

52 three lots, they were supportive, but stated that all lots must have certain street
53 frontage according to bulk standards. Because of this requirement, the Commission
54 saw an unusual “pole” configuration with the required 90 feet of street frontage
55 between the lower two lots. Lot 2 was being restated and Lot 3 was being
56 expanded to ensure at least three acres were included to meet hillside protection
57 requirements.
58

59 Mr. King’s said that the lot lines along the easement drive may be incorrect based
60 on previous plats and deeds. He would have Delta out to resurvey and pin before
61 the next meeting. The lot line was supposed to be in the middle of the drive, but
62 the present survey did not indicate that.
63

64 A note from the previous plat restricting construction to below easement drive for
65 Lot 1 was carried forward and the same restrictions were added for Lot 3 which
66 was proposed to include areas above the easement drive.
67

68 The Allen’s proposed to not use the easement drive, but to build a drive inside the
69 “pole” of Lot 1. Lots 1-3 would use the drive for construction and permanent
70 access. At the time, the proposal showed a straight drive, but a curvilinear drive
71 was being considered. The curvilinear drive would help with drainage. He added
72 that likely two detention areas would be proposed.
73

74 Tim Milton, architect showed the Commission a number of graphic renderings of
75 the planned construction to indicate placement of the home. He showed both a
76 straight and curvilinear drive. It was generally agreed the curved drive was more
77 preferable. Chairman Evan asked Mr. King if the curved solution would save more
78 trees. Mr. King responded that they had not yet engineered the drive so he was
79 unsure, but it was likely. Mr. Gardner asked about the size of the proposed home.
80 The proposed home had 6500 square feet heated and cooled space.
81

82 Mr. Foster stated that Mr. King and the Allen’s had been great to work with. They
83 were flexible and willingly sought to comply with the Code. He added that this
84 subdivision had been a thorn in the side of the City for some time and perhaps this
85 would alleviate those long standing issues. Staff had spent much time reviewing
86 this proposal and put together a memo outlining the requested/required changes
87 (attached to these minutes). The following notes were recommended to be
88 conditions of approval.

- 89 1.) The application should make the following changes to the plat before
90 preliminary approval:
- 91 (a) Revise the property line boundary of Lot 1 (adjacent to property
92 owners Hyde, Peden and Bright) to be the center of the 30 foot
93 road. According to the deeds and the existing plats of record, all
94 properties adjacent to the road run to the center of the road. We
95 recommend that the applicant (1) field stake the center of the road,
96 (2) place iron pins marking the center of the road, and (3) show
97 that centerline as the property boundary on the Preliminary Plat.
 - 98 (b) Re-title the Preliminary and Final Plat “Consolidation of Fentress
99 Estates.”
 - 100 (c) Insert the standard notes shown below. (in memo)

- 101 (d) Insert the special notes shown below. (in memo)
- 102 2.) Applicant must remove the remaining foundation of the structure presently
103 located on proposed Lot 1.
- 104 3.) Applicant must abandon the existing well on the property in accordance
105 with TDEC requirements.
- 106 4.) No structures may be constructed on portions of the land located to the
107 north of the road.
- 108 5.) Vehicular and pedestrian access, including construction access, for all
109 three lots must be provided via a new driveway located within the Lot 1
110 pole.
- 111 6.) A Declaration of Easements must be recorded prior to the final plat
112 providing for the shared use and maintenance of the shared driveway on
113 Lot 1. The City Attorney must approve the Declaration prior to its
114 recording.

115 Chairman Evans thanked staff for their work and asked if there were any
116 comments from residents. Vice-Mayor Hyde of 1436 Old Hickory Blvd spoke. He
117 said he was impressed with Mr. King's creativity and that he was in favor as
118 presented with all the suggested changes and notes. The Allen's obviously seek to
119 comply as much as possible.
120

121 *Chairman Evans called for a motion. Mr. Waller motioned to approve the concept*
122 *plan to move on to preliminary conditioned upon meeting the requirement in the*
123 *memo dated 12-17-14. Mrs. Frist seconded the motion and it was approved*
124 *unanimously.*
125
126
127

128 **5. The meeting was adjourned**
129

130

131

Chairman Winston Evans

133

134

135

Recorder, Amanda K. Deaton-Moyer

136