HISTORIC
FRANKLIN
TENNESSEE

109 3rd Ave S
Franklin, TN 37064
(615) 791-3217

City of Franklin

Meeting Minutes

Work Session

Tuesday, November 12, 2024	4:00 PM	Board Room

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Ken Moore called the meeting to order at 04:00 PM

Board Members Present: Ann Petersen, Greg Caesar, Clyde Barnhill, Beverly Burger, Matt Brown, Patrick Baggett, Jason Potts, Brandy Blanton

Board Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Eric Stuckey, Mark Hilty, Kristine Brock, Vernon Gerth, Shauna Billingsley, Angie Skarp

Mayor Moore recognized Alderman Blanton for a special announcement.

Alderman Blanton: Sadly, this will be Steve Grubb's last work session meeting before his retirement. As director of the Streets Department for 28 years, Mr. Grubb has left his footprint all over the city with his genuine love and concern for citizens of Franklin and his team members. Mr. Grubb goes above and beyond his duties for the benefit of the Franklin community. Alderman Blanton thanked Mr. Grubb for his commitment, dedication and great care of the staff and citizens of Franklin. Mr. Grubb will be greatly missed.

Eric Stuckey echoed Alderman Blanton's sentiments and noted that Mr. Grubb is a great team member for 28 years and takes great care and attention to everything he does. Mr. Grubb began as an inspector in the Streets Department and over the years worked his way up to director. Mr. Stuckey added, "You haven't lived until you've received a Grubb Hug."

Alderman Burger. "We love you and thank you for your commitment and service to the COF."

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Comments on agenda items may be made in person at City Hall or by emailing recorder@franklintn.gov before noon on the day of the meeting. Comments will be submitted for the record.

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. **Consideration Of Resolution 2024-93, A Resolution Approving A Mural Entitled "Johnny Cash: Welcome To Franklin" At 1911 Columbia Avenue**

   Sponsors: Milissa Reierson, Monique McCullough

   Mr. Stuckey, City Administrator: The mural has been approved by the Arts Commission and has been completed.

   Alderman Burger asked how someone would go about getting approval for a mural.

   Ms. McCullough stated that approval is required for any commercial mural that can be seen from the public right of way. The Arts Commission would recommend approval or denial to BOMA with BOMA making the final decision.

2. **Consideration Of Resolution 2024-98, A Resolution To Set The Special Assessments For The Sanitary Sewer Improvements On Hamlet Drive. Establishing A Public Hearing On November 26, 2024**

   Sponsors: Mark Hilty

Mr. Stuckey: This ongoing project has been completed, in house, and came in $7,000 below the estimated cost, saving Hamlet Drive residents money on the special assessment. Once the Resolution is approved, residents of Hamlet Drive will have until February 2026 to pay the special assessment interest free.

Vice Mayor Brown applauded staff for completing the project in house and saving residents of Hamlet Drive money. This project has been very meaningful and is a great service to the community.

3. *Consideration Of COF Contract No. 2024-0315, With Franklin Special School District For Leasing Premises Located At 507 New Highway 96 West For Interim City Hall Facility

Sponsors: Vernon Gerth

Mr. Stuckey: This is the last component of acquiring office space while the new city hall is under construction. The existing, fully furnished FSSD Administrative building would house COF Fire Administration and Inspections with space for a workout facility. The space fits within the projected total budget ($4 million) for relocation and storage and will save $1 million in the operating budget (maintenance and repairs) over the life of the project.

Alderman Burger asked if the cost for the FSSD building was negotiated and who would pay the utilities.
Answer. Eric Stuckey. The negotiated cost with FSSD was lower than the First Bank office lease with the COF paying the utilities.

Mr. Gerth: The team goal was to stay within or under budget. By moving out of current city hall by end of February, the city will see savings on interest of the new city hall project and cost savings of not having the ongoing maintenance and repairs of the current city hall.

4. *Consideration Of Ordinance 2024-34, An Ordinance To Amend The Franklin Zoning Ordinance Text As Part Of A Five-Year Update And Amend The Zoning Maps Of The City Of Franklin, Tennessee To Establish And Rezone Property Into The New Regional Commerce 4 District (RC4) And Adopt The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS) Updated Maps Into The Floodway District (FWO) And The Floodway Fringe Overlay District (FFO). Establishing A Public Hearing On November 26, 2024

Sponsors: Vernon Gerth, Emily Wright, Kelly Dannenfelser

Ms. Dannenfelser: This ordinance is the culmination of Joint Conceptual Workshop discussions about potential amendments to the zoning ordinance.

State Law Changes

- Maximum review/approval timeframes for telecommunication towers
- Annexation and rezoning changes related to timing of public notification(paper).
- Privately owned landfills/solid was facilities require BOMA approval
- Case Law Change – Knight vs. Metro Nashville -exemption of sidewalk requirements when certain criteria are met.

Floodplain Map Updates

- Floodplain insurance rate maps have been finalized by FEMA and are required to be adopted by the city before the end of the year.
- The Floodway Overlay District (FWO) and Floodway Fringe Overlay District (FFO) will be amended to match the map panel numbers accordingly.

Other Proposed Rezoning relating to Envision Franklin

- RC4 District – Building Height – designation of four stories in specific areas of Cool Springs to help transition into residential areas.
- Transitional Features – Building Height- reduction of 12 stories to 8 stories around the intersection of McEwen and Mallory Lane
- Farmstead Residential Building Type – available in PD – new building type for building containing 5-8 units, providing flexibility for rural architectural character.

Alderman Petersen noted her concerns about the updated Floodplain maps.

Ms. Dannenfelser: There are 12 different maps that document changes for each section of the Harpeth River.

Presentation continued.
Building Uses (New)

- R2 and R3 zoning districts will allow for accessory dwellings
- Rural Retreats permitted as a use in Planned District (PD)
- Live/Work Units – nonresidential use and living space use occupied by the same person
- Microbreweries/Craft Distilleries – accessory use that is part of a restaurant's principal use, intended for on-site retail sales and consumption
- Light Industrial/General Warehousing in PD – available as a permitted use in a Planned District.

Alderman Burger suggested that 10% of the square footage designated as the brewery is not much space. The attraction to places like this is the distillery or the brewery along with the outside area.

Ms. Dannenfelser: A study of existing breweries in the area showed that most distilleries occupied 10 % of the building. Through a development plan, one could request a larger percentage for the brewery to occupy. A development plan would allow BOMA time to consider all the pros and cons that would accompany a larger brewery. The Microbreweries/Craft Distilleries use is intended to provide clarification when the Microbreweries/Craft Distilleries are accessories to a restaurant.

Presentation continued.
Development Standards

- Infill in Commercial Shopping Centers – provides additional flexibility to promote infill in existing commercial shopping centers.
- Telecommunication Aesthetics – requirement for telecommunication towers to be concealed (architectural structures or by nature or imitation of nature)
- Additional Screening Between New Nonresidential and Existing Residential – to maximize screening of nonresidential areas from residential areas.
- Parking Standards – there has been a slight decrease in the number of parking spaces for offices from 3-4 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 2.85 spaces per 1,000 square feet aligning with ITE parking standards.
- Signage on Parapets – placement of signage up to five feet above the roofline when the parapet wraps all the way around the building.
- Expiration of a Variance – extend the variance expiration to 2 years with a 6-month extension if requested. For vested plans the variance expiration will coincide with the duration of vesting period.

Alderman Potts noted a flagpole telecommunication tower close to Centennial High School that either doesn't have a flag flying or it's not the correct size. Is there a way to require the owner operator of the tower to fly the flag and if not, how could this be made a requirement?
Answer:
Ms. Dannenfelser: Currently there is not a provision that governs this issue, but staff could work on a proposed amendment to be included in the second reading.

There are other minor changes to hierarchy, definition clarifications, reference updates and corrections.

Timeline for Ordinance 2024-34
First Reading: November 12, 2024
Second Reading: November 26, 2024 – Public Hearing
Third Reading: December 10, 2024
Adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance on January 1, 2025

Ms. Dannenfelser: Consideration of Ordinance 2024-36 amends the Zoning Ordinance to allow wire fencing to be placed behind permitted fencing per the Ordinance. Ms. Dannenfelser added that the city has received a few requests to add wire fencing behind the four-board horse fencing.

Alderman Baggett recognized the work required in updating the zoning ordinance on a yearly basis. There should be some provision to address zoning ordinance issues and potential updates that come about later in the year. Topics such as short-term rentals and flag placement on personal property are important discussions to have and should be addressed in as timely a manner as possible. Alderman Baggett requested that these two issues and any other issues that may have come about later in the year, be addressed in the Spring.

Alderman Petersen expressed her concerns about adequate space for accessory dwellings for the R2 and R3 zoning districts. The lots are extremely small with the appearance of very little room for a driveway or parking space for the accessory dwelling unit. Since accessory dwelling units have been allowed by the zoning ordinance in other areas, not many have been constructed.

Ms. Dannenfelser: Most of the areas designated as R2 and R3 have lots that are larger than 9,000 square feet. However, there are a few neighborhoods whose lots are smaller than 9,000 square feet. This was an exercise to illustrate whether an accessory dwelling unit could be placed on the lot and meet the requirements for landscaping surface area.

Ms. Wright: Not all situations will require a driveway, a sidewalk may be needed leading to the accessory dwelling. Each lot is unique with multiple options for the location of the accessory dwelling unit and how cars are situated on the property. The property owner would address the nuisances when applying for a building permit. The intent was to encourage more diversity in housing in the city. Other considerations of the R2 and R3 districts are that the homeowner's association that may limit what can be built.

Alderman Burger asked is it possible to allow street parking as an option for the R2 and R3 districts? Regarding additional screening specifically wooden fencing, is there an ordinance that addresses the upkeep and maintenance of the wooden fencing over time? Also, is there any provision that would require developers to do a better job of perimeter parking lot screening? If not, can the criteria be reviewed for the next zoning ordinance update?

Ms. Wright: For new building sites, shrubs are required to be at a certain height before the surety can be released. Overtime, as shrubs are replaced, and the city monitors this as much as possible but not to the degree as if it were a new development. The requirements can be reviewed but any changes or new requirements must be within the ability of the city to manage the changes on a long-term basis.

5. ***Consideration Of Ordinance 2024-31, An Ordinance To Rezone 2.55 Acres From Residential 2 (R-2) District To Planned (PD 11.76) District For The Property Located At The Intersection Of Carothers Parkway And Dandridge Drive, Located At 3595 Carothers Parkway (The Lofts At CHP PUD Subdivision). Establishing A Public Hearing On December 10, 2024**

Sponsors: Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Ariella Stanford

Ms. Stanford: The application proposes to repurpose an existing building into 30 dwelling units for senior adults and adults with special needs. The application meets the goals of Envision Franklin for the design concept and special consideration. There is one MOS for parking. Staff supports the rezoning request and the development plan.

Greg Gamble, representing Community Housing Partners: Available to answer questions.
Wayne Weaver, Community Housing Partners

6. ***Consideration Of Ordinance 2024-36, An Ordinance To Amend The Franklin Zoning Ordinance Text Regarding Materials, Specifically Materials In Farmstead Residential And The Use Of Wire Fencing. Establishing A Public Hearing On November 26, 2024**
THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE REQUIRES CERTAIN MATERIALS TO BE RESTRICTED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

Sponsors: Vernon Gerth, Emily Wright, Kelly Dannenfelser

This item was discussed with item #4.

7. **Consideration Of Resolution 2024-83, A Resolution Approving A Development Plan For The Lofts At CHP PUD Subdivision With One Modification Of Development Standards (Minimum Parking), For The Property Located At The Intersection Of Carothers Parkway And Dandridge Drive, Located At 3595 Carothers Parkway. Establishing A Public Hearing On December 10, 2024**

Sponsors: Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Ariella Stanford

This item was discussed with agenda item # 5.

8. **Consideration Of Resolution 2024-91, A Resolution Amending The Shawnee PUD Subdivision To Extend The Vested Rights, For The Property Located South Of North Petway Street And East Of Shawnee Drive, Located At 1101 Shawnee Drive. Establishing A Public Hearing For December 10, 2024.**

Sponsors: Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Joseph Bryan

Mr. Bryan: The application was approved in February of 2022 and, since then, FHP had budgeting and financing issues to pay for the project. The project is now back on track financially and an extension was requested to allow time to get the paperwork in order.

9. ***Consideration Of Resolution 2024-92, A Resolution Authorizing The Use Of A Competitively Sealed Proposal Procurement Method For The Preparation Of A Transit Master Plan For The Franklin Transit Authority**

Sponsors: Vernon Gerth

Mr. Stuckey: Working with the Franklin Transit Authority on a master plan, this resolution will give authorization to accept proposals for the project. FTA Chair, John Schroer will attend the next work session to discuss the master plan.

Mr. Gerth: This resolution will also allow for review of experience, scope, and cost of the project. The project will be 80% funded by the federal government, 10% funded by the state and 10% funded by the city.

Alderman Baggett noted that It's very exciting to see the direction of the Franklin Transit Authority is taking in planning for the future.

10. Consideration Of Amendment 1 To COF Contract No. 2020-0246, Employment Agreement With City Administrator Eric Stuckey

Sponsors: Mayor Ken Moore, Shauna Billingsley, Kevin Townsel

Mayor Moore: Mr. Stuckey directly reports to the mayor and periodically BOMA provides feedback on Mr. Stuckey's job performance. Mr. Stuckey's contract requires the city to notify Mr. Stuckey, one year prior to contract expiration, if the city intends to employe him for the next five years. This amendment creates the direction of the city's intention to employ Mr. Stuckey for another five years.

Ms. Billingsley: Mr. Stuckey's contract is a standard contract, and the salary is specific to what it is right now with the opportunity of merit increases like other city employees. Mr. Stuckey's new contract would begin in January of 2025 for five years. Then, by December 31, 2029, the city would once again notify Mr. Stuckey of the intention to employ him beyond the term of the proposed contract.

11. Discussion Regarding The 2024 Water And Sanitary Sewer Cost Of Service Study And Rate Plan

Sponsors: Mark Hilty, Michelle Hatcher

Mr. Stuckey: Additional capacity for water and sewer will be needed in the next ten years through a three-phase implementation process. Fernando Aranda and Scott Woodard are here from Hazen and Sawyer to review best water/sewer industry practices and standards and how to allocate funds for the project. Options are limited in the utility world for subsidizing project costs as rate payers and impact fees are the primary funding source. The study is designed to show how impact fees and rate fees interact with each other and how the fees can be structured to cover costs over time.

Mr. Aranda: The presentation will examine industry standards related to impact and rate fee increases, options available to fund treatment plant expansion, explanation of how rate studies are conducted and results and scenarios of the study.

Water and sewer utilities costs are among the most expensive due to the increased construction costs over the last few years. When comparing Franklin's current utility fees to other municipalities, Franklin 's fees fall in the middle, not the most expensive and not the least expensive. In general, there is a five to six percent rate increase across the industry in utility fees.

Alderman Baggett asked if Mr. Aranda knew if the other cities were in the beginning or end of capital investments where fees could potentially be delayed.

Mr. Aranda stated that the information could be found on any city's financial sheets with adjustments of certain assets. Infrastructure fees could be delayed depending on where the city is with its capital investments.

The rate setting process considers revenue requirements, cost-of-service and rate design with the financial goal of planning ahead so that increases overtime is small, predictable and consistent. The impact fee methodology is a one-time charge for new customer demand following the principle of growth-pays-for-growth. In summary, the impact fee results in a maximum defensible fee of $18,000 per SFE. A lower fee can be approved as a city policy decision with consideration of the adopted fee and timing of implementation

Four sewer scenarios were considered. 1) Existing impact fee (3%), 2) 5-year Phase-in ($12K), 3) 6-year Phase-in ($18K) and 4) Full Increase 2026 ($18K) each assuming different levels of debt. The average annual increases for vary for each scenario
Scenario 1) Existing impact fee (3%) - 4.6%
Scenario 2) 5-year Phase-in ($12K) – 4.0%
Scenario 3) 6-year Phase-in ($18K) – 3.2%
Scenario 4) Full Increase 2026 ($18K) – 2.9%

Mayor Moore asked if all the scenarios address the 1.25 ratio from the state.
Answer: Mr. Aranda answered yes, the 1.25 ratio is included in the calculations.

Mr. Stuckey: The target is to generate 30% in cash so that the city doesn't have to issue as much debt as on the previous wastewater treatment project. The cash will be generated through rate payers and by impact fees.

Mr. Aranda finished by noting that Franklin's overall fee increases will remain around the national average for industry standards which is a testament good management by COF.

Alderman Baggett pointed out that at the 3% scenario with a 4.6% increase, the fees remain low for the citizens, putting Franklin in a better position for considering updates needed for water and sewer.

Vice Mayor Brown asked for clarification on the $38 million in existing sewer capacity and how that calculates into the final numbers.
Answer. Mr. Aranda explained that the existing capacity of $38 million is the value on the asset that the customer has already invested in the project (previous water treatment project). The $38 million is added back into the equation to calculate the fees as an economic analysis.

Mr. Stuckey: In summary, four scenarios were provided with $18,000 as the max defensible fee with the city choosing $12,000 as a midpoint. Mr. Aranda can calculate the numbers with whatever sensitivity the Board chooses to see how the rates are affected.

Alderman Baggett suggested careful consideration of fee increases as sewer funding is much different than funding of road impact fees. The difference between scenario #1 and #3 is only $1.40 which doesn't seem like much but compounded over the phase-in period adds up to more than you think. Development will be impacted by fee increases and the COF doesn't need to fund a $400 million sewer project, if the development may not occur.

Mr. Hilty: Depending on how the rates are designed will affect what the customer pays. Variable vs. fixed rates, residential vs. nonresidential or irrigation water are all considerations when calculating fees for each level of customer.

Mr. Aranda: Once the increases are calculated, the next step is the cost-of-service which gets into the specifics of where in the increase will occur, according to the fee classification levels (nonresidential vs. residential).

Mr. Stuckey: The current sewer impact fee is approximately $6,000 per single family unit equivalent. Moving on to water fee increases, there is no impact fee change for water, only a rate increase.

Mr. Aranda: The largest cost to the COF is the Harpeth Valley water fees which are expected to increase by the industry standard of five percent. Beginning in 2026 with projected increases from Harpeth Valley, the city will run into a deficit without an increase in rate fees. The deficit can be fixed with an overall rate increase of six percent to meet the minimum 60 day of O&M, cash reserves, and debt service coverage.

Alderman Baggett suggested that the revenues from water reclamation after 2031 be used to off set the sewer increases. Could the revenues from water provide possible relief in the future? Although, we don't want to lose Harpeth Valley as the city's second source of water.

Mr. Stuckey: The city will never be able to treat enough water to discontinue buying water from Harpeth Valley. Based on what we have today relating to water treatment, the city can generate $4 million gallons of water a day alternating between three treatment areas.

Mr. Aranda: When projecting numbers so many years away, the number will change with the need to update the figures to have the most accurate view.

12. Presentation For Proposed Parkland Impact Fee Ordinance Amendment

Sponsors: Mark Hilty, Lisa Clayton, Kevin Lindsey, Heather Eusebio, Chris Franklin

Ms. Clayton: The Heritage Foundation recognized the COF Parks Department and Friends of Franklin Parks for the work on the Hayes House at the Park at Harlinsdale Farm. Also, the state of Tennessee parks organization recognized the COF Parks Department for the new facility, Thompson Alley. The Parks Department proudly shares this award with the Planning

Department and the Engineering Department.

Ms. Eusebio: In 2020, the Ordinance was amended to allow for clarification of definitions for dwelling units, Parkland dedication, Phase and the Total Parkland Impact Fee. The restructure of the timing of payments collected at the first final plat, or first building permit when a plat is not required, with the remainder of fees collected at a pro-rated rate per permit pulled. In 2023, the Ordinance was amended to include accessory dwelling units, fees being paid in full for 12 dwelling units or less and to allow for both public and private offsets to receive 75% eligible reimbursement.

Mr. Lindsey: The current Parkland Impact Fee (PIF) is $4,304 which is a one-time fee on new development that funds public facilities other than historic park property and maintenance of existing parkland. In 2014 the city was encouraged to establish parkland quadrants different than street quadrants. PIF are spent in the quadrant where the residential impact takes place.

Ms. Clayton: The main goal of the quadrant is anywhere development takes place; residents have access immediately to the amenities in their area. Using a generic five-acre park concept plan, in 2015 a basic park with an asphalt trail, basketball court, pavilion, playground and open space cost about $1.183 million. Using the same model, the same park would cost $2.8 million in 2024, considering inflationary increases.

Mr. Franklin: The Parkland Impact Fee methodology took into consideration the COF population, acres of non-historic parkland, costs to develop a five-acre park and the number of dwelling units. The total fee per dwelling unit came to $10,859.16. The results of 2023 PIF's analysis resulted in three potential options.

Option 1: Leave 2017 fee active until new census data is available.
Option 2: Increase to 2023 fee.
Option 3: Add an inflationary percentage yearly to the 2017 PIF until new census data is available.

Alderman Blanton mentioned not all parks are equal, some are better than others. The generic model includes a basketball court, play area, walking trail and a pavilion with bathrooms, the comparison is not apples to apples.

Ms. Clayton: When considering what a park would look like, all the components of the generic park example should be included.

Alderman Caesar asked regarding the comment "we do not have a shortage of land," does this mean we haven't needed to buy land for parkland development?

Ms. Clayton: Franklin is above the national standard relating to acreage when viewing the overall park system. Once the historic parks are extracted, it appears that the city is at an acreage deficit which is not the case. It would be worthwhile to consider delaying increased impact fees until the most up to date census numbers are available. An example of developers taking the lead in parkland development is The Vintage development that spent $3.6 million on their parkland development. Developers are spending more than what the city can reimburse for parkland development. Also by allowing parkland to be developed prior to the first CO approval in the community, this increases the desirability of living in the development.

Mr. Stuckey: It would be a good idea and appropriate to consider the inflationary option because it's a moderate increase. A standardized inflationary increase based on the previous baseline number makes sense rather than doing nothing and missing out on necessary fees for parkland projects. Updates can be considered based on the results of the census data.

Alderman Baggett mentioned one concern that comes up frequently is the lack of enough ball fields in the city. If incentives are leading to more pocket parks, the city must look for other means to fund ball fields with the population increase.

Ms. Clayton: Considering the overall calculations for the quadrant, are you increasing fees to fund something that many in the quadrant will not use?

Alderman Baggett asked on the other hand, is the city reimbursing developers for parkland area such as a walking trails that are not available to all citizens who live in the area?

Mr. Stuckey: As it stands now, 25% is dedicated to broader parkland projects with 75% allocated to direct amenities within the four quadrants. In the year to come, policy discussions or changes can be made to direct funds more to the large-scale features such as ball fields.

Alderman Petersen noted that over the years single family lots have decreased in size to the point there isn't space for a playset in the backyard. This should be considered as part of the larger issue.

13. Discussion Of Downtown Paid Parking And Parking Management

Sponsors: Emily Wright, Shanna McCoy, Adam Moser

Ms. Wright: The zoning ordinance prior to the 2019 adoption established a minimum parking allowance for each building use and allowed the parking to be paid parking as an option. Around this time there was a significant increase is pay parking spaces in the downtown area that had traditionally been free parking. There wasn't a required review process or a way to monitor pay parking verses free parking because it had not been studied at the time. At the time of the 2019 adoption, a request to consider pay versus free parking was requested. The step that was taken was to require parking to be free and accessible to the public, unless otherwise determined by BOMA. This would allow individual property owners to make a request through BNS or the Planning Commission and appear before BOMA for a resolution.

Ms. McCoy: Currently, there are two pay parking requests that have not been resolved.

1. 94-98 East Main Street
2. 127 2nd Avenue South

There have also been a handful of requests that have been approved in which the owner allows for free parking during business hours and pay parking for after hours.

Mr. Moser: Referring to the 2022 downtown parking study, Mr. Moser highlighted the total number of spaces available in downtown Franklin, the occupancy at certain times of day and the total free parking spaces. The study showed that people are migrating to the pay parking spaces if the free parking is not available.

Ms. Wright: There are planned parking space increases that include the new city hall garage and the surface lot at Bicentennial Park. Concerns have been expressed about the impact on residential neighbors as their street parking is consumed by those searching for free parking along with the additional traffic this creates. Also, the negative perception of the city concerning high price parking and if someone receives a parking citation, the difficulty reaching the parking management company. Ms. Wright suggested a local permitting company to manage pay parking that would be more customer friendly in reviewing citations. Consulting a parking management expert to evaluate the cities policies regarding parking is another option. Lastly, if the Board is satisfied with how the parking is being handled, tweaks can be made to the current policy.

Alderman Blanton noted that she would hate to see the free parking garages spaces taken away as there aren't many towns where free parking is available. The small-town character and feel is taken away, once free parking is no longer available.

Mr. Stuckey: The city can regulate parking by requiring a certain amount of free parking spaces. There are changes the city can make to create a better parking situation for citizens.

Alderman Caesar suggested holding off on consulting a parking management expert until the new city hall garage and the Bicentennial Park surface lots are available to ease the parking issues.

Alderman Baggett agreed with consulting an expert because the city hall garage and Bicentennial Park parking area will not free up enough parking spaces to make a difference. Consistency in parking management is needed for the downtown corridor. Also, the minimum parking requirements stipulated by the zoning ordinance are killing the historical building uses. The character of downtown Franklin is in danger of being lost if the historical uses of buildings are not maintained.

Alderman Burger agreed with Alderman Baggett regarding consulting a parking management expert. Considering residential parking concerns, a city regulated sign or cover, as seen in Charleston, SC and Savannah, GA, can be placed over the parking meter that says reserved. If the resident doesn't need the parking space, the cover can be removed to allow parking. Another option to free up parking is offsite parking for downtown employees, freeing up parking garage spaces.

Greg Gamble. Mr. Gamble is speaking on behalf of the new owners of Anderson's garage who plan to open a restaurant in the 1200 square foot building. Parking cannot be built on the property as it is in the floodway. Across the street and next door there are 200 pay parking spaces available. The new owners of Anderson's garage are requesting to be a part of the BOMA/FMPC work session to discuss potential parking possibilities.

14. Presentation & Discussion Of 10-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Rankings

Sponsors: Paul Holzen

Mr. Holzen: The purpose of this discussion is to provide feedback based on priority ranking of CIP projects from each Alderman, focusing on areas of agreement among members. The top results of the prioritization for CIP include Goose Creek Bypass and Carothers Pkwy Extension, Eddy Lane improvements - Fort Granger Park -Liberty Pike, Battle Ave Bridge Replacement, Fire Station 3 Upgrades, South Margin St. and 5th Ave Intersection Improvements, Winstead Hill Park, Chestnut Bend Trail Improvements Project, and Mallory Ln. and Cool Springs Blvd. Improvements.

Mr. Stuckey suggested several other considerations the Board should remember when evaluating projects.

1. While replacement of Fire Station 3 is needed, funding the improvements is different than in the past because the station is an existing facility without a straight funding source. Previous fire station projects were funded primarily through a facility tax that is not available for these improvements.
2. There is an opportunity to receive more funding for the McEwen Phase IV project beyond the $30 million already secured.
3. It may be necessary defer the Robinson Lake project to ensure Southeast Park Phase I is completed within the budgeting parameters.
4. The current projects don't assume any changes in road impact fees. Should the Board act on road impact fee upgrades, there are conservative assumptions that could be made for additional road improvement projects.
5. Parkland projects appear to be lower in priority.

Factoring in these considerations, staff can provide an updated funding model to the Board if needed. Acknowledgment from the Board so that staff can freely explore ways to enhance funding capacity by looking at next year's budget, property reappraisal and discussions with TDOT about partnering with COF for large scale road projects. With direction from the Board, staff can look at ways to increase funding capacity that can address more of the city's needs.

Alderman Petersen stated that she would like to see options for Eddy Lane improvements including sidewalks. With houses so close to the road, expanding Eddy Lane to three lanes is not a possibility.

Mr. Holzen: Once the Board makes final funding decisions, staff can present different options and engage citizens regarding their concerns about Eddy Lane improvements.

Alderman Potts asked if any areas where the city can maximize resources is essential in addressing the traffic issues around the city with a focus on TDOT partnerships. More details and figures on property appraisals would be useful information for the Board to consider. Southeast Park funding is a priority with additional information regarding cost implications long-term if Robinson Lake is deferred.

Mr. Stuckey: The team is looking at lower scale options for Robinson Lake that will allow the area to be useful and move forward.

Alderman Baggett mentioned the city should live within its means regarding current projects but should consider new TDOT partnerships as every major artery in the city is a TDOT road. The city must examine potential road improvements as no one could have predicted when TDOT would make a change to the prioritization of projects.

Vice Mayor Brown agreed with Alderman Baggett.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

Meeting Adjourned @ 7:06 PM

Dr. Ken Moore, Mayor

Minutes Prepared by Eydie Hassell and Reviewed by Cayce Anderson, Deputy City Recorder, City Administrator's Office, 11/21/24, 3:45 PM