The Metropolitan Planning Commission met in regular session on DECEMBER 10, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. in the Main Assembly Room, City/County Building, and Knoxville, Tennessee. Members:

Ms. Rebecca Longmire, Chair
Mr. Len Johnson
Mr. Herb Anders
Mr. Michael Kane
Mr. Bart Carey, Vice Chair
Mr. Charles F. Lomax, Jr
Ms. Laura Cole
Mr. Jeff Roth
Mr. Art Clancy
Mr. Jack Sharp
Mr. Mike Crowder
Mr. Scott Smith
Ms. Elizabeth Eason
Ms. Janice Tocher
Mr. Mac Goodwin

* Arrived late to the meeting.
** Left early in the meeting. A – Absent from the meeting

1. ROLL CALL, INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 10, 2015 AGENDA.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT.

3. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 12, 2015 MINUTES

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT.

4. REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENTS, WITHDRAWALS, TABLINGS AND CONSENT ITEMS.

Automatic postponements read

POSTPONEMENTS TO BE VOTED ON READ

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE POSTPONEMENTS AS READ FOR 30 DAYS UNTIL THE JANUARY 14, 2016 MPC MEETING. MOTION CARRIED 14-0. POSTPONED 30 DAYS.

Automatic Withdrawals Read
None
WITHDRAWALS REQUIRING MPC ACTION

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO WITHDRAW ITEM 43. MOTION CARRIED 14-0. WITHDRAWN.

REVIEW OF TABLED ITEMS

KNOXVILLE CITY COUNCIL (REVISED) 12-B-13-OA
Amendments to the City of Knoxville Zoning Ordinance regarding definitions, appropriate zone districts and development standards for various group living facilities.

TREVOR HILL 11-A-14-SC
Request closure of Forest Ave between eastern edge of Twelfth St. right-of-way and southwestern edge of World's Fair Park Dr. right-of-way, Council District 1.

WILSON RITCHIE 3-F-10-SC

METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION 6-A-10-SAP

METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION 7-C-10-SP

WILLOW FORK - GRAHAM CORPORATION 11-SJ-08-C
a. Concept Subdivision Plan
b. Use on Review
Proposed use: Retail subdivision in PC (Planned Commercial) & F (Floodway) District.

HARRISON SPRINGS - EAGLE BEND DEVELOPMENT 4-SC-09-C
a. Concept Subdivision Plan
b. Use On Review
Proposed use: Detached dwellings in PR (Planned Residential) District.

VILLAS AT MALLARD BAY - HUBER PROPERTIES, LLC 7-SC-15-C
a. Concept Subdivision Plan
b. USE ON REVIEW
Proposed use: Detached residential subdivision in PR (Planned Residential) pending District.

BEN H. MCMAHAN FARM RESUBDIVISION OF PART OF TRACT 1

HARDIGREE - HERRON ADDITION RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 9
North side of West Gallaher Ferry Dr, west of Hardin Valley Rd, Commission District 6.

RESUBDIVISION OF GEORGE HOSKINS PROPERTY
North side of N. Ruggles Ferry Pike, on a private right of way known as Rugby Lane, Commission District 8.

CHILHOWEE HILLS BAPTIST CHURCH RESUBDIVISION OF LOT 1
Northwest side of Asheville Hwy., north east of Macedonia Lane, Council District 6.

HOOD PROPERTY
North side of Rhea Rd, southwest of Spangler Rd, Commission District 9.

FINAL PLAT OF THE JERRY SHARP PROPERTY
At the terminus of Goldfinch Avenue and the east side of Ellis Street, Council District 1.

CREEKHEAD CROSSING UNIT 2
Southeast side of Creekhead Drive, at the southeast intersection of Whitman Drive, Council District 3.

HOLSTON BEND DRIVE EXTENSION
At the terminus of Holston Bend Drive, Commission District 8.

TANASI GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC. (REVISED)
Southeast side Merchant Dr., east of Wilkerson Rd., Council District 5. Rezoning from A-1 (General Agricultural) & C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) to RP-1 (Planned Residential).

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH CONCORD AS SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO WESTLAKE BAPTIST CHURCH
North side Westland Dr., east side I-140, Council District 2.
  a. Southwest County Sector Plan Amendment
     From PI (Public Institutional) & SLPA (Slope Protection Area) to C (Commercial) & SLPA (Slope Protection Area).
  b. One Year Plan Amendment
     From P (Public Institution) to GC (General Commercial).
  c. Rezoning
     From RP-1 (Planned Residential) to SC-1 (Neighborhood Shopping Center).
GUSTO DEVELOPMENT, LLC
Southeast side Ball Camp Pike, northeast of Middlebrook Pike, Commission District 6.

a. Northwest County Sector Plan Amendment
   From LDR (Low Density Residential) to C (Commercial).
   10-F-15-SP

b. Rezoning
   From A (Agricultural) to CA (General Business).
   10-Q-15-RZ

BUFFAT MILL ESTATES - CLAYTON BANK & TRUST

7-A-13-UR

SOUTHLAND ENGINEERING

WORLEY BUILDERS, INC.

ITEMS REQUESTED TO BE UNTABLED OR TABLED

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO UNTABLE ITEM 8A&B, 19 AND 29. MOTION CARRIED 14-0. ITEMS UNTABLED.

CONSENT ITEMS

COMMISSIONERS ELIZABETH EASON AND SCOTT SMITH RECUSED FROM VOTING ON THE CONSENT LIST.

Items recommended for approval on consent are marked (*). They will be considered under one motion to approve.

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO HEAR THE CONSENT ITEMS AS READ. MOTION CARRIED 12-0-2.

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE CONSENT ITEMS AS READ. MOTION CARRIED 12-0-2. APPROVED.

Ordinance Amendments:
None

Alley or Street Closures:

* 5. PACKERS SOUTH USA, LLC
   Request closure of unnamed alley between northwest corner of
   12-A-15-AC

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Request closure of Gale St between Cecil Avenue and southern terminus, Council District 4.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Street or Subdivision Name Changes:
None

Plans, Studies, Reports:

* 7. METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION 12-A-15-SP

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve the 2015 NORTHEAST COUNTY SECTOR PLAN, ALSO AMENDING THE KNOXVILLE-KNOX COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2033.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Chair Longmire: Because of the consent we did approve the Northeast County Sector Plan. I would like to compliment staff particularly Bryan Berry on how well he worked on that sector plan and took it into the community and got community feedback.

Executive Director Green: Thank you madam chair. I would like to reiterate the compliments to Bryan Berry. I have some unfortunate news regarding Bryan. Yesterday he turned in his resignation and he will be he has been offered a position with the Office of Redevelopment which is a good step for him but we will certainly miss him at MPC and look forward to working with him in his new position with the Office, the City of Knoxville Office of Redevelopment.

Michael Kane: I thought we were really nice to him yesterday. I don’t understand that. I was very nice to him.

Roth: Doesn’t that require a vote.

Longmire: And it is not my fault that I had him in my car for five hours driving around Northeast Knox County.
Art Clancy: That explains a lot.

**Concepts/Uses on Review:**

8. **CLEAR SPRINGS PLANTATION**
   North and south sides of McCampbell Wells Way, west of Glen Creek Rd., Council District 4.

   THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

9. **WHELAN FARM, UNIT 2**
   Southwest end of Whelahan Farm Rd., south of Babela Dr., Commission District 8.

   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve the concept plan for 62 lots subject to 9 conditions.

   Tom Brechko: You have a revised staff report for this in your blue sheets for today. The reason for the change in the staff report is we had added one condition regarding once the detailed grading plan is completed for this development under the design plan, is we are requiring identification of clearing and grading limits on the design plan based on the approved grading plan. Also requiring that those proprieties especially on the sloped area would be marked for the limits of the clearing and grading before they start any work out there to protect the steeper slopes on MacAnnaly Ridge. You have received a letter from Lisa Starbuck concerning the fact that staff’s report did not address the hillside plan and the impact that this development would on that. We have an additional sheet that we handed out which is a slope map. It is actually up on the screen. When you look at that one of the reasons we didn't have any conditions initially is that this subdivision is actually a reduction from a previously approved concept for this portion of the property where there is 29 fewer lots. The developer has shortened a number of the roads through this area that would have impacted the ridge. As you look at that map there is very limited area that actually gets into any slope greater than 25%. They have actually done a good job in reducing the size of the subdivision and the impact on that major ridge and the steeper slopes. Another thing I just wanted to point out that one of the conditions is for the developer to work with the Knox County Greenways Coordinator. While we are used to hearing greenways as a part of a plan, this area here on MacAnally Ridge is a part of a ridge conservation corridor trail area. They have actually had initial discussions with staff, County staff, on the easement. It is my understanding what staff was looking at as far as an easement was acceptable to the developer but it actually has easement areas as deep as 200 feet along the ridge to make sure there is adequate room for any future ridge trail system that could be put in there. With that staff is recommending approval with that, with the 9 conditions.
Longmire: Is there opposition? I don’t see any opposition. Is there anything you want to say? Always a wise thing sir.

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE PER STAFF RECOMMENDATION.**

Elizabeth Eason: I would just like to say I am excited to see this additional information from MPC staff. It is really helpful in evaluating the slopes and the percentages. I am also excited about having the ridgetop, the greenway and the easements deserve that. Looking forward to walking that in the future. Thank you for working with the Greenways Coordinator.

Longmire: And I concur totally. Good luck with your development sir.

**MOTION CARRIED 14-0. APPROVED.**

**P 10. WESTLAND OAKS - MESANA INVESTMENTS, LLC**

a. Concept Subdivision Plan

Southeast side of Westland Dr., northwest side of Nubbin Ridge Rd., Commission District 5.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

b. USE ON REVIEW

Proposed use: Detached residential subdivision in PR (Planned Residential) District.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

**P 11. HARRISON SPRINGS - EAGLE BEND DEVELOPMENT**

a. Concept Subdivision Plan


**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

b. USE ON REVIEW

Proposed use: Detached dwellings in PR (Planned Residential) pending District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

**P 12. EMORY OAKS - SCOTT DAVIS**

a. Concept Subdivision Plan

12-SD-15-C

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

P  b. USE ON REVIEW 12-F-15-UR
Proposed use: Detached dwellings in PR (Planned Residential) pending District.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 13. ARTISAN ROW 12-SE-15-C
Northwest side of Westland Dr., west of Craig Rd., Council District 2.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Final Subdivisions:

* 14. WILLOW POINTE PHASE II 10-SO-15-F

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

P 15. FAITH WAY S/D 11-SA-15-F
Northwest side of W Emory Rd, east of Oak Ridge Highway, Commission District 6.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 16. EFFICIENT ENERGY OF TENNESSEE & CALLAHAN BUSINESS PARK RESEMBLE OF LOT 1 11-SH-15-F
At the intersection of Old Callahan Dr and Callahan Dr, Council District 3.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 17. THE HERRELL PROPERTY 12-SA-15-F
North side of Beaver Ridge Rd, east of Windcrest Rd, Commission District 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 18. **ROBERTS AND METZ PROPERTY** 12-SB-15-F
West side of McCarty Rd, north of Thorn Grove Pike, Commission District 8.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 19. **EARL FOX PROPERTY RESUBDIVISION** 12-SC-15-F
West side of Piney Grove Church Rd, north of Middlebrook Pike, Council District 3.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 20. **LAKESIDE PARK RESUB. OF LOTS 22 & 32, SOUTH POINTE RESUB OF LOT 41** 12-SD-15-F
West side of Stock Creek Rd, east side of Lake Bluff Court, Commission District 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 21. **DAVID C KERNS PROPERTY** 12-SE-15-F
At the west intersection of Palmer Street and Fort Avenue, Council District 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 22. **VILLA GARDENS RESUB. OF LOTS 341-342** 12-SF-15-F

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 23. **R O DEADERICK ESTATE RESUB. OF PART OF LOT 2** 12-SG-15-F

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.
* 24. **THE RIVER CLUB RESUB. OF LOT 10-R**
   12-SH-15-F
   At the terminus of Captains Way, east of Tooles Bend Rd, Commission District 4.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 25. **THUNDERCHASE FARMS**
   12-SI-15-F
   South side of W Beaver Creek Drive, northeast of Harrell Rd, Commission District 6.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 26. **RUGGLES FERRY, PHASE 3**
   12-SJ-15-F
   North side of Pleasant Hill Rd, west of Molly Bright Rd, Commission District 8.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 27. **VILLAGE AT SADDLEBROOKE, PHASE 3**
   12-SK-15-F
   At the north terminus of Saddlebrooke Drive, north of E Emory Rd, Commission District 7.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 28. **JOHNNY F LEACH PROPERTY RESUB. OF LOTS 1 & 2R**
   12-SL-15-F
   Southwest side of High School Rd, northwest of Glenoaks Drive, Council District 5.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 29. **SHADY GLEN**
   12-SM-15-F
   South side of S Northshore Drive, northeast of Harvey Rd, Commission District 5.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
   
   THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 30. **FINAL PLAT OF THE 411 GAY STREET, LLC PROPERTY**
   12-SN-15-F
   West of S Gay Street, south of Wall Avenue, Council District 6.
   
   STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve
THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Rezonings and Plan Amendment/Rezonings:

P 31. JAMES STERNBERG (REVISED)
Southeast side W. Emory Rd., southwest of Central Avenue Pike, Commission District 7.

a. North County Sector Plan Amendment
From LDR (Low Density Residential), MU-CC (Mixed Use - Community Commercial) with SP (Stream Protection) & HP (Hillside Protection) to GC (General Commercial) with SP (Stream Protection) & HP (Hillside Protection).

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

P b. Rezoning
From A (Agricultural), TC (Town Center), TC (Town Center) / HZ (Historic Overlay) & F (Floodway) to CA (General Business), CA (General Business) / HZ (Historic Overlay) & F (Floodway).

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT SMITH RECUSED FROM DISCUSSION OR VOTING ON THE FOLLOWING ITEM.

32. SCOTT DAVIS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE PR (Planned Residential) zoning up to 3 dwelling units per acre.

Suzanne Ferrera, Cate Road which is just off of Emory. I grew up in Karns. West Emory is already overburdened with traffic. If you ask any Knoxville deputy they will tell you there are wrecks after wreck after wreck. In the last 24 months there have been 4 people killed just this section between Oak Ridge Highway and Blacks Ferry Road. It is a small community. Already we have substandard infrastructure. The traffic is dangerous. People fly on Emory. The posted speed limit is 45 which is too high. It is not ever. I never see police out there doing anything about it. The property in question is absolutely beautiful one of the last pieces of farm land left on Emory Road. It has some of the finest heir able land around. I know two other people interested in farming it. As our farm land gets eat up for houses it just gets worse and worse. There needs to be a moratorium on houses built on this section of Emory. There is... the traffic is ridiculous. It can take 15 to 20 minutes to get from Camelot to the elementary school in the morning to try and get off of Beaver Creek on Emory is taking your life in your hands in the afternoon when high school kids are there. Of the four people who died three of them were under twenty. It is just. Something needs to be done about it. Please
take these things into your consideration in rezoning deliberations regards this property. The demand for more houses in this area is simply not there. There are 244 empty houses or houses for sale in just this area alone. In the other residential that they have built, there are houses sitting there foreclosed. They were half finished. The lots weren’t sold. We simply don’t need another subdivision on this section of Emory. Thank you.

Kim Sinclair, Resident of Camelot 2, I reside at 7404 Wickham Road. We back up to the already developed Copper Ridge Subdivision. I am opposed to this new subdivision at the proposed 3 homes per acre. Not in line with what Camelot 2 already has. They are several homes per acre. If you look at the design you can see that the houses are jam backed in for the Copper Ridge Subdivision. I have students in the elementary school as well as in the local colleges. Our traffic as she indicated is severe in this area. You cannot navigate West Emory Road nor can you navigate Byington Solway during the rush hour traffic. Our schools are overcrowded. If we add a subdivision that has 3 to 5 homes per acre, that is a starter development. That means more families, which while on one hand is a positive thing for growth area, our schools are not capable of handling those students. If you look at the numbers for the Karns elementary school and the Karns middle school you will see that right now we have the largest student populations that there has been in those schools. The schools are not equipped to handle it and the roads are not equipped to handle it. If we allow these houses to be built, they cannot be unbuilt. While I am not opposed to growth, I am opposed to 3 to 5 houses per acre and would ask that you take our children and our community into consideration before you approve this.

Arlene Lemiszki, 7516 Brittany Drive. I lived in the Camelot 2 subdivision for over 20 years and as a resident whose property is most affected by this rezoning request I have submitted for your consideration a suggested resolution to this issue. A 50 foot minimum buffer to include the existing Woodlands on the rear of the subject property that is adjoining Brittany Drive residents. Nor more than 2 dwellings per acre on the subject property where it directly adjoins the properties along Chartwell Road and Brittany Drive. No construction, dirt removal or excavation of the subject property until the concept plan submitted by Mr. Davis is approved by the MPC. A thorough study be done by the appropriate agencies, be it County or TDOT, as to the feasibility of adding a new subdivision and entrance on a precarious part of West Emory Road which will directly impact the safety of the residents of the surrounding subdivisions and the community at large. THE MPC staff has recommended up to 3 per acre indicating their opinion that this would be more consistent than the 5 requested. While this is a step in the right direction I respectfully disagree. According to MPC’s case summary Camelot 2 is at a density of 1.4 per acre and zoned RA. Bent Creek directly across from Camelot 2 on West Emory while zoned 1 to 3 to acre is not developed at the maximum density. The other subdivisions in the area are zoned RA. The only subdivision developed at 3 per acre is Mr. Davis’s Copper Ridge development which after ten years in the making
still has approximately 25% of the lots undeveloped. One subdivision maxed out at 3 dwellings an acre does not define...

Longmire: Ma’am your time is up but I am going to extend it just a little bit but I will extend it to Mr. Davis also.

Lemiszki: Thank you. I certainly understand that developments result in additional property tax revenue for Knox County. However such development should be thoughtful, measured and taken into consideration the surrounding property. By limiting Mr. Davis to up to 2 per acre and requiring a buffer on just a portion of his proposed development property tax revenue is still generated but also helps preserve some of the character and integrity of the subdivision we chose to live in. While Mr. Davis gets to move on to his next project the residents of Camelot and surrounding subdivisions will be left to suffer the consequences of this one. The new subdivision entrance and approximately 80 plus additional vehicles vying to enter Emory Road during peak traffic hours is a recipe for disaster. I can tell that MPC’s staff comment that “access to the site from West Emory Road may have challenges because of the steep slope along the road, slight curve to the west, vertical curve to the east and inability to create an access directly across from Meadow Creek” is an incredible understatement. That doesn’t even address the quote challenges the existing residents will have when the subdivision is built.

Longmire: You need to wind it up ma’am.

Lemiszki: I am. I hope you can appreciate the extreme impact this rezoning request has on the many current property owners and the surrounding community and that you will favorably consider my recommendations. Thank you.

Lee Dunlap P.O. Box 11315, Knoxville, TN. I am sitting in for Mr. Davis who is out of town. There are several pieces of property around the piece of property we are talking about that has more than 3 units per acre density. There are pieces across Beaver Creek, there are pieces right down near Harrell Road where it is 5 units per acre. I mean I think Mr. Davis could probably work it out if we could do 4 units per acre but I think he wants to stay with the request as it is.

Longmire: I would like to ask County Engineering about the road please.

Leo LaCamera, Knox County Engineering, I am pinch hitting for Cindy who is, she is traffic engineer. I am a stormwater engineer. I do know that even at 5 units per acre, there is 14 acres so that would only be 70 units in there. A traffic impact study isn’t triggered until you reach 75 units. We would be relying on Cindy’s expertise and also it would require a permit from Tennessee Department of Transportation since it is a state route.

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AT DENSITY UP TO 3 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE.**
Elizabeth Eason: I just have a questions about I couldn’t quite tell on the map what the densities where.

Longmire: There is one in your packet. Look on the back of page 32.3. It is 32.4 I think.

Clancy: You have 1 to 3 all around it through there.

Longmire: Alright so the motion is to approve per 3 dwelling units, up to 3 dwelling units per acre. Is that correct?

Clancy: That is correct.

**MOTION CARRIED 13-0-1. APPROVED.**

Longmire: It is really 1 to 3 dwelling units per acre that is the most that they would be able to do. Thank you all very much. I appreciate not just you all coming for the meeting but also all the emails and information you sent us.

* 33. **JANET DEBUSK HENSLEY**  
South side Osprey Point Ln., southeast of S. Northshore Dr., Commission District 4. Rezoning from A (Agricultural) to RA (Low Density Residential).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE RA (Low Density Residential) zoning.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

34. **CHAMPION CONSTRUCTION, LLC**  
**a. Northwest County Sector Plan Amendment**  
From ROW (Right-of-Way) & MU-SD (Mixed Use Special District) - (NW-Co-7) to LDR (Low Density Residential).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** DENY LDR (Low Density Residential) sector plan designation.

Mike Brusseau: This is a PR request. PR Planned Residential zoning. It also requires a sector plan amendment because this property currently is designated as right of way. The reason for that is that this property was in the line of the Orange Route or State Road 475 that was at one time being proposed through the Solway area. That of course is no longer being considered. The current Northwest County Sector Plan shows it as right of way but that is currently being updated and will return this to the original designation which was Technology Park or Office. Since the onset of the Technology Overlay back in 1983 has always been shown for technology park. The Tennessee Technology Corridor Development Authority, I will refer to them as TTCDA if I can say it again, has reviewed
this twice and denied it. Both times were for the same type of request. It was PR at 5 units per acre back in 2014 and again on Monday at their meeting they actually denied this request as well. The reason being is that this area or this particular location being within the Technology Overlay and having frontage on and good exposure to Pellissippi Parkway is especially important we think to maintain for technology business park type uses. The exposure to the parkway and the access, well the future access that will be improved with the improvement to the interchange to the north, Solway Road and Oak Ridge Highway and Pellissippi is going to be improved in the near future, will give better access here for business development. There is a technology, I suppose a technology based business to the south called Permafix. I was told it is some kind of recycling type business. That is established just to the south of here. Solway Road in this section, this is kind of the north end of the section of Solway that runs parallel to Pellissippi Parkway for a pretty good distance between George Light Road and Hardin Valley. No more than 800 feet between Solway Road and the parkway and none of that area where the two run parallel fairly close to each other has been developed with residential. Residential has been mainly confined to the west and to the north of this property. Some of it is in the Technology Overlay, but at least on this side of the highway no residential has been developed right along the highway. There is some that is pretty close to the north that access to George Light Road. We feel that the residential uses should be limited to the west side of Solway Road but preserve the sites that have good exposure to the parkway for business technology park uses. Staff has recommended denial of both the sector plan amendment and the rezoning.

Champ Beeler, Champion Construction. I reside on Northshore Drive in west Knox County. I am coming this afternoon to represent our application as well as the owner of the property who is sitting behind me. We understand the original intent of the Technology Overlay in 1983 however, it hasn’t happened. I don’t know if it will happen in the near future. There are very few businesses down there. It seems like the highest and best use for us is planned residential. If you will bear with me just a minute I will try to focus on this a little bit. The Williams family has owned the property since 1950. The property was left to a now deceased heir and her aunt who is in a nursing home in Kentucky. The family has been activity trying to sell the property for the past 13 years with not one offer during that time. Family desperately needs the money from the sale of the property to help with the nursing home bills. I am requesting PR zoning for single family residential use. PR zoning has been approved along the Pellissippi Parkway Corridor with positive results. In doing this I am required to meet one of the four changes of conditions to warrant an amendment to the 2003 General Plan. My proposal meets three of these requirements. First requirement: Introduction of significant new roads or utilities that make development more feasible. Several new roads have been introduced since the General Plan was adopted. Most recently the Karns connector and the widening of Hardin Valley Road. The extension of utilities to the property and new roads make the development more feasible. Of course you know those roads: Middlebrook Pike, Hardin Valley Road, Karns connector, Outlet Drive,
Dutchtown Road at Pellissippi Interchange. Second requirement: changes in government policies such as a decision to concentrate development in certain areas. We know the hillside and ridgetop protection plan was a change in government policy to concentrate development in certain areas. From the hillside ridgetop protection plan, I am paraphrasing, it says limited medium density housing or office development may be appropriate in areas where provision for housing near jobs have been found to be prudent land use policy such as the technology corridor. The following recommendation should be considered in creating site plans. Allow consideration of medium density residential 6 to 12 units per acre and office uses on slopes of 15 to 25%. Number 3 trends in development or traffic that warrant reconsideration of the original planned proposal. The population from 2000 to 2010 has increased 22.5%. Traffic count in 2003, the traffic count was 7533 trips a day on the portion of Hardin Valley at Solway Road. In May 2014 it was 20,820 an increase of 275%. I am required to meet one of the four of those. We meet three of the four requirements. Regarding the sector plan amendment, sector plan amendment 6.30 of Knox County Zoning Ordinance states four conditions must be met for a sector plan amendment. My request to change the sector plan for this property meets all four of those conditions. Number 1: The proposed amendment shall be necessary because of the substantially changed or changing conditions in the area and zones affected or in the County generally. The northwest sector is the fastest growing sector of Knox County and growth has been concentrated in the Hardin Valley Pellissippi corridor. This area has substantially changed since the sector plan was adopted in 2003. If a sector plan change is not warranted here, no sector plan amendment can every meet that threshold. The northwest county sector land use change from 2002 to 2013 multifamily residential increased 74%, commercial has increased 44%, office 42%, transportation, communication, utilities 33%, industrial manufacturing 20%. Residential has added over 7,000 units. The proposed amendment shall be consistent with the intent and purpose of this resolution. Well the amendment I am proposing is consistent with the intent and purpose of this resolution. Number 3: The proposed amendment shall not adversely affect any other part of the County nor shall any direct or indirect adverse effects result from such amendment. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect any other part of the county and there is no direct or indirect adverse effects as a result from such amendment. Number 4: The proposed amendment shall be consistent with not in conflict with the General Plan of Knox County including any of its elements – major road plan, land use plan, community facilities and others. The amendment we are...

Longmire: Mr. Beeler you time is up. Is there a closing statement.

Beeler: From the Tennessee Public Chapter 1101, Tennessee Growth Plan, as adopted by the City of Knoxville, Knox County, Town of Farragut. The purpose of the Planned Growth Area designation are to encourage a reasonably compact pattern of development, promote expansion of Knox County economy, and offer a wide range of housing choices. This property fronts Solway Road and it is across from two large apartment
complexes and a University. Other tracts of land that border the parkway have been zoned for residential use between Solway and Pellissippi, Greenbrook being one to my north. I respectfully request rezoning of this property to planned residential.

Longmire: I would like to point out to Commission as far as sector plan the change in the Orange Route alone would give us a reason to approve because of the change in the sector plan.

Art Clancy: I have got a question. Michael I mean 32 years and we are still waiting for the technology part to fill out. Back when they were proposing the Orange Route we were holding up approval of subdivisions because we weren’t sure if the Orange Route was coming through or not. Now we know it is not. Do you find that Mr. Beeler’s arguments are compelling?

Brusseau: No I do not. Any other questions?

Clancy: I do find they are compelling. I think we have got a university out there. We do have some businesses out there everything along Hardin Valley. People need a place to live close to where we are putting businesses and developing commercial. That is kind of what we are supposed to do I think. So amend the sector plan. I would like to make a motion that amend the sector plan to low density residential.

MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO AMEND THE SECTOR PLAN TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL.

Bart Carey: We dealt with one of those maybe about a year ago. It was something in the TTCDA was opposed to it or I am not exactly sure what their position was. We rezoned I guess we did a sector plan and rezoning a piece of property in a very similar situation. My question is do all the land owners that are in this area I guess maybe in 1992 when there was visions of prosperity in the technology corridor, did this overlay, was it voluntary? Did your property only gain this designation if it you agreed or was it a wide spread blanket put over the property?

Brusseau: I believe it was handled as a general rezoning so it was not necessarily voluntary, you know the property owners didn’t opt in I don’t know all the details to be quite honest but I believe it was handled as a general rezoning which would mean that it wasn’t the owners of the property that asked for it.

Carey: I would love to see, this frontage especially would be a great visionary place to have a great technology center or some kind of beautiful building that would be visible from Pellissippi. I think the hardship that we are putting on the property owner, they have had the property basically open on the market for 13 years and can’t get a buyer and all of the sudden have one. That to me is a real compelling issue here in this discussion.
Michael Kane: I have thought a lot about this. I have been changing my mind on. I do that every once in a while. I do find that argument somewhat compelling. I work out in Oak Ridge. We are tearing down the K-25 plant. We are going to make it available for reuse you know for an industrial park. We are moving very quickly to do that. We also hear about new technologies coming up as a result, or new manufacturing coming up as a result of activities from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. We always seem to be poised for something to happen. There are some things happening with carbon materials and advanced printing and all those kinds of things. But on the other hand I hear the argument about you know hey these people have been sitting on the property for 30 years and the only use I think that they have is the use I think that it had when they owned the property which I assumed is agricultural as grandfathered. I think that is kind of hard. I understand that. Then I look at the big picture. I say okay let’s say we make this change. Let’s say everybody else in this whole area says well we want to make this residential. We say okay. You have waited 30 years and nothing has happened. And then it all goes away. All the land goes away. Like whoa. What did we do? I guess we lucked out on that. To be honest with you I think that is a big picture item that is beyond this body really to make a decision on. I think that comes through our County Commission and really through the Chamber of Commerce and the other folks that are in that kind of business to say hey. Now would they look at other things that are preventing it? It is my understanding, I know the people at Permafix. I talked to them today. They say traffic is terrible. There is a problem getting trucks into this area any time of morning, noon or evening would be terrible and the infrastructure is terrible. Maybe the County can do some things to improve the infrastructure that will make it more viable to have. I think if we vote for this particular property opening the door to getting more and I am not quite comfortable with that.

Laura Cole: I am struggling with the same thing. I definitely understand how this looks and feels from a property owners perspective. But I am looking at the intent and mission of the technology corridor and today we are talking about undoing that. It makes me think of the Growth Policy Plan we discussed last month. Maybe the Growth Policy Plan needs to be changed but it is not up to this body to change it. I am leaning towards looking at the technology corridor plan the same way. I am not sure it is up to us to suddenly open the door. It seems like more thought should be put into that than letting individual projects make that decision. That is where my struggle is. I am concerned that we are making the decision to throw this plan out and time for it to close.

Longmire: This will go to County Commission. Final approval will rest with County Commission.

Scott Smith: I just wanted to say that think it is a good idea to have land available if the County decides they want to for a technology park or something. I am not sure it is fair to do it when you basically use other people’s land and hold it out and set it aside. Maybe the County like they did, I don’t want to say Midway, but they have business parks. Let the
County buy the land from some of these property owners if they feel like it is that important. I mean 32 years. I worked down there a lot. We avoid this land because it is so screwy with that zoning. There is an enormous amount of BP/TO land down there that doesn’t get used every year. I just feel like if the County wants to set it aside they ought to buy it from the property owners.

Jeff Roth: I am not really conflicted about this particular piece of property because of the time frame that has been involved and the people who have owned it. I just don’t think it is… I kind of echo what Scott said, I think as a government body if there is property that we want to restrict or that we restricted in 1983 or 85 or whenever it was we are basically saying to the person that owns it, it is going to stay that way and there is nothing you can do with your property that you own. I think that amount of time is a huge amount of time to realize that and I don’t think we are using this… wouldn’t be using this to open the door. I think the economy or state of the property or the state of the property not being sold is what justifies opening the door to allow it to be used for something other than just vacant land in hopes that someday the technology will open up.

Clancy: I just wanted to say as well, after 32 years I don’t think we have a crystal ball that can tell us what this is going to be. I really don’t. There is no reason why we should assume just because we are approving residential in this technology overlay that they can’t work together. It will require the developers to put connection into the bike trails, walking trails that get you from the neighborhood to any… I mean there is plenty of technology corridor left. There is no reason to think that we can’t develop… Technology isn’t necessarily an industrial use. It is more office space where intellectual properties are stored and used. It is more of a campus style development. What is wrong with having your residential comingle with your technology uses? I don’t think one precludes the other. I don’t think we need to throw out the technology overlay. I think we need to make sure that whoever we let develop residential in there develops to a point where we have bike trails that connect them in and hold them to that standard and say, look this is… I agree with Scott about Knox County ought to buy it but right now we can’t hold hostage the property owners is my take on it. I don’t think that residential precludes that there is no technology in the area anyway. So I just think it is a good idea.

Brusseau: Just a couple of things. One reason we feel you ought to reserve this for Technology Park uses is because if it does go residential, all the new residents, future residents of this development are potential opposition to any Technology Park development that may come in down the road. They all require use on review approval. I don’t disagree that they can’t mix but experience says that homeowners in a residential single family subdivision don’t want to be next to business and they don’t want businesses on their road that goes there. There is one thing. I guess I would also mention if the Commission is inclined to go residential, there is a lot of topography constraints on this property. We did include a slope analysis just for that reason since the request was for planned residential.
Crunching the numbers of the hillside and ridgetop protection plan basically yields a density of about 3.66 units per acre. I just advise to take that into account if you do make a motion for PR zoning. Finally, the greenways coordinator for the county if you go in the direction of approval has asked that a greenway easement be placed along the front of the property along Solway Road. They have proposed that Knoxville to Oak Ridge greenway project is there. It is usually about a 50 foot corridor. I would ask you for consideration of a condition to work with the greenways coordinator on that.

Longmire: Would that be a motion that we would do now?

Brusseau: The motion on the floor is for the sector plan amendment.

Longmire: Yes I understand that. But if we do the zoning would that be a condition that we add?

Brusseau: That would be a condition you could put on now if you go in the direction of PR which we do not recommend.

Clancy: Would it be when they come with the concept plan?

Brusseau: Well we just want to it clear that that will be expected at the time of the concept plan.

Tocher: I have one question with regards to the sector plan update. I understand that right now with it being right of way it really does need to be changed. If it is changed looking at the GIS map would the appropriate change be LDR or mixed use?

Brusseau: The Northwest County sector plan is currently being updated. It is in process. I spoke with the planning that is doing that. They are proposing to maintain that as technology park or office. That whole corridor that I talked about with the two roads parallel to each other is all proposed to be Technology Park. We feel like the residential land that is available in the area is right on the other side of Solway Road. Why use up the property that has a good exposure for residential.

Bart Carey: Mr. Beeler do you or the property owners had any discussions with the greenway coordinators? Is this something that you’re aware of?

Beeler: No sir I have not. However seeings that Beaver Creek has a tributary coming into it that follows along Solway Road there I am sure we could work out something in that area which is going to be off limits for us anyway in terms of a greenway. It could probably work in with that creek buffer would be my guess without studying it. One other thing I would like to say. There is a lot of business parks in the area that aren’t full; that aren’t being utilized that, you know, they pay these, they give businesses incentives to come in and they are still vacant. There are a lot of places out there other than here that businesses can go.
Len Johnson: Ten years ago I was involved with the rezoning scenarios down in South Waterfront. One of the things that came out of that and I think you guys are all aware of it was this very issue of mixed uses. That is the direction we are going in. You look at downtown Knoxville. We are starting to have businesses on the first floor, second third and fourth floor residential. That being said I would like to call for the question.

Longmire: Which you can as soon as Commissioner Kane gets to speak.

Kane: I just want to clarify Mr. Brusseau. What you are suggesting is that staff would consider LDR on the west side of Solway but this in particular because it is on the east side adjacent to Pellissippi Parkway makes it partially good for business development or the business technology overlay.

Brusseau: Most of the businesses that we have seen have been developed in the overlay have been developed when they have exposure to Pellissippi. We just feel like this is one that has a better potential for the development that is being proposed.

Longmire: You said there is 800 feet between the back edge of the property and Pellissippi.

Brusseau: There is no more than 800 feet separation between those two roads in the area where they run basically parallel.

Upon roll call the Planning Commission voted as follows:

Carey       Yes
Clancy      Yes
Cole        Yes
Crowder    Yes
Eason       Yes
Goodwin   No
Johnson    Yes
Kane        No
Lomax       No
Roth        Yes
Sharp       Yes
Smith       Yes
Tocher      No
Longmire   Yes

**MOTION CARRIED 10-4. LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL APPROVED.**

**b. Rezoning**

From BP (Business and Technology Park) / TO (Technology Overlay) and F (Floodway) / TO PR (Planned Residential) / TO (Technology Overlay) and F (Floodway) / TO.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENY PR (Planned Residential) zoning.**

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE PR PLANNED RESIDENTIAL ZONING. MOTION**
CARRIED 11-3 (TOCHER, LOMAX AND GOODWIN VOTED NO - KANE CHANGED TO YES). APPROVED.

Longmire: We need to have a motion on the density. 4 units per acre is the request.

Carey: What was the max again Mr. Brusseau?

Brusseau: 3.66 is what the guidelines of the hillside plan require.

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE A DENSITY OF UP TO 3.66 UNITS PER ACRE**

Kane: What about the greenway thing?

Clancy: Can we tell the developer that we will expect that when he comes back.

Longmire: It could be a condition that we expect.

Johnson: There is a creek along Solway and that requires a 50 foot buffer. I don’t see any reason why those two couldn’t be in the same piece of ground.

Clancy: I would feel better about seeing the concept plan when it came in and saying no that is not exactly what we had in mind, let’s change it to this or yes that is exactly what we were thinking. The developer knows that he still has to have a concept plan approved. I think it is a little more appropriate for me to or I feel better about looking at what he comes up with rather than me telling him what I would like him to do.

Longmire: But I would like to have the developer work with the County Greenway coordinator. I think we can just suggest that very strongly that we would be expecting that.

**MOTION CARRIED. 13-1 (KANE- NO)**

Beeler: I just wanted to say thank you and Merry Christmas or Happy Holidays whatever applies. I will work with the greenway coordinator.

* 35. **LAND DEVELOPMENT SOLUTIONS**

   Northwest side of W. Depot Ave, southwest side of Williams St., Council District 6. Rezoning from C-3 (General Commercial) to C-2 (Central Business District).

   **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** RECOMMEND that City Council APPROVE C-2 (Central Business District) / D-1 (Downtown Design Overlay) and incorporate the Knoxville Downtown Design Guidelines.

   **THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.**

36. **TIM AND KIM WEBB**
Southeast side Tazewell Pike, northeast of Ridgeview Rd., Commission District 8.

a. Northeast County Sector Plan Amendment 12-C-15-SP

From AG/RR (Agricultural/Rural Residential) & SLPA (Slope Protection Area) to GC (General Commercial) & SLPA (Slope Protection Area).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: ADOPT RESOLUTION #12-C-15-SP, amending the Northeast County Sector Plan to RC (Rural Commercial) and recommend the Knox County Commission also approve the sector plan amendment, to make it operative.

Arthur Seymour Jr: Mr. and Ms. Web are interested in taking this property and using it for a business they are already in. She does stitching and embroidery on bags like this, on uniforms. IF MPC wants a shirt she will either buy the shirts and embroider your emblem on there or you can bring the shirts and she will embroider everything on.

Longmire: That is what I want to do Mr. Seymour is walk through the neighborhoods wearing my MPC shirt.

Seymour: You might. Ms. Web will be there she and her husband will be there to take care of you.

Gerald Green: Can she put a pulls eye on the back for free.

Seymour: She can do that also. The property involved is at 6130 Tazewell Pike. There is a dilapidated house and used to be a garage on the site. What she and her husband want to do is fix up the house, potentially live there one day, but not right now, fix up the garage. They want to continue their business at that location. He husband will retire in the next couple of years and will go to work for Mrs. Web I think doing this. We ask that a portion of the lot be rezoned. I asked for CA and MPC staff wisely recommended rural commercial. We are in agreement with that. That would allow her to pursue this business there without living in it. I think she might be a home occupation of she and her husband lie there but since they do not intend to live there right now she will need this zoning. We ask for the minimal amount of the property to be rezoned. It is consistent with property around it. Immediately to the east is a building where they work on cars. It is zoned CA. Across the road is what appears to be a mini industrial park. It is zoned CB. There are several warehouse buildings down there and a number of tractor trailers that operate out of there. Almost immediately to the west is other CA property. There are all sorts of businesses that have been out there forever in this little area. She is sort of in the middle of what’s going on. I know there is some suggestion that she limit the uses for the property. I am telling you what she intends to do with the property. The Rural Commercial zone is rarely used in Knox County. It has a lot of restrictions on it. She would have to come back if she did much to the house or the garage other than rebuild it and go through a lot of approvals for that. That is certainly not her intention. Our request is to approve the rezoning as requested so they can fix up the house, rebuild the garage and operate a family business
out of it. There was also some concern about the sign. I forgot to ask you Ms. Web. Are you all going to put up a big billboard or anything?

Webb: We would like to have a sign for people traveling Tazewell Pike know what we do.

Seymour: It will certainly not even equate to what is permitted in the zone. I don’t think she has thought about that very much yet. The first thing if Ms. Web can get the zoning is to fix up the house, rebuild the garage and make this a nice piece of property. I would like to reserves any time I have.

Longmire: You have a minute and 19 seconds.

Kevin Murphy, 4508 Murphy Road. I would not say opposition. I am sort of sideways on this and acting as the guiderail. First the use I think is actually a very good addition to the community. Uses like this seem to enhance the character of rural home based type business. I am not opposed to the use. I am just here as a cautionary person to remind you about a few things. First of all this area while it has a bunch of underlying commercial property that has been zoned that way for decades. My mechanic is one of those that I use out there. It is underlying commercial but it is not reflected on the sector plan. The 2003 or the one that we just went through an extensive process out in the northeast county to adopt. There have been some nodes identified for rural commercial areas but this particular section isn’t one of them. Any change to that sector and zoning underneath I think should be prescribed as narrow as possible. That is really what I am asking for is how narrow can you make this change. The things that I requested were a condition to the requested use. This protects against unintended change of use if say the ownership changes in ten years. This is the opportunity to have that hearing so that is why I am here asking for that right now is to see if it was possible to condition it down to the specific conditioned use. The other one about the illuminated sign verses indirectly illuminated sign was when I went through and ran through the differences between CN and CR zoning. I am a big fan of the indirectly illuminated signs instead of the illuminated signs. I have got illuminated signs near my rural property. I am not a fan of those at all. Indirectly illuminated seems like a small change to make. I am a little surprised to see that is allowed in the CR zone. I am appreciative of the staff recommending rural commercial. I think that is the least intensive that would accommodate the use in the community. It has a number of nice landscaping requirements around it if the uses change and the building had to be redone. There are a lot of things that are very good about this. I am just here to serve as the guiderail.

Longmire: Before you sit down Mr. Murphy. The church across the street, Adkins, has an illuminated sign and the automotive has illuminated signs. I was out by there today looking at it and when they changed it from Heinman’s to whatever it is now it has an illuminated sign. Thank you. Mr. Brusseau how do you feel about conditions limiting a use?
Mike Brusseau: In your blue sheets there was some commentary that went around the office this morning. My opinion is I don’t know that it is necessary considering that the zoning they are asking for allows much less in signage than what the adjacent CA and CB zones would allow. I am not sure how the illumination on some of those adjacent signs how they are illuminated but I know they are fairly good size signs some of them are on poles. This particular CR zoning only allows a 6 foot high monument sign of 60 square feet which would be I guess you could argue would be much more attractive and much more suitable for the area. As far as the sector plan goes it is true that the plan does not recognize any of these still both the old plan and now the current plan that was just adopted earlier today both still show this area for LDR. The fact of the matter is there is CA and CB zoning out there. Essentially because it is somewhat clustered in this area the trend there has been for a small commercial area. For that reason staff found it hard to find any rational to not approve the request or at least to recommend approval of the request. I think the CR requirements are enough. If the commission’s will is to put a condition on lighting that is certainly fine. I don’t think it is necessary.

Longmire: My other question is why is it CR sometimes and RC sometimes?

Mike Brusseau: RC is the plan designation and CR is the zoning.

Michael Kane: My mind is going. I am sorry. I appreciate the input Mr. Murphy has done on this. It is very well researched. That is very helpful. Your table is excellent by the way. I certainly understand your argument. I think reflecting on staff’s comment it seems to me that in terms of uses most of the uses in terms of their impact are going to be limited by that size of 5000 square feet. That is regardless of the size of the lot. I think that is going to have the most impact on you. In terms of the signage I agree that the illuminated signs in the residential area would be more impactful but I think that given this does seem to be more of a commercial node I don’t think that would be noticed. It would be interesting to know what the person next door, it looks like at least on Tazewell Pike there is only that one parcel remaining, what their thoughts are on it. I don’t know if you talked to that person at all or if there has been any feedback. That would be nice to know. I would ask that the property owner actually talk to their neighbor before putting up any sign. I think that is what Mr. Kevin Murphy would have done if the Weigel’s folks had talked to him before they put up their… You probably would have appreciated that a lot. Would have probably spurred less...

Longmire: But he is really looking forward to the Dollar Store sign.

Kane: He is really looking forward to the Dollar Store sign. Anyway so actually I am going to trump somebody and make a motion that we adopt the resolution amending the northeast sector county plan to rural commercial and recommend that Knox County Commission also adopt and approve the sector plan amendment to make it operative.
MOTION (KANE) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION AMENDING THE NORTHEAST COUNTY SECTOR PLAN TO RURAL COMMERCIAL AND RECOMMEND THAT KNOX COUNTY COMMISSION ALSO ADOPT AND APPROVE THE SECTOR PLAN AMENDMENT TO MAKE IT OPERATIVE.

Clancy: I am going to vote against it just because Michael made the motion.

Charles Lomax: I just had a question for Ms. Webb. I was just curious while we were talking around the issue and around you if you have given any thought to the particular type of signage that you would be using?

Webb: Not at this time but considering we would like to retire there and live on the property I do not see us wanting huge sign because we are not going to want that in our front yard. But we do want people to know where to find us and be able to know they can come to us with their business. I don't see us putting a large sign because we want to live there and we have children and grandchildren. I wouldn't want my grandchildren playing around a large sign.

Longmire: Plus they are really expensive. I will say in this area there have always been commercial nodes although the bootlegger during my high school years I think it was a home industry, I don’t think it was commercial.

Kane: Was it a drive thru?

Johnson: It was yes.

Longmire: Mr. Johnson knows, I just heard about it.

Clancy: Call for the question before you get in anymore trouble Madam Chair.

MOTION CARRIED 14-0. APPROVED.

b. Rezoning

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE CR (Rural Commercial) zoning.

MOTION (KANE) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF CR RURAL COMMERCIAL. MOTION CARRIED 14-0. CR APPROVED.

37. SADDLEBROOK PROPERTIES, LLC

West side Harvey Rd., south side Tanglewood Dr., Commission District 5. Rezoning from A (Agricultural) to PR (Planned Residential).
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE PR (Planned Residential) zoning at a density of up to 3 du/ac.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 38.  **RUFUS H. SMITH & COMPANY**  

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE PR (Planned Residential) zoning at a density of up to 5 du/ac.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 39.  **RUFUS H. SMITH & COMPANY**  
Southeast side Lovell Rd., southwest of Thompson Rd., Commission District 6. Rezoning from A (Agricultural)/ TO (Technology Overlay) to PR (Planned Residential)/ TO (Technology Overlay).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE PR (Planned Residential)/ TO (Technology Overlay) zoning at a density of up to 5 du/ac.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

Withdrawn Prior to Publication

* 40.  **MARTILYN LYLE**  
Northwest side W. Beaver Creek Dr., southwest of Old Clinton Pike, Commission District 6. Rezoning from A (Agricultural) to RA (Low Density Residential).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that County Commission APPROVE RA (Low Density Residential) zoning.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 41.  **SERTOMA CENTER**  
South side Boyds Bridge Pike, west of Delrose Dr., Council District 6. Rezoning from O-3 (Office Park) & R-1 (Low Density Residential) to O-1 (Office, Medical, and Related Services) & R-1A.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMEND that City Council APPROVE O-1 (Office, Medical & Related Services) and R-1A (Low Density Residential) zoning, as requested.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

**Uses on Review**

P 42.  **ED CAMPBELL**

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

W 43. MERCHANTS RETAIL PARTNERS

THIS ITEM WAS WITHDRAWN EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

P 44. ANDREW STEWART MELLISA STEWART
South side of E. Emory Rd., west of Mayes Chapel Rd. Proposed use: Two duplexes on individual lots. in RA (Low Density Residential) - pending District. Commission District 7.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

* 45. RICHARD MEADOR

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve the request to reduce the peripheral boundary setback from 35' to 23'-9" as shown on the site plan subject to 1 condition.

THIS ITEM WAS APPROVED ON CONSENT EARLIER IN THE MEETING.

46. WALDEN POND SENIOR VILLAGE
Northwest side of McKamey Rd., southwest of Brierley Dr. Proposed use: Independent senior living units and assisted living in PR (Planned Residential) pending District. Commission District 3.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve the development plan for up to 48 independent senior living units and 119 assisted living bedrooms and a reduction of the peripheral setback from 35' to 25', subject to 9 conditions.

Robert Burn, 12916 Butterfield Lane. We would like to have the vote and get it approved.

Longmire: And you feel comfortable with the 9 conditions?

Brechko: Just for the record we received a call from the property owner directly to the east of this site concerning drainage issues. They had videotaped some of the drainage flow after storms in that area. They provided a copy of that to County Engineering for their review. I told them that we would make you aware that they
did have this concern. It is something that County Engineering is aware of and will be looking at when this project comes through for stormwater approval.

Longmire: We just happen to have the stormwater person here with us.

Leo LeCamera: The property upstream when we get several days of rain that lake will back up onto his property. He was concerned to make sure they had adequate conveyance to get that water through their property and into the lake. We will make sure that gets done when the design plan comes in.

Longmire: Is it a natural lake?

LeCamera: It is.

Clancy: Condition 5 addresses that. I mean it has to meet all the applicable requirements of Knox County Department of Engineering and Public Works which is you right?

LeCamera: Correct.

Clancy: That takes care of it. I would like to make a motion.

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION. MOTION CARRIED 14-0. APPROVED.**

47. **KING PROPERTIES AND DEVELOPMENT**

12-D-15-UR


**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the Development Plan for up to 50 attached dwellings, and the requested reduction of the peripheral setback from 35' to 25' as identified, subject to 5 conditions.

Longmire: I would say that even though we seem to be taking things lightly we are taking them seriously in a light sort of way. Is there opposition? Is the applicant present? Sir is there anything you need to say. If so you need to come to the microphone. You are fine.

**MOTION (CLANCY) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.**

Laura Cole: At agenda review I believe that staff mentioned that engineering had some concerns about this site. Has that been addressed?
Mike Reynolds. There has been a misunderstanding mostly on my side of that one. I got my cases mixed up in my head whenever I saw it. This property does not need the 400 foot sight distance clearance as originally thought, only 300 feet. According to their plans they have that in both directions. They should have the sight distance they need.

MOTION CARRIED 14-0. APPROVED.

Other Business:

CHAIR LONGMIRE TURNED THE MEETING OVER TO NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR ELECTION OF OFFICERS, LAURA COLE.

48. Consideration of Election of Calendar Year 2016 MPC Officers.

Laura Cole: Commissioners as you know according to our MPC Bylaws we elect officers every year. Last month we nominated Becky Longmire for Chair and Bart Carey for Vice Chair. This month we need to make a motion to elect them. Do I have a motion?

MOTION (TOCHER) AND SECOND (JOHNSON) WERE MADE TO ELECT BECKY LONGMIRE AS CHAIR AND BART CAREY AS VICE CHAIR OF MPC. MOTION CARRIED 14-0.

Adjournment

MOTION (CLANCY) WAS MADE TO ADJOURN.

There being no further business, the Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting was adjourned in order at 2:52 p.m.

Prepared by: Betty Jo Mahan

Approved by: Secretary for the Commission

Approved by: Rebecca Longmire, Chair

NOTE: Please see individual staff reports for conditions of approval and the staff recommendation.