentist offices, tires shops, and fast-food restaurants. Spring Hill is such a wonderful place to live, but we need to set a long-term plan for esthetically pleasing, fiscally and environmentally responsible structures that provide intrinsic value to the town. There is only so much land available on Hwy 31 and Port Royal. What we do now is going to be here for decades.

Thanks again, for all you do.

Steven Blanton

615-693-9133
stevenDblanton@gmail.com
I am writing in reference to the special use approval for another car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Blvd.

My concern is that we continue to add businesses to Spring Hill that do not increase our culture, uniqueness or services. We continue to add businesses that are duplicative of existing businesses, exist in other cities, and funnel much needed revenue out of the city in the form of licensing fees to national chains.

Please consider adding businesses the provide services not already available which are unique to Spring Hill that make our community a unique destination with a specific culture and feel all its own.

Thank you.

Jack Flynn
Autumn Ridge
**External Email**

I **fully support** the addition of a car wash to be located as described in your post card.

Thank you.

Jill

Jill Wright
8050 Fenwick Lane
Spring Hill TN 37174
720-988-8697
**External Email**

Austin,

I am emailing you today with concern regarding the special use approval that is on the agenda for the Spring Hill Planning and Zoning Board meeting on June 16th for another car wash.

I don’t know why we would need to have another car wash right near another one. It is the wrong place to put one plus we don’t need the added traffic. I would much rather have a restaurant or some other business there than something so similar. Plus, a new car wash just opened near the Crossings and every time I go by it’s never busy. I do not believe we need another one but if we do we certainly don’t need one right nearby Sudsy’s.

Please consider these comments when this comes up at the meeting.

Thank you,
Kristina Zirschky

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
https://www.avast.com/antivirus
Mr. Page,

We have some concerns regarding the new car wash to be built at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive.

We do not feel that there is a need to have two car washes across the street from one another. It would be nice to see a nice restaurant or shop there.

The traffic already gets backed up to go into the current car wash and I can imagine how bad it will be with two right across from one another.

Thank you for your time.
Darcy Kaapke
Autumn Ridge Homeowner
Hello Austin,
Thank you for soliciting comments in lieu of an in-person planning meeting. It is greatly appreciated as many of us cannot be present in normal times but would like our voices to be heard.

No----I do not support having yet another car wash in Spring Hill, particularly in basically the same block as Sudsys. Not only will that negatively impact Sudsys’s business but it will add additional traffic. Additionally, people already use Belshire Way as a cut-through off of Highway 31, so at times, the traffic is enormous, not to mention the fact that people do not adhere to the 20 mph speed limit, thus endangering our children who play in the neighborhood.

Also, I would like to see Spring Hill become a city of choice to live in but I don’t see the type of retail on Highway 31---the main thoroughfare---that would entice people here. We have so many tire shops, mattress stores, nail salons and the like and not enough retail shopping and restaurants (other than fast food). Our family would like to shop and dine in our own hometown, but due to the lack of sit-down restaurants with decent service, we rarely eat here and shop here.

Yet another carwash (or any other car service business or dealership) on Highway 31 does not improve Spring Hill.

Thanks again for considering my comments.

Have a good day,
Kathy Blanton
Resident of Belshire
Hello Austin, I am a resident of Autumn Ridge neighborhood and understand there is a request to add another car wash just one lot over from the existing car wash. Personally, I think this is an awful decision considering there are many other stores we could benefit from having in this area rather than 2 car washes side by side. Additionally, the car wash that is there does create a lot of traffic issues already and it would be compounded by having another car wash right next door. There are so many other restaurants/stores we'd rather see and have been somewhat disappointed in the choices Spring Hill has allowed to be made available within this area thus far. For example, there are many food options that have not made their way down to Spring Hill, such as Chipotle, or other marquee restaurants such as Cheesecake Factory all of which we need to travel to Franklin or other places to eat there. If we want to improve this city, we need to start considering better options. Adding a car wash would be a terrible idea.

Thanks for your consideration,

Joel Troutt
Austin/Terry,

I hope you’re both well. I wanted to take a minute to weigh in on the proposed zoning appeal at the corner of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive for a car wash that is on your agenda for June 16.

I have lived in Autumn Ridge since 2007, and operate a State Farm Agency on Main Street right outside of my neighborhood (Keller Williams Building). I remember when Belshire was a field, and Commonwealth didn’t connect on the other side! I even considered the building that currently has McAlister’s Deli for my original office site. At that time George Ritzen was developing that building and also owned the parcel in question. The plan was for that to be another row of high end shopping to compliment the businesses across the street. Obviously since then we been through a major recession and I assume that land went to the bank as it was never developed, and actually became an eyesore for quite some time littered with construction debris and trash.

The traffic at this intersection is far beyond what I’m sure city planners designed. I can sit at the light at Hwy 31 and Belshire trying to turn right to my office through 3 or 4 cycles before I get through at high traffic times. Additionally, when we’ve had a rainy patch and people decide to wash their cars Sudsy’s traffic can back up in both directions literally causing turning traffic to drive down the center turn lane to get north. It’s dangerous, creates a terrible traffic snarl and would only be made significantly worse if you allow another high traffic business to occupy that parcel. Not to mention…one of them won’t make it. Then we’ll end up with an empty commercial structure right in one of the main traffic points in town. Also please bear in mind that as we’ve added crosswalks and signals at the Hwy 31 intersection there are many walkers, runners, and kids on bikes crossing at these two points. We’ll keep pouring more traffic on these intersections until someone gets hit and killed.

This is a bad idea from the start. I would urge you to reject this request and advise the developer not to come back. Controlled growth and more focus on appropriate land use/zoning is paramount at this important time in the life of our city. Please don’t exacerbate past mistakes by piling on new ones!

Thank you for serving our city. If you have any questions please don’t hesitate to reach out.

David St Charles, RICP®
Providing Insurance & Financial Services
If this communication is securities related, click here for additional disclosures.

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software. www.avast.com
**External Email**

Given the current traffic challenges in the proposed location of the new car wash, I would hope that the Planning and Zoning Board will not approve this "special use" request. Currently, traffic can be backed up as people try to access the current car wash and the Culver's restaurant. The amount of traffic going through the Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive intersection has continued to increase and any back-up will cause additional problems.

I want to see our city grow and its businesses thrive but believe that this request will create more problems than the opportunity it can provide.

Sincerely

Marvin C. Cobern  
Phone: (615) 975-9002  
Email: mcobern@bellsouth.net
Austin Page,

Austin, I received your post card and wanted to respond to one of the most idiotic planning issues I have ever scene. First of all all board members have to understand that it is known to all that vehicles wanting to avoid Hwy 31 cut through our neighborhood to go to Lowe’s, Walmart, Publix etc. These people cut through our neighborhood cause a bottleneck for us to all the time. They also cause a safety concern because they usually speed through the neighborhood. Belshire does not need another place to attract more vehicles cutting through our neighborhood to avoid Hwy31 much less a car wash across the street from another car wash. Unless the board does something about vehicles using our neighborhood to avoid Hwy31, then nothing else needs to be considered in that area.

Scott Arneson
Belshire Resident

Get Outlook for iOS
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As an Autumn Ridge resident, I do not think a second car wash at Belshire Way is a necessary or good use of space. Thank you,
Sam Cervarich
4187 Miles Johnson Pwky
I am writing in regard to the “special use approval” required for a new car wash to be built at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. I am not in favor of having an additional car wash at this location. Currently there are already 4 car washes available and the addition of another at this location is unwarranted. The traffic at that location and on Hwy 31 is already a bottleneck without introducing any new commercial buildings. The beauty of Spring Hill is being adversely affected by the numerous commercial and retail establishments on Hwy 31. When our family relocated to Spring Hill one of the attractive aspects of the community was having open green space. Sadly those open fields and green spaces have already become cluttered by buildings that distract from the community. The attention needs to be given to improving the traffic flow on Hwy 31 and not toward increasing the overcrowding of our streets.

Respectfully,
Marilyn Staats
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Mr. Page,

Received your Neighborhood Concern card about an upcoming zoning board meeting for June 16.

We do not believe another car wash is needed in this area. The one we have, and the new one behinds Arby’s are sufficient for the Spring Hill area.

If a tax base is needed, maybe looking to businesses – new or old - looking to relocate would be better served with office space at this location.

We do not need more traffic on already high traffic roads.

- Jade

Mrs. Jade Yunkman Meyer

Addr:  3024 Everleigh Place  |  Spring Hill, Tennessee 37174 USA
Email:  jadeimeyer@hotmail.com
***********************************************************************
Want good news? Read the Bible.
“With God all things are possible.”
A crisis cannot break the one who relies on God’s strength!
“Commit your way to the Lord, trust in Him, and He will act”
“For God So Loved The World That He GAVE His Only Son...”
***********************************************************************
To whom it may concern.

I wanted to express my opinion that I am opposed to the building of a new car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. We already have a car wash in that area and traffic can cause that area to be very congested. The addition of another car wash, in basically the same location, would only exacerbate that condition.

Andy Anderson  
Security Consultant  
Physical Security

HCA Healthcare – Information Technology Group  
1 Park Plaza Building 2-1E, Nashville, TN 37203  
O 615-344-2730 | M 615-487-7273

HCAhealthcare.com | Connect With Us
**External Email**

Well, good afternoon, Austin! Fred Staats here.

I would like to oppose the granting of a “special use approval” that will allow another car wash in Spring Hill. I especially oppose that location of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive.

While I have your ear, I will further propose that someone do something to prevent any additional home building and any population growth until the Hwy 31 traffic congestion is much improved during rush hours and during lunch and throughout the day.

I further propose that any spending by the city be directed to addressing the Highway 31 traffic problems to the greatest extent possible.

Thank you for listening!

Fred Staats

615-887-1116
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Austin,
This is concerning the special use approval required for a new car wash at Belshire Way & Belshire Village Drive. We do not need another car wash in this area. We have 3 large car washes in the Spring Hill area plus some self serve ones which takes care of this need. This area gets congested enough with the backup at the light at Belshire & Main Street, which backs up into the 2 way stop just before it, & also backs up into Sudsy's Car Wash. Our family would rather have another sit down restaurant in this area or strip center with other shops. Thanks for listening,
Janet Mezzatesta
2083 Autumn Ridge Way, Spring Hill TN
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Good afternoon Austin,

Thank you for the Neighborhood Concern post card. My name is William Sanford and I live at 1071 Cantwell Place. I fell that adding a second carwash in the neighborhood would greatly increase traffic backups and congestion in our neighborhood. If this parcel was approved for this use there would be little we could do. However with the property owner requesting a change in the zoning use we should oppose this development. With the addition of the townhomes behind the mini-storage facility our traffic and congestion will increase in time and we do not need the additional congestion that goes with a car wash. If we could encourage some type of restaurant, office, or a retail business that would cater to local residents, I think this would be the best use of the property.

Sincerely,
William Sanford
1071 Cantwell Place
Spring Hill, TN
It has come to my attention that there is a proposal to put a car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive.

This is a HORRIBLE proposal. There is already a car wash just a couple of doors down. That car wash generates traffic that quite often blocks the street.

I live in the Belshire Subdivision, so I use the Belshire Way exit quite often. We do not need another car wash. We would prefer to see something like a restaurant, an office building, or almost any other type of business at that location. The traffic to the light at Main Street backs up too far already, and adding a car wash that will have traffic spill out onto the street will just make that situation much worse.

I hope that you are listening to the comments of the voters of Spring Hill on this matter!

-- Darrell Pitzer
   Belshire Subdivision
   4007 Pendleton Dr, Spring Hill, TN 37174
Hello Austin,
I have come to learn that the Spring Hill Planning and Zoning Board will meet on June 16th and will be discussing a special use approval for yet another car wash, this one within the block of the existing Sudsy's car wash.
I would like to request that this not move forward. The Sudsy's already backs up traffic into the road and there is simply no need to have 2 car washes right next to each other. Just within a couple miles on Main St, there are now 3 car washes. We do NOT need a fourth. I am not opposed to something being developed on the lot, but not something that we already have in excess, such as car washes and storage facilities.
I live in the Belshire subdivision, so I would like to see something developed there that doesn't increase cars lining up on the road and creating hazardous driving conditions.

Thank you for listening to my concerns,

Holly Redmon
Austin,

As a resident of the Arbors of Autumn Ridge, I wanted to voice my disapproval of the new car wash request at Belshire. I don't believe we need another car wash so close to an existing one. We just opened one recently by Target and I can't imagine needing another one all within the span of a couple of miles. I'm concerned about traffic and would prefer that the area was used for something else.

Thanks for your time.

Jeff Crane
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Upon learning about the proposal of yet another car wash in Spring Hill, I was disappointed. I can't imagine that there is truly a need for a forth one and it seemed like a bad business decision. However, once I heard of the location, I had to voice my concerns. The location in the Belshire Village shopping center is not a place that we need another car wash.

First, there is already one in that area. Second, there is a lot of traffic on the one road through the center and leaving on Belshire Way has become increasingly difficult due to the short left turn lane at the light. I can only imagine that adding another car wash (high traffic, short term visit) will only complicate matters. Lastly, there are no sidewalks on that side of the development and many people from Belshire and Autumn Ridge frequently walk to get food and ice cream and a car wash would make that more dangerous.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and passing them along.

Sincerely,
Bethany Vriesman
1002 Gadwall Ln, Spring Hill, TN 37174
**External Email**

Good afternoon Austin,

While I certainly am for business competition to improve the goods and services of the area, I would respectfully request to not allow another car wash in to the Belshire area.

Being so near to a residential area, you must take in to account the potential traffic issues this car wash would potentially cause the neighborhood I live in. We have more than enough “cut through” traffic coming through Belshire. One of the reasons we chose to relocate to Spring Hill and specifically Belshire was that it was a little removed from Main Street. In the 3.5 years that we have lived here, my family has watched car traffic and larger work truck traffic (not allowed through the neighborhood) increase and run at much higher speeds than the posted limit. This is despite the radar sign being added and occasionally having the SHPD place officers monitoring speeding from the side streets. Adding a business that would potentially more cars to the area is not a good idea.

In addition, please keep Spring Hill’s natural beauty in tact whenever possible! Extend parks and natural recreational areas. Designate land to add more multi-use baseball/softball fields. Spring Hill’s mix of amenities and rolling hills, green grassy fields, and parks were another reason we settled here. Just a thought!

Thank you for your time Austin,

D.J.

D.J. Bowers  
5004 Belshire Pl  
Spring Hill, TN 37174

Sent from my iPhone
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Austin-

I am a resident in Autumn Ridge subdivision. We love the neighborhood, but of course do not love the traffic already associated with Belshire Drive which leads into our sub. It is already so congested near Sudsy’s so I cannot even imagine what a second carwash right next door would do to the traffic! Why would we want two car washes side by side anyhow? We just had one open up by Arby’s! Do we really need ANOTHER one? If this business person thinks they want to build another car wash, please have them consider elsewhere! There are other spots in Spring Hill that would not haunt the residents like this addition would for us! Two big busy car washes side by side is not even realistic?!

Thanks for hearing our concerns as this is put to the test at the zoning meeting on June 16!

Sincerely,

Toni Fahey
entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete it from your computer.
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Austin,

My family lives in Autumn Ridge and before that lived in the Arbors of Autumn Ridge for 4 years. We strongly oppose the Belshire car wash that is proposed. We have 2 car washes on this side, Sudsy's is fine but is already causing huge traffic congestion in this area. And the new one at the Crossings already provides adequate coverage for need and competition. My concern is the traffic nightmare, and a ugly eyesore in a prime location if the area can’t sustain 3 and it fails. Also we need some variation in this area, would rather see something retail, entertainment or restaurant added there. We are good on car washes.

Thanks,

Kasey & Jeremy Frank
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Hi, my name is Ashley and I received a notice in the mail that on the agenda is for a car wash to go right beside the other car wash on Belshire Way. I think this is the most stupid thing I've ever heard of. I say heck no to it, the traffic in and out of that intersection is bad enough. Thank you for your time.

-Arbors of Autumn Ridge Resident
**External Email**

To whom it may concern:

Upon learning about the proposal of yet another car wash in Spring Hill, I was disappointed. I can't imagine that there is truly a need for a forth one and it seemed like a bad business decision. However, once I heard of the location, I had to voice my concerns. The location in the Belshire Village shopping center is not a place that we need another car wash.

First, there is already one in that area. Second, there is a lot of traffic on the one road through the center and leaving on Belshire Way has become increasingly difficult due to the short left turn lane at the light. I can only imagine that adding another car wash (high traffic, short term visit) will only complicate matters. Lastly, there are no sidewalks on that side of the development and many people from Belshire and Autumn Ridge frequently walk to get food and ice cream and a car wash would make that more dangerous.

As a resident of Belshire, I would rather see something that we don’t have a lot of in Spring Hill. Give a business a chance to join our community and thrive!

Thank you for hearing my concerns and passing them along.

Thank you,
Danielle Oliver

--
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In my opinion, the space could be better used for restaurant. Car washes can create lots of traffic on busy weekends that overspill into the street, as it did last Sat in that area.  
I would like to see Schlotzskys  
Sandwich shop with drive thru window.  
Sent from my iPhone

**
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Upon learning about the proposal of yet another car wash in Spring Hill, I was disappointed. I can't imagine that there is truly a need for a forth one and it seemed like a bad business decision. However, once I heard of the location, I had to voice my concerns. The location in the Belshire Village shopping center is not a place that we need another car wash.

First, there is already one in that area. Second, there is a lot of traffic on the one road through the center and leaving on Belshire Way has become increasingly difficult due to the short left turn lane at the light. I can only imagine that adding another car wash (high traffic, short term visit) will only complicate matters. Lastly, there are no sidewalks on that side of the development and many people from Belshire and Autumn Ridge frequently walk to get food and ice cream and a car wash would make that more dangerous.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and passing them along.
Hello,

I strongly oppose another car wash to be built between Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive. With a community that has so many families, we don’t need another car wash, especially in that location and given that one was just recently built in Crossings area. And with one that is so close to that area, why have a second? It will increase traffic and congestion in that area that already exists. We would rather see a restaurant or an activity place in the neighborhood. Thank you for hearing my concerns and passing them along.

Thanks,
Mayuri Furgala
Hi,

I wanted to email about the car wash that was planned.

I really don’t feel we need another car wash especially directly outside the neighborhood. Personally, I feel a restaurant like Chipotle would be better. We love Chipotle but the closet one is in Cool Springs!!

Thanks
Lucy

Sent from my iPhone
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Hey Austin!

My understanding is that there is a business seeking a special use approval that's needed for a car wash to be erected at Belshire Way and Belshire Village Dr.

Our family believes that there is no need for that type of business at that location or anywhere else on Main St. in our city. As you know, there is already a self serve car wash close to Wendy's, a major car wash just opened behind Arby's not to mention an already established car wash within a stone's throw of this proposed location (or is it closing and just hasn't been announced).

Anything you can do to keep this project from going forward would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for all your help.

Kenneth Garrett

--
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From: darin stairs
To: Austin Page
Subject: [External] No more car washes
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 8:36:25 PM

**External Email**

To Whom this may concern,
I live in Belshire subdivision and would like to vote against another carwash when there is already one to lots over from the proposed carwash. This town keeps bringing in more unnecessary things like all the pizza joints, storage facilities etc when we could use more family budget restaurants and stores like hobby lobby or a sporting goods store like Academy or dicks.

Sincerely,
Wendy Stairs
1065 CANTWELL Pl

Sent from my iPhone
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Austin,

I am a Belshire resident and see a lot of traffic use Belshire way daily. If there was another car wash where it is proposed it would cause great concern for the amount of traffic in the proposed area. The current car wash “Ducky’s” sometimes backs out onto the street as well as Culvers next door. I am not in favor of another car wash in this area. I’m more in favor of a restaurant or office with a lesser amount of traffic.

Thanks,

Michael (Mike) Cohee
Cell: 615-870-8771
Dear Mr. Page and Members of the Spring Hill Municipal Planning Commission,

Thank you for allowing public comment regarding the “special use” approval for another car wash to be built on the busy corner of Belshire Village Drive and Belshire Way. While I wish this could be done in person, I do appreciate the opportunity for my voice to be heard through this email.

I own Sudsy's Car Wash, the existing car wash located in Belshire Village just 200 feet from the intersection of the proposed new wash. This location has been serving our community well for over twelve years. We are a locally-owned, faith-based, family business and our greatest joy in business has been the way we have been able to be involved with the community and help in so many great ways, from washing first responder service vehicles for free, to countless fundraisers for our local schools; from offering free washes to veterans, mothers, and fathers on their respective holidays, to helping sponsor and raise funds for non-profit events for great organizations like The Well, the Spring Hill Police and Fire department Sgt. Daniel Baker Memorial Fund, the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation, and even the front-line healthcare workers during this pandemic. We are blessed to be a small employer in our local economy. I say all of that to say we are strongly engaged with and love this community and want to see the VERY BEST for Spring Hill.

While it likely won’t come as a surprise that I believe strongly that this “special use” for another high-volume car wash should be denied, I trust you’ll find the reasons below to be objective and in the best interest of Belshire Village and our community.

Certainly, the most compelling reason to deny this special use is the fact that we already have significant, and sometimes stressful, traffic issues at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive creating frustration for both residents and businesses alike. On any moderate day this intersection is at best a challenge to navigate and is nearly at capacity. On regular busy days (as neighboring businesses, homeowners, the Spring Hill Police, and perhaps even some of you can personally attest), the traffic generated by Sudsy’s Car Wash alone can back up along both directions of Belshire Village Dr. (north and south), and around and through the intersection east toward Highway 31 on Belshire Way, creating near gridlock and definite aggravation and hassle for those of us who use it.

I have attached just a couple of videos from this past Saturday so you can see first-hand what a busy day looks like. Sudsy’s is approximately 200 feet from the intersection. Now, imagine adding another super-high-volume car wash right at that intersection! No matter how layout and ingress/egress are handled for this site, all of the new traffic that would be created from any high-volume business will funnel through that intersection.
While the last thing the homeowners and residents accessing Belshire Way want is more traffic at this intersection, the Belshire Village business community (myself included) actually likes the idea of development and traffic, but it must be the RIGHT traffic. A super-high concentration of volume - which this car wash would absolutely create - targeted directly at the already swollen, congested intersection is a terrible idea, creating the negative impact of more traffic jams, more irritation, traffic fatigue, and safety concerns (you probably saw the car try and do a U-turn in the middle of this mess in the video I sent and the honking horns!)

Just to clarify, the high-volume express car wash business model (like Sudsy’s and the proposed new wash) are very different than almost any other retail or professional business. The reality is that most retailers (and certainly offices) accommodate vehicle traffic with not much less than 30-minute vehicle turn-around or more. Sudsy’s and the new proposed wash are aiming to get as many cars as possible, in the shortest time-period possible (3-5 minute turn-around), creating traffic flow and targeted congestion/gridlock concerns unlike almost any other business in Spring Hill!

My understanding of “special use” considerations, among other things, is whether a business is a good fit for the particular neighborhood due to unique or “special uses” and circumstances. The applicant’s existing site has been a great addition to Spring Hill in their current location already contributing to Spring Hill in meaningful ways, but I would argue placing a site like their current location anywhere in the Belshire Village development, not to mention right on top of another high-volume, high-traffic express car wash model offering almost identical services (tunnel car washes, free vacuums, unlimited wash clubs, similar pricing, etc.) will only add exasperating and unnecessary bottlenecks and gridlock and hamper both businesses (and surrounding businesses) ability to operate optimally. This will not add to the quality of life for our neighborhood but diminish it.

Finally, the argument could be made that the traffic situation can be mitigated with the eventual widening of 31, the addition of a light at the Belshire Village Dr. intersection, or proper layout and placement of the ingress and egress of the proposed car wash. I don’t believe any of these will work in this case. The eventual widening of 31 will only let traffic flow more quickly at the intersection of 31 onto Belshire Way, allowing even more vehicles to flood the strained Belshire Way/Belshire Village Dr intersection. With only 250 feet between the two intersections, the addition of a traffic light at Belshire Village Dr. would create the likely potential to see traffic swelling and backing up onto 31 on just a moderately busy day.

It is for these reasons, that this special use must be denied. These two uniquely super-concentrated, high-volume businesses should not be allowed to build right on top of one another at an already stressed intersection. These businesses should be spaced a reasonable distance apart and not use the same small intersection to funnel traffic! Having less than 250 feet separation between Sudsy’s and the proposed new car wash lot, at an intersection that serves two big-box retailers, multiple small businesses and up to 800 homes is not prudent, would lack vision, and would create major headaches, safety concerns and hassles for the existing homes, residents and businesses. Please let common sense prevail and deny this special use.

Thank you for the great work of the commission in making Spring Hill such a great place to live and do business and I appreciate the consideration to VOTE NO on this special use!

Sincerely,
Dear Mr Page,

Upon learning about the proposal of yet another car wash in Spring Hill, I was disappointed. I can’t imagine that there is truly a need for a forth one and it seemed like a bad business decision. However, once I heard of the location, I had to voice my concerns. The location in the Belshire Village shopping center is not a place that we need another car wash.

First, there is already one in that area. Second, there is a lot of traffic on the one road through the center and leaving on Belshire Way has become increasingly difficult due to the short left turn lane at the light. I can only imagine that adding another car wash (high traffic, short term visit) will only complicate matters. Lastly, there are no sidewalks on that side of the development and many people from Belshire and Autumn Ridge frequently walk to get food and ice cream and a car wash would make that more dangerous.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and passing them along.

Kirsty and Jason Crook
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Austin,
I hope that you and the family are doing well. I was just informed of a proposal to build another car wash near the intersection at Bellshire Village. I currently run the Marco’s Pizza and in process of purchasing it. The traffic in and out is already incredibly difficult and adding another car wash would increase the amount of traffic we already face. I hope that this does not get approved and cause more stress for the community both residential and business. Thanks for taking the time to read this.

Thank you,
Chad Overstreet

Marcos Pizza 8351
3015 Bellshire Village Dr. Suite 116
Spring Hill, TN
615-302-2626

--
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Austin,

We have received word that yet another car wash is being considered very close to Sudsys. My husband and I feel like this town does not need yet another car wash, seeing that we already have three and definitely not so close to the one in our area. The traffic of course would be an issue but we really would rather see something go in that our city really needs. It seems that our town is being bombarded with the same kinds of businesses over and over. Auto part stores, mattress stores, liquor stores, storage units etc. How about we get something that we don’t have. We would welcome more sit down restaurants, entertainment as in bowling, skating, putt putt etc. or more shopping choices.

Thank you for allowing our input.

Mike and Rikki Hack

Rikki Hack
SSMS Holiday Station Marketplace
Vendor Coordinator
rikkihack@outlook.com
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Hi April,

As a neighborhood resident I wanted to express concern over a 2nd car wash being located at Belshire Way & Belshire Village. That particular stop light already has traffic delays trying to enter highway 31. In my opinion this would only perpetuate those issues. Also, not thrilled with another car wash when Spring Hill could use so much more. I do hope to see a push for more locally owned business to being given first priority.

Thanks for your consideration.

Andrew Clifton
Mr. Page,
I live in Belshire on Cantwell Place and am against the building of another car wash at the intersection of Belshire Way and Belshire village Drive. When the existing car wash is very busy, the traffic gets backed up into the intersection and its becomes dangerous to drive passed the car wash or through that intersection.

Nancy Miller
**External Email**

Hi Austin,

First of all, I appreciate all the work the Planning and Zoning Board does to help Spring Hill grow and prosper. That said, I live in Autumn Ridge and can attest that we DO NOT need another Car Wash on Belshire Way and Belshire Village Drive.

The intersection is very busy and adding another unneeded business will only create more congestion and opportunity for mishaps.

Thank You for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Laura White
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We do not see the need for another car wash in Belshire Village, so we say NO CAR WASH! Thank you.

Dave & Debbie Thomas
**External Email**

It’s hard to believe this is even a question.
NO car wash next door, across the street or on the same short street as an existing car wash.
No Storage Buildings either.
Be smart Spring Hill

Thank you,
Leigh Ann Murray

Sent from my iPhone
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### Table 8-1: Use Matrix

| Principal Use                                             | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-D | C-G | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Agriculture                                               | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | P              |
| Alternative Correction Facility                           |     |     | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Amusement Facility – Indoor ^                             |     |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Amusement Facility – Outdoor ^                             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Animal Care Facility – Large Animal                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Animal Care Facility – Small Animal                       |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Animal Kennel/Breeder                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Art Gallery                                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Arts Studio                                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.A     |
| Bar                                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | S   | S   | S   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |               |
| Bed and Breakfast                                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.B     |
| Body Modification Establishment                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.B     |
| Broadcasting Facility TV/Radio - With Antennas            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.C     |
| Broadcasting Facility TV/Radio - No Antennas              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.D     |
| Campground                                                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |               |
| Car Wash                                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.C     |
| Cemetery                                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.D     |
| **Principal Use**                                        | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-D | C-G | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
| Children’s Home                                           |     |     | S   | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |               |
| Conservation Area                                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.F     |
| Contractor’s Yard                                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.G     |
| Country Club                                              |     |     | S   | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |               |
| Cultural Facility                                         |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.H     |
| Day Care Center                                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     | P              |
| Domestic Violence Shelter                                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.H     |
| Drive-Through Facility                                    |     |     | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.H     |
| Drug/Alcohol Treatment Facility, Residential              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.H     |
| Dwelling - Above the Ground Floor                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Sec. 8.3.H     |
### Article 8. Uses

**Table 8-1: Use Matrix**

| Principal Use                                      | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Dwelling – Accessory Dwelling Unit: 900sf or Less in GFA | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.I          |
| Dwelling – Accessory Dwelling Unit: 901sf or More in GFA | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.J          |
| Dwelling – Manufactured Home                       | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.J          |
| Dwelling - Multi-Family                            | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.K          |
| Dwelling – Townhouse ^                             | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.K          |
| Dwelling - Single-Family                          | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.K          |
| Dwelling - Three-Family ^                          | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.M          |
| Dwelling - Two-Family                              | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.M          |
| Educational Facility - Primary or Secondary        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.M          |
| Educational Facility - University or College       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.M          |
| Educational Facility - Vocational                 | S   | S   | S   | S   | P   | S   | P   | P   | P   |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.N          |
| Financial Institution ^                            | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.N          |
| Financial Institution, Alternative                | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.N          |
| Food Bank                                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.K          |
| Food Pantry                                      | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.K          |
| Principal Use                                     | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
| Funeral Home                                      | S   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Gas Station                                       | S   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Golf Course/Driving Range                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Government Office/Facility                       | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Greenhouse/Nursery – Retail ^                     | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Group Home                                        | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Halfway House                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Healthcare Facility/Institution                   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Heavy Retail, Rental, and Service                 | S   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Homeless Shelter                                  | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Hotel                                             | S   | P   | P   | P   | S   | S   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Industrial – General                              | S   | P   | P   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Industrial – Light ^                              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Industrial Design ^                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
| Live Entertainment - Secondary Use                | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.O          |
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| Principal Use                                      | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | C-9 | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Live Performance Venue                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.P    |
| Lodge/Meeting Hall                                | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   | P    | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |    |    |    |    |    |                |
| Manufactured Home Park                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Article 10    |
| Medical/Dental Office                             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Article 10    |
| Micro-Brewery/Distillery/Winery                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.Q    |
| Office ^                                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.Q    |
| Outdoor Dining                                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.Q    |
| Parking Lot (Principal Use)                       | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Article 10    |
| Parking Structure (Principal Use)                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Article 10    |
| Personal Service Establishment                    | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Place of Worship ^                                 | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Public Park                                       | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Reception Facility                                | S   | S   | S   | S   | S   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.R    |
| Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park                    |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.C    |
| Research and Development ^                        | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.C    |
| Residential Care Facility                         | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Residential Care Facility ^                        | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Restaurant                                        | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |
| Retail Goods Establishment                        | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.S    |

| Principal Use                                      | R-A | R-R | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | R-5 | R-6 | R-7 | R-MH | C-1 | C-2 | C-3 | C-4 | C-5 | C-6 | C-7 | C-8 | C-9 | I-1 | I-2 | RD | IC | AG | PR | NA | USE STANDARD |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----------------|
| Retail Liquor Store                                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.T    |
| Self-Storage Facility: Enclosed ^                  | S   | P   | S   | P   | S   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.T    |
| Sexually-Oriented Business ^                       |     |     |     |     |     | S   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.U    |
| Social Service Center                              | S   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.V    |
| Solar Farm                                         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.V    |
| Specialty Food Service                             | P   | P   | P   | P   | P   |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.V    |
| Storage Yard - Outdoor                            |     |     |     |     |     | S   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |
| Vehicle Dealership - Enclosed                      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |
| Vehicle Dealership - With Outdoor Storage/Display | S   | P   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |
| Vehicle Operation Facility                        |     |     |     |     |     | S   |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |
| Vehicle Rental - Enclosed                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |
| Vehicle Rental - With Outdoor Storage/Display     | S   | P   | S   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    | Sec. 8.3.W    |

---
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### Table 8-1: Use Matrix

<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>Vehicle Repair/Service – Major</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair/Service – Minor</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Establishment</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Energy System</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Telecommunications – Collocation, Antenna ^</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Telecommunications – New Towers ^</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Telecommunications – Small Cell &amp; DAS Colocation ^</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sec. 8.3.Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TEMPORARY USE                                | R-A   | R-R   | R-1   | R-2   | R-3   | R-4   | R-5   | R-6   | R-7   | R-MH  | C-1   | C-2   | C-3   | C-4   | C-5   | C-D   | C-G   | I-1   | I-2   | RD   | IC   | AG   | PR   | NA   | USE STANDARD |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Farmers' Market                              | T     | T     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Sec. 8.4.A |
| Mobile Food Sales                            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Sec. 8.4.B |
| Real Estate Project Sales                    | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | Sec. 8.4.C |
| Office/Model Unit                            | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | 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 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     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | Sec. 8.4.E |
| Temporary Outdoor Entertainment               | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | 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 Sales                       | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | Sec. 8.4.G |
| Temporary Outdoor Storage Container           | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | T     | (Ord. 19-09, 4/15/10; Ord. 19-28, 9/16/19) ^ Revised |
Spring Hill Board of Zoning Appeals

TO: Spring Hill Board of Zoning Appeals
FROM: Austin Page, Associate Planner
THROUGH: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director
MEETING: June 16, 2020
SUBJECT: BZA 835-2020 (Variance – 303 Jones Avenue)

BZA 835-2020: Submitted by Kris Thompson for 303 Jones Avenue. The property is zoned R-1, contains approximately .27 acres, and is located in the Jackson & Jones subdivision. The applicant requests a variance from the side yard setback requirements of the UDC to construct a carport. Requested by Kris Thompson.

Request: The applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the building setback for a carport to encroach approximately 6’ into the 10’ side setback. The proposed carport is 20’x30’ and will be a minimum of 3.84’ from the side property line.

Property Description and History: 303 Jones Avenue is located in the Jackson & Jones subdivision and is zoned R-1, Single-Family Residential. All surrounding properties are zoned R-1, with C-5 zoning to the rear. The property is rectangular in shape and has no irregularities, although the home is slightly skewed on the lot. The home is approximately 14’ from the 10’ side setback and 24’ from the side property line. The property is adjacent to other residential lots in Jackson & Jones and the applicant intends to install a 6’ privacy fence that will run along the western property line to the rear of the property. The applicant has discussed the Board of Zoning Appeals process with staff to ensure a complete application has been submitted. The applicant had been coordinating with the Building department prior to the submittal of a variance application. The carport was permitted, but construction was not consistent with the plans submitted. The carport has been constructed and a stop work order has been placed on the property until a variance is granted.

Analysis: The applicant is proposing to construct a 20’x30’ “L” shaped carport. The northwest corner of the proposed carport will be approximately 4’ from the western property line and will encroach 6’ into the 10’ side setback. While the middle southwest corner of the carport is approximately 3.84’ from the western property line and will encroach 6.16’ into the setback. The southernmost 10’x10’ area of the carport does not encroach any setbacks and is 14’ from the western property line. The proposed carport will be approximately 8’ in height and will use materials to match the current characteristics of the home. The proposed carport is to be open on three sides and is not permitted to be enclosed. The proposed carport is covered with a galvanized metal roof that will be tilted to direct water towards to the rear of the property. The carport is attached to the primary structure and is considered part of the primary structure for building setback purposes. The applicant is not proposing any electrical to be installed in the structure. The proposed carport does not impact any drainage easements. The applicant has provided staff with a complete application submittal. A list of all adjacent property owners has been provided, along with a notification letter and proof of mailings.

Findings of Fact: The applicant has met UDC requirements regarding the U.S.P.S. First Class mailing of notices to all adjacent property owners of 303 Jones and at least ten days in advance of the first scheduled action. City staff has placed notice in the newspaper and a sign on the subject property. The findings listed below represent staff’s response to the approval standards required in Section 13.4.E of the UDC, to be considered by the Board of Zoning Appeals prior to approving a variance and a review of the applicant’s justification statements.

1. Where, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, size or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of the enactment of this Code, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of such piece of property it is not able to comply with the regulations as required under this Code. The city receives many requests from property owners to cover existing patios, decks, and/or carports. This has often times been considered a reasonable request, based on the facts of each individual situation, when the size of the structure is reasonable, and when the encroachment is limited. Based on the positioning of
the home and layout of the property’s setbacks, little room is available to provide a double wide carport on either side of the property. A single car width tandem carport does fit without encroachment.

Per the applicant: “The size and shape of my lot on the driveway side is such that there could be no room for a carport to cover/protect both vehicles without the variance to be within 10’ rule.”

2. The strict application of any provision enacted under this Code would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exception or place undue hardship upon the owner of such property. The subject lot is considered a standard lot. The proposed carport which has started construction, encroaches approximately 6’ into the 10’ side yard setback. There are no drainage easements. A single wide carport would not require a variance.

Per the applicant: “This is a unique situation and encroaches into another property in no way. As a matter of fact, even within the 10’, the fence is on my side of a privacy fence within legal code on the property. It is actually still 83’ from the near housing structure at 307 Jones Ave. in no way causes undue hardship on the owner or property of any party involved”.

3. Such relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zoning map and this Code. The encroachment is along the side of the property, which is adjacent to a driveway on the neighboring property. Garages and/or carports are typically located on the sides of homes. Staff finds the home to be consistent with the surrounding lots and does not believe that the proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on the public good or any of the surrounding property.

Per the applicant: “There is no substantial detriment to the public good by approving this request for variance. As the submitted documentation illustrates, there are already similar and very nice looking carports on neighboring properties in the subdivision, which further supports no detriment to the public.”

Recommendation: If the Board of Zoning Appeals finds the request to be reasonable and compliant with the requirements for a variance, staff recommends that they adopt the findings in this report or others to support the approval. Should the Board of Zoning Appeals approve BZA 835-2020, a building setback variance request for construction of a screened patio, approval should be subject to the submitted plans and the conditions below. Members should also provide reasons for not finding consistency with section 13.4.E above if unable to support the request.

Possible Motion(s):

A) Motion to adopt the finding of facts and conclusions of law provided in the staff report and to approve variance BZA 835-2020 to reduce the building setback for a carport at 303 Jones Avenue with the following conditions.

1. Substantial consistency with the plans submitted and encroachment shown.
2. The carport shall be open on three sides and may not be enclosed with any material.
3. Per Section 13.4G of the Unified Development Code, an approved variance will expire one year from the date of approval unless a site plan review application has been submitted or, where site plan review is not required, a building permit is obtained. The Board of Zoning Appeals may grant an extension for a period of validity for no longer than an additional 6 months, so long as the applicant applies in writing for an extension of time at any time prior to the date of expiration. No public hearing is required for approval of such extension of time.

B) Motion to deny BZA 835-2020 for the reason that the required findings have not been met.
2 stall carport -
- 1st stall (closest to house) 30' x 10'
- 2nd stall (outer) 20' x 10'
- 8' height

Materials -
(to compliment house)
- Wood structure
- Covered in siding to match house
- Gutter
- Galvanized roof (flat w/ tilt for drainage toward back of lot)
- Soffit underneath roof to finish
- Flashing where roof meets house
CITY OF SPRING HILL
199 TownCenter Parkway
Spring Hill, TN 37174
931-486-2252 FAX 931-486-3596

SHED PERMIT
THIS FORM WAS PRINTED ON: 04/21/2020

Permit Number: O-03714-20
Date Issued: 04/20/2020

Project Address: 303 JONES AVE LOT 23 JACKSON
JONES
SPRING HILL, TN
Parcel ID:
Subdivision:
Lot #:
Block #:
Zoning:

Owner/Agent: Kris Thompson
Address: 303 JONES AVE.
City: Spring Hill
State: TN
Zip:
Phone: (615) 480-5038

Contractor: Kris Thompson
Address: 303 JONES AVE.
City: Spring Hill
State: TN
Zip:
Phone: (615) 480-5038

Desc of Work: Carport Cover
Valuation: $0.00
Project Sq Ft: 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Code</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $25.00

NOTICE
This permit becomes null and void if work or construction authorized is not commenced within 1 year, or if
construction or work is suspended or abandoned for a period of 6 months at any time after work is started.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ AND EXAMINED THIS DOCUMENT AND KNOW THE
SAME TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT. ALL PROVISIONS OF LAWS AND ORDINANCES GOVERNING
THIS TYPE OF WORK WILL BE COMPLIED WITH WHETHER SPECIFIED HEREIN OR NOT.
GRANTING OF A PERMIT DOES NOT PRESUME TO GIVE AUTHORITY TO VIOLATE OR CANCEL THE
PROVISION OF ANY OTHER STATE OR LOCAL LAW REGULATING CONSTRUCTION OR THE
PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION.

__________________________  ____________
(Signature of Contractor or Authorized Agent)  Date

__________________________  ____________
(Approved By)  Date
Spring Hill Board of Zoning Appeals

TO: Spring Hill Board of Zoning Appeals  
FROM: Austin Page, Associate Planner  
THROUGH: Steve Foote, AICP, Planning Director  
MEETING: June 16, 2020  
SUBJECT: BZA 836-2020 (Variance – 2005 Gweneth Drive)

BZA 836-2020: Submitted by Branch Atkisson for 2005 Gweneth Drive. The property is zoned R-2, contains approximately 1.41 acres and is located in the Campbell Station subdivision. The applicant requests a variance from the requirements of the UDC to construct a swimming pool in a regional stormwater detention area. Requested by Branch and Jenny Atkisson.

Request: The applicant is requesting a variance to construct a 20’x40’ swimming pool with an additional 10’ concrete pool deck to encroach the regional stormwater detention area.

Property Description and History: The property at 2005 Gweneth Drive is located in the Campbell Station subdivision and is zoned R-2, Single-Family Residential. All surrounding properties are also zoned R-2. The property is abnormally long in length and is home to a regional stormwater detention area easement, 40’ trunk sewer easement and a 40’ powerline easement. The home is approximately 20’ from the regional stormwater detention area easement. Currently, there is an existing covered patio that does not encroach into the easement. The property is adjacent to other residential lots in Campbell Station and the applicant has discussed the Board of Zoning Appeals process with staff to ensure a complete application has been submitted.

Analysis: The applicant is proposing to construct a 20’x40’ swimming pool that will entirely encroach into the regional stormwater detention area easement. The furthest edge of the pool is approximately 53.4’ from the rear of the home and a concrete pool deck extends a distance of 64.5’ from the rear of the home. According to the aerial exhibit and the City’s GIS contour lines, the top of the berm sits at an elevation of 735.75’. Based on the historic flood of 2010 (500-750-year storm event), which crested the berm, the elevation that delineates the peak flow function of this detention basin is 737’, which is 1.25’ above the berm elevation. As proposed on the aerial exhibit, the pool and deck construction are shown at an elevation of 738’. The pool and deck construction can be achieved by a retaining wall in the rear or a soil backfill slope. If a soil backslope is utilized, then the limit of fill or disturbance should be the 737’ contour line. No fill can be added below this 737’ elevation because it is the peak flow functional limit of the detention basin. Staff has discussed these requirements with the City’s Floodplain Manager and confirmed that the pool design is consistent with these technical requirements.

The applicant has provided staff with a complete application submittal. A list of all adjacent property owners has been provided, along with a notification letter and proof of mailings. No building setbacks are impacted by this proposal.

Findings of Fact: The applicant has met UDC requirements regarding the U.S.P.S. First Class mailing of notices to all adjacent property owners of 2005 Gweneth Drive and at least ten days in advance of the first scheduled action. City staff has placed notice in the newspaper and a sign on the subject property. The findings listed below represent staff’s response to the approval standards required in Section 13.4.E of the UDC, to be considered by the Board of Zoning Appeals prior to approving a variance and a review of the applicant’s justification statements.

1. Where, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, size or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of the enactment of this Code, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of such piece of property it is not able to comply with the regulations as required under this Code. The city receives many requests from property owners to cover existing patios, decks, and/or create new ones. This has often times been considered a reasonable request, based on the facts of each individual
situation, when the size of the structure is reasonable, and when the encroachment is limited. However, a request for a swimming pool to encroach a regional stormwater detention area easement is an unusual request. With the positioning of the home and the proximity to the easement, little room is available to construct a swimming pool. This is in spite of the fact that the rear yard is over 400’ deep. Even if the applicant decided to adjust the layout of the pool and move it closer to the rear of the home, majority of the pool would still be encroaching into the easement.

Per the applicant: “An undue hardship has been placed on the owners as a result of a large storm water detention area easement on the property. We are requesting a variance/special exemption to relieve the hardship in such a way that will not affect the functionality of the detention area. Therefore, not impairing the intent/purpose of the easement or peak flow functional limit of the detention basin.”

2. The strict application of any provision enacted under this Code would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exception or place undue hardship upon the owner of such property. The subject lot is unique and contains 1.4 acres. Majority of the lot is encompassed by some sort of easement and unusable. The proposed pool encroaches the regional stormwater detention area by approximately 14’ but is above an elevation of 737’ and would not impact the functionality of the detention area.

Per the applicant: “Allowing the owners to build a pool while partially encroaching on the easement would relieve the hardship.”

3. Such relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zoning map and this Code. The encroachment is in the rear of the property, which is more than 340’ from the rear lot line. Staff finds the home to be consistent with the surrounding lots and does not believe that the proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on the public good or any of the surrounding property.

Per the applicant: “As shown in the attached info packet, allowing the variance/SE to encroach while building out past an elevation of 737’ (and additional criteria listed) would ensure no detriment to public good or impairment of intention or purpose of the detention area or easement.”

Recommendation: Staff finds the request to be reasonable and compliant with the requirements for a variance and recommends approval of this request based on the findings in this report. Should the Board of Zoning Appeals approve BZA 836-2020, a variance request for construction of a swimming pool, approval should be subject to the submitted plans and the conditions below.

Possible Motion: Motion to adopt the finding of facts and conclusions of law provided in the staff report and to approve variance BZA 836-2020 to permit a swimming pool to encroach the regional stormwater detention area easement at 2005 Gweneth Drive with the following conditions.

1. Substantial consistency with the plans submitted and encroachment shown.
2. The City’s Floodplain Manager is to verify that pool and deck construction is consistent with the letter from Dempsey, Dilling & Associates and the City’s Floodplain ordinance.
3. Subject to homeowner’s association approval as may be required for Campbell Station.
4. Per Section 13.4G of the Unified Development Code, an approved variance will expire one year from the date of approval unless a site plan review application has been submitted or, where site plan review is not required, a building permit is obtained. The Board of Zoning Appeals may grant an extension for a period of validity for no longer than an additional 6 months, so long as the applicant applies in writing for an extension of time at any time prior to the date of expiration. No public hearing is required for approval of such extension of time.
Written Statement Explaining how request is consistent with approval standards

Subject: RE: [External] Re: Pool survey

Chris/Tom:

We have developed an exhibit from the information Mr. Atkisson provided. The aerial exhibit shows contours, proposed pool and deck, detention easement boundary line and Atkisson property lines. The top of berm elevation is 735.75+/- and based on the historic flood of 2010 (500-750 year storm event) which crested the berm, the elevation which delineates the peak flow function of this detention basin is 737.00 (1.25' above berm elevation). Therefore, as you can see from the exhibit, the proposed pool and deck is at elevation 738.20 +/- . The pool and deck construction can either be achieve by a retaining wall, in the rear, or a soil backfill slope. If a soil slope is utilized then the limit of fill would be the 737.00 elevation line. No fill can be added below this 737.00 elevation which is the peak flow functional limit of the detention basin.

So, with the technical issue being addressed, it raises the question on how to allow Mr. Atkisson to construct his pool which encroaches on Regional Stormwater Detention Easement. As discussed with Chris, the new Unified Development Code (UDC) does not allow encroachment into an easement. Therefore, this will require presentation to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) for review and approval consideration.

Chris: Can you guice Mr. Atkisson through this application process? Based on this information and everyone's understanding of the proposed project, I do not believe a site visit is needed.

Sincerely,

Jerome Dempsey, P.E. | Principal | Regional Director
DEMPSEY, DILLING & ASSOCIATES, now an affiliate of THOMAS & HUTTON
p 615-220-5800
e dempsey.j@tandh.com
502 Hazelwood Drive | Smyrna, TN 37167
Hi Branch, thanks for submitting this info. I am the Vice President of the Campbell Station HOA and I am also a member of the Architectural Review Committee. Based upon the information that you have provided we intend to approve this project so long as the city of Spring Hill issues you their approval.

Regards,

Matt Fisher
Loan Consultant

615 838 8639
(855) 753-9676
MFisher@loandepot.com
https://www.loandepot.com/mfisher

10 Cadillac Dr., Suite 360 Brentwood, Tennessee 37027

Apply Today