



## Meeting Minutes

### Franklin Municipal Planning Commission

---

Thursday, July 24, 2025

7:00 PM

Williamson County  
Auditorium

---

*Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission will be held on the date, time and at the location listed above. Additional information can be found at [www.franklintn.gov/planning](http://www.franklintn.gov/planning).*

*The typical process for discussing an item is as follows:*

1. Staff Presentation
2. Public comments
3. Applicant presentation, and
4. Motion / discussion / vote

*Applicants are encouraged to attend the meeting, even if they agree with the staff recommendation. The Planning Commission may defer or disapprove an application/request unless someone is present to represent it.*

*For accommodations due to disabilities or other special arrangements, please contact the Human Resources Department at (615) 791-3216, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.*

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lindsey called the meeting to order at 07:02 PM

Board Members Present: Marcia Allen, Jimmy Franks, Scott Harrison, Roger Lindsey (Chair), Michael Orr, Alma McLemore, Jenny Williamson, Ann Petersen

Board Members Absent: Nick Mann

**CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open for citizens to be heard on any issue or concern, including those related to items on the agenda. Please submit a Speaker Card at the beginning of the meeting if you would like to address the Commission. If you would like to speak on a non-consent agenda item, the Chair will hold your comment until the public comment period associated with the item. As provided by law, the Planning Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments for items not on the agenda, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director for administrative consideration, or to a schedule the matter for consideration at a later date. Those addressing the Commission are requested to come to the microphone and identify themselves by name and address for the official record. The Chair may restrict the period for public comment, including the length of the public comment period, the number of individuals who can speak and the length of time each individual may speak. When time allows, the standard individual public comment time is two minutes.)**

Chair Roger Lindsey asked for citizen comments. There were none.

**Comments on agenda items may be made in person at the meeting or by emailing [planningintake@franklintn.gov](mailto:planningintake@franklintn.gov) before noon on the day before the meeting. Emailed comments will be provided to the Commission and included in the minutes, but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting.**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Consideration Of Approval Of The June 26, 2025, FMPC Minutes.

**Sponsors:**

- Attachments:**
1. DRAFT FMPC minutes June 26 2025
  2. Citizen handouts Item #27

A motion was made by Commissioner Allen, seconded by Commissioner Harrison to approve the Minutes from the June 26, 2025, meeting. The motion carried 8-0.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ms. Wright recognized Officer Ryan Schuman and announced that Officer Schuman will be retiring from the police department with his last day being July 31, 2025. Officer Schuman has been present at the Planning Commission meetings over the years, keeping everyone safe. Ms. Wright congratulated and thanked Officer Schuman for his service to the city and the Planning Commission.

Secondly, Ms. Wright announced that October is "Planning Month." Chelsea Randolph will be heading up several activities throughout the month focused on engaging local officials in the community. An email will be sent with dates and times of the events. Ms. Wright asked the Commissioners to go ahead and put October 1, 2025, on their calendar for an event at Eastern Flank Event Facility from 8 am to 12 pm. The event is called Urban Plan Workshop and will be led by the Urban Land Institute. The workshop is an interactive fictional case study focused on gaining more understanding into the nature of Land-Use decisions, the tradeoffs and the private and public roles with the purpose of creating a better community. Also, the workshop would count towards the Planning Commission's four required continuing education credit hours. The workshop is available to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and the Planning Commission with more information about registration to follow in an email.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

2. Consideration Of Approval Of Items 3-8 And 13 On The Consent Agenda.

**Sponsors:**

**Attachments:** None

A motion was made by Commissioner Harrison, seconded by Commissioner McLemore to approve items 3-8 and 13 as presented on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried 8-0.

**SITE PLAN SURETIES**

3. Amelia Park PUD Subdivision, Final Plat, Section 5; Accept The Sidewalks Improvement, Release The Performance Agreement And Establish A One-Year Maintenance Agreement; Extend The Performance Agreement For Streets Improvement To January 22, 2026. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

- Attachments:**
1. Action request - 7-2025 sidewalk
  2. 07-2025 - Street Department 20

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

4. Berry Farms Reams-Fleming Tract PUD Subdivision, Site Plan, Infrastructure; Extend The Performance Agreement For Drainage And Sidewalks Improvements To July 23, 2026. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

**Attachments:** None

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

5. Carothers Development Property Subdivision, Final Plat, Revision 1; Accept The Acces, Sidewalks And Streets Improvements, Release The Performance Agreement. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

**Attachments:**

1. Action request - 7-2025
2. 07-2025 - Street Department 25
3. 07-2025 - Street Department 26
4. 07-2025 - Street Department 27

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

6. Harts Landmark Subdivision; Extend The Maintenance Agreement For Water Improvement To October 23, 2025. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

**Attachments:** None

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

7. Longview Subdivision, Final Plat, Revision 1, Lots 11 and 12; Extend The Performance Agreement For Green Infastructure Improvement To July 23, 2026. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

**Attachments:** None

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

8. Quail Hollow Subdivision, Site Plan, Section 2, Lot 11 (O'Reilly Auto Parts); Extend The Performance Agreement For Drainage Improvement To July 23, 2026. (CONSENT AGENDA)

**Sponsors:** Melodie Brady

**Attachments:** None

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

## REZONINGS/DEVELOPMENT PLANS

9. Consideration of Ordinance 2025-22: An Ordinance To Rezone 27.19 Acres Planned (PD 21.8/850,000/700) District To Planned (PD 33.1/245,460/300) District For The Property Located South Of McEwen Drive And West Of Carothers Parkway (Aureum PUD Subdivision).

**Sponsors:** Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Chelsea Randolph

**Attachments:**

1. MAP Aureum PUD Subdivision, Rezoning and Development Plan Revision 3
2. ORD\_2025-22\_AureumPUDSubRez\_Combined\_LawApproved
3. REZONING Aureum PUD Subdivision
4. Applicant Presentation FMPC Aureum

Staff Presentation: Chelsea Randolph. Ms. Randolph stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone 27.19 Acres located south of McEwen Drive and west of Carothers Parkway, also known as Aureum PUD Subdivision from Planned District PD 21.8 – 850,000 square feet of nonresidential, 700 hotel keys to Planned District PD33.1 – 245,460 square feet of nonresidential and 300 hotel keys. The development plan has been submitted concurrently. Envision Franklin places this property in the Regional Commerce Design Concept which should contain high-intensity activity that attracts large numbers of people and employers from both within and outside the city. These areas include major employment and revenue generators that are valuable community resources. Envision Franklin's Regional Commerce Design Concept also states that, "New developments should have integrated designs with coordinated access, amenities, and cohesive architecture that fits within the context of the corridor. The proposed mix of uses (Multifamily Residential, Office, and Commercial) as outlined in the Aureum PUD Development Plan (Resolution 2025-53) meets the intent of the Regional Commerce Design Concept by providing activated streetscapes and comprehensive site planning.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to approve Ordinance 2025-22.

Public Comments: None

Applicant: Glen McGee, Southstar. Mr. McGee stated that the project was originally approved in 2019 with work set to begin in 2020, then COVID hit. Since then, the economy has changed along with the goals for this property. The project was heavy on office space in the beginning, and since then, the team has spent several years envisioning the best use of the property. The residential portion, Phase I, began a couple of years ago and is underway with extensive off site improvements already complete. Mr. McGee thanked Reagan Smith, Gamble Design Collaborative and Nelson architectural from Atlanta for a unique, executable, and financially solid plan appropriate for the property and the Franklin community.

Greg Gamble, Gamble Design Collaborative. Mr. Gamble stated that he will be presenting a new master plan for consideration that includes 900 homes, 400 hotel rooms, 92,860 square feet of restaurant and retail and 153,600 square feet of office space. A key aspect of the master plan includes a change in traffic impacts by a significant portion. A reduction of 4,000 average daily trips through the McEwen and Carothers corridors, which is down 110 trips during the am peak hours and down 333 trips during the pm peak hours.

#### MOTION

Commissioner McLemore motioned to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-22: An Ordinance To Rezone 27.19 Acres Planned (PD21.8/850,000/700) District To Planned (PD 33.1/245,460/300) District For The Property Located South Of McEwen Drive And West Of Carothers Parkway (Aureum PUD Subdivision) to the Board Of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Franks. Without discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

10. Consideration Of Resolution 2025-53, A Resolution Approving A Revised Development Plan For Aureum PUD Subdivision With 4 Modifications Of Development Standards (Roof Forms And Signs) For The Property Located South Of East McEwen Drive And West Of Carothers Parkway.

**Sponsors:** Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Chelsea Randolph

- Attachments:**
1. MAP Aureum PUD Subdivision, Rezoning and Development Plan Revision 3
  2. RES\_2025-53\_AureumPUDSubDevPlan\_Combined\_LawApproved03
  3. COF 8851 Aureum PUD Subdivision, Development Plan, Revision 3 Conditions of Approval\_01
  4. OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PLAN Aureum PUD Subdivision
  5. MOS EXHIBIT Aureum PUD Subdivision
  6. 1-8 Pages from 2025-07-03 Aureum PUD - COF 8851
  7. 9-16 Pages from 2025-07-03 Aureum PUD - COF 8851-2
  8. 17-24 Pages from 2025-07-03 Aureum PUD - COF 8851-3
  9. 25-30 Pages from 2025-07-03 Aureum PUD - COF 8851-4
  10. Applicant Presentation FMPC Aureum

Staff Presentation: Chelsea Randolph. The applicant has submitted a development plan revision for Aureum PUD Subdivision, a multi-phase, mixed-use development located south of East McEwen Drive and west of Carothers Parkway. The applicant is proposing 900 multifamily dwelling units, 245,460 square feet of non-residential space, and 300 hotel

rooms. The proposed development plan is vested and has been reviewed under the July 2018 Zoning Ordinance. As detailed in the associated rezoning, Envision Franklin places these parcels within the Regional Commerce Design concept. The proposed mix of uses in the development plan meets the intent and guiding principles of the Regional Commerce design concept. A parking study has been submitted that analyzes the parking needs throughout the development in comparison to the requirements of the vested zoning ordinance. The applicant has incorporated shared parking that will be utilized. The shared parking study meets the requirements of Chapter 5.9.11(2), which outlines that an alternative parking plan may be utilized with the justification that "includes information on the size and type of the proposed development, the composition of tenants, the anticipated rate of parking turnover, and the anticipated peak parking and traffic loads for all uses that will be sharing off-street parking spaces. Staff support the proposed shared parking analysis, based on National Parking publications. The shared parking utilization will support parking efficiency over convenience but does provide for a small surplus during the allocated peak utilization timeframe. The residential uses are part of the proposed share factor and are not assigned dedicated spaces. The traffic impact analysis has been submitted and reviewed, and Staff agrees with all proposed improvements. The parkland agreement will be executed and will coincide with this development plan when the development plan is considered by the BOMA.

#### MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS:

Ms. Randolph explained that there are four Modification of Standards (MOS) requests for this plan. This plan also has an existing MOS that was previously approved by BOMA on June 11, 2019, with the original Aureum PUD Subdivision Development Plan. Ms. Randolph noted that she prepared a "cheat sheet" for the Commissioners covering the Modification of Standards. Green indicates that staff recommend approval and red indicates a recommendation of disapproval.

MOS #1: Requesting a modification of standards to allow pitched or gabled roofs in addition to flat or low-pitched roofs for non-residential and mixed-use structures. Pitched roofs are requested in the Village Center zone as designated within the development plan and the MOS exhibit (attached to staff report).

Chapter 5.3.6(9)(c) states, "Flat or low-pitched roofs with parapet walls are encouraged within traditional areas; however, sloped roofs are permitted as necessary as a transitional feature, as allowed in Subsection 5.3.4, Transitional Features." The zoning ordinance has more recently been updated to allow for pitched or gabled roofs, so this request is now consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommend approval of MOS #1.

MOS #2: Requesting a modification of standards to allow a maximum of (3) digital, interactive wayfinding screen panels in the designated zones within the Village Center as designated within the development plan and the MOS exhibit (attached to staff report).

Chapter 5.12.9(5) states, "The following signs are prohibited in all zoning districts: Moving signs" as well as, Chapter 5.12.5(6)(c) states, "Exposed neon and LED that are visible are prohibited for signs and shall not be incorporated into the design of a principal or accessory structure." Moving signs of any kind and LED and exposed neon are not allowed per the current ordinance and have been prohibited since the last major update to the signage standards. We are not able to regulate the content of signs and moving digital signs opens up the possibility for scrolling ads, or some other information not related to business names, directory information, etc. The request to allow prohibited moving signs for digital, interactive screen panels is not consistent with the purpose and intent of not only the vested zoning ordinance but also the current zoning ordinance. Staff recommends disapproval of MOS #2.

MOS #3: Requesting a modification of standards to allow for neon lighting, LED lighting to be used as internal illumination when the sign has a 3-dimensional depth (within a channel or when used to reinforce the design of the sign), or when used as back-lighting to create halo lighting effect.

Chapter 5.12.5(6)(c) states, "Exposed neon and LED that are visible are prohibited for signs and shall not be incorporated into the design of a principal or accessory structure." The current zoning ordinance also prohibits these types of illumination. The request to allow prohibited sign illumination is not consistent with the purpose and intent of not only the vested zoning ordinance but also the current zoning ordinance. Staff recommends disapproval of MOS #3.

MOS #4: Requesting a modification of standards to allow string lighting as an appropriate lighting solution in pedestrian-oriented areas, dining areas, and amenity spaces within the development. String lights will be permitted in designated zones within the development plan and the MOS exhibits (attached to staff report). There shall be no string lights or other hanging obstructions within the public ROW or spanning fire access lanes.

Chapter 5.12.9(13) states, "Signs Prohibited in All Base Districts - The following signs shall be prohibited and may neither be erected nor maintained: String Lights." The zoning ordinance has more recently been updated to allow string lights. The request to allow string lights is now consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommends approval of MOS #4.

Ms. Randolph noted, as a project consideration, the vested and approved development plan utilizes the Conventional Design Standards as opposed to the Traditional Design Standards. The zoning ordinance that this plan is vested in allowed for this property to use either Traditional or Conventional Design Standards. The Traditional and Conventional Design Standards are outlined in the staff report. This change is notable only primarily because it reduces the parking requirements as well as the open space requirement from 5% to 3%.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to approve Resolution 2025-53, with conditions.

Public Comments: None

Applicant: Greg Gamble, Gamble Design Collaborative. Mr. Gamble began by discussing the area on the corner of McEwen Drive and Carothers Parkway that many have asked about. This area will have a small pond water feature with a rock-lined edge. In the background, there will be a hotel along with an office building with retail restaurants on the bottom floor. Mr. Gamble presented a large board rendering, not part of the submittal documents, showing the park-like setting of the pond with the office building in the background. The uses of this building include office space over ground floor restaurants and retail space that enclose the area between the pond and the building for a unique park-like gathering space. The intent of the project for the Regional Commerce design concept, as suggested by Envision Franklin, is to create areas where people can live, work and play. The first phase of the project has been approved, building permits pulled with construction set to begin soon. The second phase in the middle block includes retail, restaurant, residential and the park area. The third phase in the north section of the development will have a special focus on storm water management as drainage runs from south to north. Off-site road improvements to be completed during Phase II of the project include the addition of a second lane to the south side of McEwen Drive from I-65 to Aureum Drive and the addition of two turn lanes, westbound along McEwen Drive to access Hume Drive. Secondly, as the middle block is constructed, road improvements will include two right-turn lanes turning onto Carothers Parkway extending all the way to the right-in, right-out. Two new turn lanes will be added to Carothers Parkway, northbound, with a left turn onto Ovation Parkway. Mr. Gamble referenced a rendering of the Central Park area and stated that the goal is to attract and accommodate all age groups to the outdoor space that will have ground floor outdoor dining along with rooftop dining. To attract and activate the retail areas surrounding the park, inviting streetscapes and landscaping along with pedestrian connectivity will encourage easy movement in and around the buildings. Aureum is playing a role in creating a mountain bike park and hiking trail system in the middle of Cool Springs that will connect to the bike trails associated with Columbia State and will eventually connect to the trails at Liberty Park. The Aureum development was approved in 2019 and is vested in the zoning ordinances in place in 2019. Some of the modifications of standards being requested are now included in the updated zoning ordinances. For example, the MOS requests for festival lights and pitched roofs or gables are now included and allowed within the current zoning ordinances. Regarding the MOS relating to signage and wayfinding, the proposed interactive signs are new and unique. For the development of this size, a modern, updated way-finding package is necessary. The team identified three areas on the master plan where signage would be needed, within the park space around the restaurant, retail areas, and shops. The proposed type of signage would provide for better wayfinding within the master plan. The team is hoping for special opportunities to handle signage in a fun and different way as this project moves forward.

#### **MOTION (Main Motion)**

Commissioner Allen motioned to recommend approval of Resolution 2025-53, A Resolution Approving A Revised Development Plan For Aureum PUD Subdivision With 4 Modifications Of Development Standards (Roof Forms And Signs) For The Property Located South Of East McEwen Drive And West Of Carothers Parkway with conditions to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

#### **MOS MOTIONS**

**MOS #1.** A request to allow pitched or gabled roofs in addition to flat or low-pitched roofs for non-residential and mixed-use structures. Pitched roofs are requested in the Village Center zone as designated within the development plan and the MOS exhibit (attached to staff report).

Commissioner Orr motioned to recommend approval of MOS #1 relating to pitched or gabled roofs in the Village Center zone to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner McLemore. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

MOS #2. A request to allow a maximum of (3) digital, interactive wayfinding screen panels in the designated zones within the Village Center as designated within the development plan and the MOS exhibit (attached to staff report).

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of MOS #2 to allow use of three digital/interactive signs in designated zones within the Village Center to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Allen stated that she would not vote against staff's recommendation even though a precedent has been set through previous signage approvals. Commissioner Allen suggested that if the Commission is going to approve signage by going against the zoning requirements, the sign ordinance may need to be changed. Otherwise, the Commission will continue to see signage Modification of Standards requests and staff will continue to recommend against those requests.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 6-2 (Commissioners Allen and Williamson voting against).

MOS #3. A request to allow for neon lighting, LED lighting to be used as internal illumination when the sign has a 3-dimensional depth (within a channel or when used to reinforce the design of the sign), or when used as back-lighting to create halo lighting effect.

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of MOS #3, a request to use neon/LED lighting for internal illumination for 3-dimensional sign depth or when used as back-lighting to create a halo lighting effect, to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner McLemore.

Commissioner Williamson stated that she could not support a recommendation to BOMA for neon or LED lighting for internal illumination. Halo lighting is one thing but exposed open channels of neon or LED illumination is another.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 6-2 (Commissioners Allen and Williamson voting against).

MOS #4. A request to allow string lighting as an appropriate lighting solution in pedestrian-oriented areas, dining areas, and amenity spaces within the development. String lights will be permitted in designated zones within the development plan and the MOS exhibits (attached to staff report). There shall be no string lights or other hanging obstructions within the public ROW or spanning fire access lanes.

Commissioner McLemore motioned to recommend approval of MOS #4, a request to allow string lighting as proposed to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

There being no further discussion, the main motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

11. Consideration of Ordinance 2025-20, An Ordinance To Rezone 103.93 Acres From Planned (PD 12.23/480,000/450) District To (PD 15.34/1,655,000/350) District For The Property Located At The Southeast Corner Of East McEwen Drive And Carothers Parkway (Ovation PUD Subdivision).

**Sponsors:** Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Chelsea Randolph

**Attachments:**

1. MAP Ovation PUD Subdivision, Rezoning and Development Plan
2. ORD\_2025-20\_OvationPUDSubRez\_Combined\_LawApproved
3. REZONING EXHIBITS Ovation PUD Subdivision
4. Ovation Rezoned Parcel Exhibit
5. Applicant Presentation

Staff Presentation: Chelsea Randolph. Ms. Randolph stated that along with the rezoning request a development plan has been submitted concurrently. Envision Franklin places this property in the Regional Commerce Design Concept. The Regional Commerce Design concept states that these areas "contains high-intensity activity centers that attract large numbers of people and employers from both within and outside the City. These areas include major employment and

revenue generators that are valuable community resources." Envision Franklin's Regional Commerce Design Concept also states that, "New developments should have integrated designs with coordinated access, amenities, and cohesive architecture that fits within the context of the corridor." A separate development plan is being considered with this rezoning. The proposed mix of uses (Attached Residential, Office, and Commercial) as outlined in the Ovation PUD Development Plan (Resolution 2025-52) meets the intent of the Regional Commerce Design Concept by providing activated streetscapes and comprehensive site planning.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to approve Ordinance 2025-20

Public Comments: None

Applicant: Alex Chambers, Highwoods Realty. Mr. Chambers thanked the Commission for their time and thanked staff for their help navigating through the process.

Greg Gamble, Gamble Design Collaborative. Mr. Gamble explained that although the vesting has expired for the development plan, the development plan is approved and could be developed as it exists today. Ovation Boulevard has been constructed. Originally, the community plan consisted of 77.7 acres. The development plan in front of the Board proposes 104.5 acres and includes Regional Commerce 12. As part of the original development plan, a traffic study was prepared for 1.4 million square feet of office space. The results indicated that there would be 32,000 daily trips associated with the plan in 2014. Mr. Gamble noted that it is important for the new plan to stay within the original parameters as the new road improvements to McEwen and Carothers are all tied to the original 2014 study. Highwoods and Centercal would like to avoid a stand-alone block of office space, instead an integration of office space into the overall master plan. The mixture of office and residential uses characteristic of the Regional Commerce concept will be what sustains Ovation and Cool Springs long-term. The restaurants associated with Ovation will thrive at lunch because of the office traffic and thrive in the evening because of the residential component. The new plan will have an increase in 1100 trips per day while staying within the parameters of the 2014 study. Mr. Gamble stated that more information regarding the development plan will be presented during the next item.

#### MOTION

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of Ordinance 2025-20, An Ordinance To Rezone 103.93 Acres From Planned (PD 12.23/480,000/450) District To (PD 15.34/1,655,000/350) District For The Property Located At The Southeast Corner Of East McEwen Drive And Carothers Parkway (Ovation PUD Subdivision) to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

12. Consideration Of Resolution 2025-52, A Resolution Approving A Revised Development Plan For Ovation PUD Subdivision With 8 Modifications Of Development Standards (Building Type, Retaining Wall Height, And Parking Structures), For The Property Located At The Southeast Corner Of East McEwen Drive And Carothers Parkway.

**Sponsors:** Emily Wright, Amy Diaz-Barriga, Chelsea Randolph

- Attachments:**
1. MAP Ovation PUD Subdivision, Rezoning and Development Plan
  2. RES\_2025-52\_OvationPUDSubDevPlan\_Combined\_LawApproved02.pdf (1)
  3. COF 8849 Ovation PUD Subdivision, Development Plan, Revision 2 Conditions of Approval\_01
  4. OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PLAN Ovation PUD Subdivision
  5. MOS REQUEST EXHIBIT Ovation PUD Subdivision 5
  6. 33-40 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-5
  7. 41-18 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-6
  8. 49-56 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-7
  9. 57-64 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-8
  10. 65-67 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-9
  11. 1-8 Pages from 2025-07-08 Ovation DP Rev2
  12. 9-16 Pages from 2025-07-08 Ovation DP Rev2
  13. 17-24 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-3

14. 25-32 Pages from 2025-07-03 Ovation DP Rev 2-4
15. 2025-07-02\_Ovation Shared Parking Study\_Revised\_FINAL
16. Applicant Presentation

Staff Presentation: Chelsea Randolph. Ms. Randolph stated that The applicant has submitted a development plan for Ovation PUD Subdivision, a multiphase, mixed- use development. The plan proposes 1525 multifamily dwelling units, 69 townhouse dwelling units, 1,655,000 square feet of nonresidential space, and 350 hotel rooms for a site that is composed of 103.93 acres. As detailed in the associated rezoning, Envision Franklin places these parcels within the Regional Commerce Design concept and the proposed mix of uses meet the intent and guiding principles of the Regional Commerce design concept. A shared parking study has been submitted that analyzes the parking needs inside the Ovation Parkway loop in comparison to the requirements of the vested zoning ordinance and, in this case, it would be the 2025 Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has incorporated shared parking that will be utilized. The shared parking study meets the requirements of chapter 10.4.1, allowing the reduction of 2339 spaces inside the Ovation Parkway loop. Any uses outside the Ovation Parkway loop will individually meet the parking requirements within the zoning ordinance without the utilization of a shared parking plan. The traffic impact analysis has been submitted and reviewed, and the staff agrees with all proposed improvements. The parkland agreement will be executed and will coincide with this development plan when the development plan is considered by the BOMA at the next work session.

MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS: Ms. Randolph stated that there are 8 modifications of standards request for this plan.

MOS #1: Requesting a modification of standards to allow a maximum block length of 3,600 LF for the block encompassing the Wetland Park and stormwater management area.

Chapter 3.6.5 (Internal Street Network) states, "Block length perimeter shall not exceed a maximum of 2,400 feet, except the DRT may approve a block length perimeter up to 3,200 feet in cases:

1. Where environmental or topographic constraints exist;
2. Where the street classification prevents a connection; or
3. Where a proposal includes an internal parking structure."

The proposed block length is 3, 598 linear feet, which is nearly 400 linear feet more than what can be approved administratively. With that said, the block encompasses an existing wetland area which includes two sections of protected stream and stream buffer area as well as an existing stormwater management area. This block includes two parking structures and a fire lane, which provides emergency and pedestrian access through the block. This request meets the standards laid out for staff within the zoning ordinance but exceeds the amount allowable to be approved administratively. The request also does not threaten the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommend approval of MOS #1.

MOS #2: Requesting a modification of standards to allow flat roofs with parapets for the Townhouse Building Type.

Chapter 6.6 states the roof element's pitch, "3:12 to 12:12, excluding small roof sections over porches, entryways, or similar features". Staff can support this request based on the proposed urban, mixed-use context and the precedent set by the approval of a similar MOS for the adjacent development (Aureum PUD). Staff recommend approval of MOS #2.

MOS #3: Requesting a modification of standards to allow up to 50% of Retail Storefronts on Commercial / Mixed-Use building types to not have transom windows and to allow up to 50% of Retail Storefronts on Commercial/Mixed-Use building types to not have knee walls.

Chapter 6.9 (Building Elements - Retail Storefronts) states, "Any storefront shall have display windows, transom windows, knee walls of between 18 and 24 inches tall, and other architectural elements such as bulkheads, trim, and cornice details." This request is not consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance. Knee walls provide a base which is required for facade composition by our zoning ordinance. Both knee walls and transoms define a more traditional, classic design which is prioritized in this building type. In addition, the request results in practical difficulties in enforcement and tracking of the 50% allowance. Staff recommend disapproval of MOS #3.

MOS #4: Requesting a modification of standards to allow up to three of the following as primary materials on a facade: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a large-scale office building type.

Chapter 6.10 states, "Primary Materials on Facade: Up to three of the following: brick, natural stone, or cultured stone." Staff requested more information addressing why pre-cast is suitable and advised the applicant to provide some explanation as to how the addition of pre-cast concrete would enhance the design of the development more than if the standards were strictly adhered to, and adequate explanation was not provided. Limited example photos were provided, with the majority of the examples being from other locations. There are no specifications related to the application of the proposed pre-cast concrete material in terms of scoring or facade variation, as discussed at the Joint Conceptual Workshop. This request is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommend disapproval of MOS #4.

MOS #5: Requesting a modification of standards to allow up to three of the following: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, smooth wood siding, fiber cement siding, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a commercial/mixed-use building type.

Chapter 6.9 states, "Primary Materials on Facade: Up to two of the following: brick, natural stone, cultured stone, smooth wood siding, or fiber cement siding." Staff requested more information addressing why pre-cast is suitable and advised the applicant to provide some explanation as to how the addition of pre-cast concrete would enhance the design of the development more than if the standards were strictly adhered to and adequate explanation was not provided. Staff does not support the addition of pre-cast concrete. Limited example photos were provided, with the majority of the examples being from other locations. There are no specifications related to the application of the proposed pre-cast concrete material in terms of scoring or facade variation, as discussed at the Joint Conceptual Workshop. This request is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommend disapproval of MOS #5.

MOS #6: Requesting a modification of standards to eliminate the requirement for planting at the base of the retaining wall behind building J, as shown in the development plan.

Chapter 13.2.5.A (Retaining Walls for Multifamily, Nonresidential, and Mixed Uses) states, "Each retaining wall shall have a single row of evergreen shrubs, planted every five feet on center, at the base of the wall to soften its appearance. Shrubs shall be a minimum of 30 inches in height at the time of planting. Evergreen trees or ground covers may be permitted as an alternative, subject to the approval of the Department of Planning and Sustainability." The existence of the established riparian buffer meets the intent of the screening of retaining walls. Therefore, the request does not threaten the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommends approval of MOS #6.

MOS #7: Requesting a modification of standards to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum height of 22 feet for one wall, located behind building J; and to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum of 16' adjacent to Brook Meadow Lane. Locations are shown in the development plan.

Chapter 13.2.5 states, "Maximum Height of Retaining Walls: 10 feet". The applicant is purposing to exceed the height allowance within Chapter 13 in two places on the site. Both walls could be reduced if the density of the site overall was reduced. The applicant has not provided any exhibits that detail that the height of these walls would enhance the design of the site. This request is contradictory to the purpose and intent of this section of the zoning ordinance. Staff recommend disapproval of MOS #7.

MOS #8: Requesting a modification of standards to place a parking structure parallel to the Carothers Parkway and the McEwen Drive Right of Ways, as shown in the development plan.

Chapter 10.5.2.A (Parking Structures) states, "Outside of the CFO and CAO, where along an arterial or collector street, parking structures shall be screened by buildings at least as tall as the parking structures." The zoning ordinance clearly requires that where along an arterial or collector street, at-or-above grade parking structures shall be screened by buildings at least as tall as the parking structures. The proposed MOS does not enhance the design of the development more than if the standards were strictly adhered to. The conditions upon which the request is based do not seem unique to the design intent for the development and seem to be applicable generally to other properties, and the modification is not consistent with Envision Franklin or the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the adjacent development (Aureum) was able to locate their parking structures internally to the site and meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance. Staff advises the same for this site.

The request for the parking structure along McEwen Drive right-of-way is about 390 feet from the right-of-way. Staff was

clear on the importance of showing the view from McEwen Drive of the proposed parking structure. While a few graphics were provided to show the distance from McEwen Drive and the topography/natural features between McEwen and the parking structure, there were no graphics or exhibits provided to ensure that the parking structure wouldn't be viewed from the right-of way. The graphics provided seem to only shed light on how much of this structure will be seen from McEwen and while there is a large amount of space between the parking structure and McEwen, there appears to be only a small portion of the structure that will be screened from view. These requests threaten the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance and are not consistent with the level of design expected within the City of Franklin.

Staff recommends disapproval of MOS #8 unless the following conditions are achieved with the purpose of meeting a greater public benefit for the overall transportation system in a high priority regional transit corridor that could justify the placement of a parking structure along a major arterial street against Zoning Ordinance requirements:

- (1) A regional and/or local transit ticket office with possible ancillary amenities is located on the first floor of the parking structure along Carothers to activate the ground floor facing the street;
- (2) A transit stop (perhaps with a designated pull-off area) is located on Carothers Parkway adjacent to the parking structure, and pedestrian connections are provided directly from the parking structure to the transit stop;
- (3) A specified amount of park and ride parking spaces, as determined by the City of Franklin and regional and local transit providers, are provided within the Carothers Parkway parking structure;
- (4) The shared parking study is updated at One-Stop to reflect the park and ride spaces, as staff anticipates there to be minimal impact to the development's parking demand at the peak times; and
- (5) Elevated architectural detailing is provided on the facades of both parking structures to make the appearance of the parking structures mimic other buildings in the development.

Furthermore, the city of Franklin, the applicant and representatives with regional transit partners have recently begun discussions about the possibility of a future park-and-ride location within this proposed development. The development's location is a high-priority regional transit corridor and the inclusion of transit accommodations along with park and ride spaces could justify the placement of a parking structure along a major arterial street against typical zoning ordinance requirements and an effort to achieve a greater public benefit for the overall transportation system.

Ms. Randolph provided a final summary of the applicant's request, staff recommendations, and other options for the FMPC to consider as a motion for MOS #8:

- 1) Approval of parking structures as proposed, and the elevations of the parking structures meet the basic requirements of the zoning ordinance.
- 2) Approval with conditions (applicant's request). The location of the parking structures are recommended to be approved as proposed, and that the elevations of the parking structures meet conditions provided by the applicant, for the applicant to explain.
- 3) Disapproval – This would mean that the location of the parking structures along the arterial streets are recommended to be disapproved, unless the zoning ordinance requirements for parking structures, to be screened by buildings-at least as tall as the parking structure, are met.
- 4) Disapproval with staff comments. This option would include staff's recommendation that the location of the parking structures along the arterial streets are recommended to be disapproved, unless the zoning ordinance requirement for parking structures, to be screened by buildings at least as tall as the parking structure, is met, or the plan provides the conditions with staff's recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to approve Resolution 2025-52, with conditions.

Ms. Wright added a quick note about the Commissioner's cheat sheet regarding MOS #6 and #7. Modification of Standards #7 is listed as #6 and MOS #6 is listed as #7.

Public Comments: None

Applicant: Greg Gamble, Gamble Design Collaborative. Mr. Gamble stated that there will be multiple entrances to Ovation with the goal of having a Central Park area as the main gathering area where you would find outdoor dining, a food hall, programmed events, an outdoor movie screen and a grand lawn. This central area can be accessed from McEwen, Carothers and from Ovation Parkway. The pink buildings noted in the application documents are mixed use with ground floor retail,

restaurant, personal services and are part of the 400,000 square feet of commercial space. The blue buildings are intended to be office buildings with a coffee shop or café on the ground floor. Mr. Gamble explained that the office buildings could be built during any phase of development depending on market demand as Highwoods has intentionally planned. The first phase of development will be the area around Central Park moving down Live Oak Lane. The orange buildings on the other side of the street on Ovation Parkway are condos and for-sale townhomes. The master plan includes a 29-acre mountain bike park, an 11-acre wetland park with boardwalks and educational signage and biodiversity that one would anticipate seeing in an urban wetland. Staff suggested a traffic study combining Aureum and Ovation looking at both updated developments at the same time. The results include a new eastbound lane on the south side of McEwen, creating a three-lane section with additional turn lanes. Also, a new westbound lane on the north side of McEwen adds more capacity to access I-65. One of the concerns from the joint conceptual workshop was the building height on the corner of McEwen and Carothers. A self-imposed restriction for a maximum of eight stories has been determined for this corner. In the development plan, the building is given a range of 4-8 stories in height. Also, self-imposed restrictions of a 10-story maximum on the office building along Carothers Parkway. While Envision Franklin, RC 12, allows for a maximum of 12 stories, Mr. Gamble stated that the expected height would be somewhere between 6 and 10 stories. The only buildings that would be upwards of 12 stories would be predominantly office buildings that are internal to the development, buildings S and P. Mr. Gamble shared information from a massing study to provide a perspective of the buildings. There might be one 12-story building but the other would need to be capped at 6 or 7 stories as indicated in the development plan. There are several aspects Highwoods and CenterCal have designed allowing flexibility as the plan develops over time along with restrictions that cap how intense the development can be as it's being built out.

Regarding the modification of standards not supported by staff, the team has gathered additional information. To accommodate grade changes going down Ovation Parkway, knee walls would help transition the grades going down the sidewalks. Transom windows will be part of the design of storefront shops for restaurants and retailers and the team would like to have the opportunity to have special situations where the glass goes down to the sidewalk or where glass goes to the ceiling. The team agrees that it would be very difficult to monitor 50/50 percentages of knee walls and transoms, over time, despite good intentions. Mr. Gamble asked the Commission to consider the MOS without the monitored 50/50 percentages, recognizing the ability not to have transom windows and not have any walls. Regarding retaining wall height, MOS #7, Mr. Gamble explained that the first retaining wall is directly off McEwen Drive. There is a small section of the wall that is 22 feet high transitioning to 15 feet on each side and then to 10 feet. This section is a valley where stormwater comes out into the channel of the stream. The section is very small with the wall being 586 feet from McEwen and screened by the protected tree area and stream buffer. In the master plan, there are two fixed points of access into Ovation, one from a right-in-right-out at McEwen that cannot move. That right-in-right-out cannot be closer to Caruthers Parkway. It cannot be further to the right because of environmental protections. There's another right-in-right-out off Carothers Parkway that's in a fixed location making very little room for adjustments in this block area. The second retaining wall is 16 feet in height right off Ovation Parkway and Brick Meadow Lane. Mr. Gamble stated that he's asked the engineers to go back to the drawing board and see if this wall can be designed without a modification of the standards. Mr. Gamble asked in the motion regarding retaining walls to not include the retaining wall on Brook Meadow Lane and to remove the wall from being part of the modification of standards.

Chuck Gannaway, Hastings Architecture. Mr. Gannaway provided additional information regarding the MOS for the use of precast material. Mr. Gannaway explained that he has used precast as a primary building material for 25 years. It is more of an architectural precast that provides a variety of shapes, textures, colors, profiles, finishes and is long-lasting and very durable. Mr. Gannaway stated that the architectural precast is a high-quality material that he would place in the same family as brick or stone.

Mr. Gamble added that the architectural precast material is proposed to be used for the hotel and the large-scale office buildings.

Mr. Gamble addressed the MOS relating to the parking garage by referring to a rendering that shows how the parking garages can be designed in such a way that they look and feel like a building. An elevated architectural design for the garage can be achieved, where it fits and makes sense, by adding a cap, middle and base to the building along with breaking up the structure so that it looks like a collection of buildings. The garage is 100 feet from Carothers Parkway Right Of Way and 67 feet at the closest point. Landscaping can be added where there is a lot of depth, separating the parking deck from Carothers. The second parking garage, deck R, is aligned with the Mars parking garage and as you drive down McEwen, one does not feel the presence of a parking garage right on the road. Pushing the garage back further becomes problematic for the overall master plan and design as the drive alignment would not match up with the Mars garage across the street. Mr. Gamble highlighted the wetland areas that do not meet the block parameters for informational purposes. Lastly, Mr.

Gamble suggested that if the Commission is inclined to support MOS #8 (parking garages), please include the self-imposed restrictions as part of the motion.

Ms. Wright noted that Ms. Randolph added the language of Mr. Gamble's conditions for MOS #8 at the end of the staff report.

Commissioner Allen asked about the regional transit plan and at what stage of planning the project is in.

Mr. Wiseman stated that the transit plan discussions have been very encouraging with meetings as recently as this week. With the passage of the referendum in Nashville, additional funds have been freed up to be used elsewhere.

Mr. Chambers explained that meetings with Franklin Transit and WeGo have begun, but it is very early in the process. Discussions with Gray Line about providing parking have also been ongoing until WeGo is up and running or until the City or County comes up with a better system.

Chair Lindsey asked what role WeGo would have in the transit plan.

Mr. Chambers stated that WeGo would provide motor coaches that would pick up in Franklin and drop off in Nashville and/or the airport. Franklin would serve as a transfer station and tie in with the Franklin Transit system, providing smaller shuttles throughout Franklin. Additional funds are available if Franklin can serve as a transit stop along with a transfer station. There is a great opportunity for a slip line off Carothers, but until more information is known about the grants, it's difficult to know the direction of the plan. Everyone is at the table for discussion with meetings with Aureum and Franklin Transit working out how all the components will work together.

#### **MAIN MOTION**

Commissioner Allen motioned to recommend approval of Resolution 2025-52, A Resolution Approving A Revised Development Plan For Ovation PUD Subdivision With 8 Modifications Of Development Standards (Building Type, Retaining Wall Height, And Parking Structures), For The Property Located At The Southeast Corner Of East McEwen Drive And Carothers Parkway to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen with conditions, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Chair Lindsey stated that the Modification of Standards requests are very confusing and if a Commissioner chooses to make a recommendation or move to send the applicant back to staff for additional work, that would be acceptable. There was a lot of jumping around from one MOS to the other along with a separate cheat sheet. The Commission will handle the easy MOS and, if necessary, the difficult or unclear MOS requests can regroup or go back to the drawing board with staff and try again. The suggestion that the Commission should not consider one part of a MOS request is vague and unclear.

Commissioners Franks and Orr encouraged and agreed that the Commission can sort out the unclear MOS requests one by one.

#### **MOS MOTIONS**

**MOS #1.** A request for a modification of standards to allow a maximum block length of 3,600 LF for the block encompassing the Wetland Park and stormwater management area.

Commissioner Orr motioned to recommend approval of MOS #1, to allow a maximum block length of 3,600 LF block encompassing the Wetland Park and stormwater management area, seconded by Commissioner McLemore. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

**MOS #2.** A request for a modification of standards to allow flat roofs with parapets for the Townhouse Building Type.

Commissioner Orr motioned to recommend approval of MOS #2, to allow flat roofs with parapets for the Townhouse Building Type, seconded by Commissioner Harrison. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

**MOS #3.** A request for a modification of standards to allow up to 50% of Retail Storefronts on Commercial / Mixed-Use building types to not have transom windows and to allow up to 50% of Retail Storefronts on Commercial/Mixed-Use

building types to not have knee walls.

Commissioner Orr motioned to recommend approval of MOS #3 with the text that says up to 50% of transoms and knee walls in two locations be omitted, seconded by Commissioner Williamson.

Commissioner Williamson stated that in downtown Franklin, the Registry and Ruby Sunshine have storefronts that go down to the ground, adding the historical component that makes this MOS appropriate. Also, the North McEwen area is a similar caliber project to this one, making the storefront (down to the ground) suitable. Commissioner Williamson also recommended a variety of storefronts, not all the same.

Commissioner Allen stated that she can support the motion because of the change in the numbers, as she had concerns about staff's ability to monitor the storefronts over time.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

MOS #4. A request for a modification of standards to allow up to three of the following as primary materials on a facade: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a large-scale office building type.

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of MOS #4 to allow up to three of the following as primary materials on a facade: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a large-scale office building type, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Williamson asked if there were any requirements or recommendations for secondary building materials.

Ms. Diaz-Barriga explained that there is not a requirement for secondary material, but accent materials are permitted but cannot be used on more than 25% of the building. There is no requirement beyond the primaries if the building is constructed using at least one of the primary materials or a combination of three primary materials is acceptable. Other limitations such as building type will affect the building material. Every so many feet the building must change in mass and form. This could be a color change or material change. Depending on the length of the building, it won't be one solid mass of a single material.

Commissioner Williamson stated that she can support the architectural precast material but has concerns about setting a precedent for future projects and how the precast material is used.

Ms. Diaz-Barriga explained that they are asking for the use of precast concrete, which there are no parameters in the zoning ordinance regarding precast, so it is difficult to regulate. If this MOS is approved, this is the only project that could use precast material until the next project requests precast use through a MOS or until the zoning ordinance is changed to allow use of precast material.

Commissioner Allen stated that she has concerns about the use of this material because initially staff had requested more information. Commissioner Allen stated that she cannot support the MOS because of the lack of information such as photos and details about the concrete being stamped or not stamped.

Commissioner Franks stated that precast material adds a historical feel, and it is a high-quality material. Looking at the application documents, the light color helps blend and balance the buildings in the community. It would be nice for the applicant to expand and provide more information for educational purposes or possibly defer the MOS.

Ms. Billingsley stated that if you defer one MOS, you defer the entire application back to the next FMPC voting meeting or whatever meeting is decided upon.

Commissioner Franks asked if the deferral would delay the project going before BOMA.

Ms. Diaz-Barriga stated that until the application is voted on by the FMPC, the application will not be on the BOMA schedule.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 7-1 (Commissioner Allen voting against).

MOS #5. A request for a modification of standards to allow up to three of the following: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, smooth wood siding, fiber cement siding, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a commercial/mixed-use building type.

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of MOS #5 to allow up to three of the following: Brick, natural stone, cultured stone, smooth wood siding, fiber cement siding, or pre-cast concrete as primary material on a facade for a commercial/mixed-use building type, seconded by Commissioner Orr. The motion carried by a vote of 7-1 (Commissioner Allen voting against).

MOS #6. A request to eliminate the requirement for planting at the base of the retaining wall behind building J, as shown in the development plan.

Commissioner Harrison motioned to recommend approval of MOS #6, to eliminate the requirement for planting at the base of the retaining wall behind building J, as shown in the development plan, seconded by Commissioner McLemore. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

MOS #7. A request to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum height of 22 feet for one wall, located behind building J; and to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum of 16' adjacent to Brook Meadow Lane. Locations are shown in the development plan.

Ms. Wright reminded the Commission that at the request of the applicant, the second retaining wall request in MOS #7 is to be removed (to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum of 16' adjacent to Brook Meadow Lane).

Commissioner Franks motioned to recommend approval of MOS #7 A request to increase the maximum retaining wall height to a maximum height of 22 feet for one wall, located behind building J only, seconded by Commissioner Harrison.

Commissioner Allen stated that she will support this MOS because of the physical constraints of the property and because the 22-foot height wall is for a small section and not the full length of the retaining wall. There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

MOS #8. A request to place a parking structure parallel to the Carothers Parkway and the McEwen Drive Right of Ways, as shown in the development plan.

Commissioner Harrison motioned to recommend approval of MOS #8, option #2 - Approval with conditions (conditions: the building include a base, middle and cap, a minimum of three different building facades applied along the facade facing the arterial road, unless it's a shorter distance of less than 150ft, then only two facades would be required pedestrian access, face entry facing the arterial road and foundation landscape plan to be provided along the base of the parking structure), per the applicants request, seconded by Commissioner Orr.

Commissioner Allen stated that she feels strongly about the regional ramifications of this project and, if this is approved, recommends staff's comments on number 4, A-E, be adopted by the property owner. The staff's recommendations are for the betterment of the whole area and will benefit everyone.

Commissioner Williamson agreed with Commissioner Allen and stated that although the transit plan is in early talks, when the time comes, if the applicant could adopt staff's recommendations, it would be beneficial to the entire region.

Commissioner McLemore also echoed Commissioners Allen and Williamson's statements and stated that this is the first time this type of plan has been presented to FMPC, and she will strongly support it when the time comes.

Commissioner McLemore asked if the handout should be noted.

Ms. Wright stated that the Commission's choice will be noted in the minutes. Staff recommended disapproval with staff comments (#4) regarding the transit system and the overall transportation improvements. Staff applauds the applicant's efforts to enhance the architecture through number two, although staff would not have conditions related to the transportation and transit piece. This would not preclude the applicant from moving forward with WeGo and Franklin Transit, it would be at their own discretion and timeline. Ms. Wright stated the conditions are that the building include a

base, middle and cap, a minimum of three different building facades they apply along the facade facing the arterial road, unless it's a shorter distance of less than 150ft (then only two facades would be required pedestrian access), face an entry facing the arterial road, and foundation landscape plan to be provided along the base of the parking structure.

Commissioners Franks and McLemore made statements but they were unclear as their microphones were not turned on.

Commissioner Orr stated that unless a decision is made on the parking garage MOS #8, the transit piece may not matter.

Mr. Gamble stated that CenterCal is financially incentivized by financial contributions to be provided by WeGo in federal grants to participate in this program so that the parking garage can be paid for, making their overhead cost less. CenterCal is excited about exploring the opportunities and will continue to do so with 100% energy to see if the transit plan will work. There are a lot of reasons that this is a good idea.

Commissioner Williamson stated that one thing to avoid is the appearance of concrete slabs of the garage parking decks. The applicant appears to have addressed this issue in the proposal.

There being no further discussion of MOS #8, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Chair Lindsey reviewed the MOS approvals - MOS #1 for block length, MOS #2 for roof elements, MOS #3 with modified language, MOS #4 for material/large scale office building, MOS #5 for material and commercial mixed-use building type, MOS # 6 for planting and retaining walls, MOS #7 approval with the removal of the 16-foot wall section adjacent to Brook Meadow Lane and MOS #8 – as discussed.

There being no further discussion of the main motion, the motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

#### **SITE PLANS, PRELIMINARY PLATS, AND FINAL PLATS**

13. Tuck Away PUD Subdivision, Site Plan, Developing 31,607 Square Feet Of Institutional Space, On 25.64 Acres, Located At 1192 Lewisburg Pike. (CONSENT AGENDA)

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

**Attachments:**

1. MAP Tuck Away PUD Subdivision, Site Plan
2. 8764 Tuck Away PUD SP\_Conditions of Approval\_01
3. 20250703- Tuck Away PUD Subdivision - Plans

The item was Approved on Consent Agenda.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Chair Roger Lindsey asked if there was any further business. There was none.

#### **ADJOURN**

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Orr, seconded by Commissioner Allen. The meeting adjourned at 09:06 p.m.

   
Chair Date