SUMNER COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
APRIL 21, 2026
REGULAR MEETING 5:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT:
DAVID KLEIN, CHAIRMAN
CHRISSI SMITH MILLER, VICE CHAIRMAN
ADAM ISSA
JON BELCHER
RON STRAHLE
TOMMY ELSTEN

MEMBERS ABSENT:
DEBORAH HOLMES

STAFF PRESENT:
SYDNY SIMPSON, COUNTY PLANNER
MARSHALL BOYD, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & ENGINEERING/COUNTY ENGINEER
KATHY YOUNG, STAFF PLANNER (MINUTE TAKER)
STEVE WEINER, COUNTY STAFF ATTORNEY

Mr. Klein called the meeting to order and requested that all stand.

INVOCATION & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. Issa provided the Invocation.

Mrs. Miller led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 20, 2026 MINUTES

Mrs. Miller made a motion to approve the January 2026 Minutes.
Mr. Strahle seconded the motion.
The motion passed with all voting members in favor and Mr. Issa abstaining.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 2026 AGENDA

Mrs. Miller made a motion to approve the April Agenda.
Mr. Belcher seconded the motion.
The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Klein stated that Public Comment will follow the presentation of each item on the agenda. He then turned the floor over to Ms. Simpson for staff presentation.

1. **RIGGS HWY 31W PUD – MAJOR PLAN AMENDMENT – R Rentals, LLC - Represented by Richard Graves Land Surveying – 4th Commission Voting District (Dillon Lamberth)**. Applicant is seeking a Major Plan Amendment for the purpose of requesting an additional building for mini storage use. Subject property is located at **4624 Hwy 31W, Cottontown, TN, 37048, is** Tax Map 036, Parcel 008.01, contains 2.48 acres and is zoned PUD.

Ms. Simpson began by noting this is the second amendment to the PUD, with the first happening administratively. She reviewed the details above. Ms. Simpson noted the request is to add an additional building. They are not requesting a change of use from the mini storage. This is an additional storage building to the site. The application is represented by Richard Graves Land Surveying, and all public notice requirements were met.

The original PUD was approved in January of 2024 by the County Commission with six buildings totaling 20,000 square feet. The site plan corresponded with the PUD approval. In October of 2024, the PUD was amended administratively with a design change from six to three buildings totaling 19,500 square feet. Ms. Simpson explained that because the amendment reduced both the number of buildings and the overall square footage, the modification qualified for administrative approval. Ms. Simpson noted the subsequent site plan was approved, construction has been completed, and Certificates of Occupancy have been issued based on the existing approval.

This amendment is to request a 6,000 square foot building, totaling 26,550 square feet for the approved mini-storage use. The County Zoning Resolution stipulates what can be approved administratively versus what must be approved through the Planning and County Commissions as essentially a rezoning as it must be treated the same way as the original approval. The additional square footage triggers the requirement of approval as a Major Plan Amendment.

Verification of the Public Notice requirements being met was displayed as well as verification of the required Neighborhood Meeting notice sent to property owners within 500 feet, noting staff attendance of the Neighborhood Meeting. No persons from the public attended.

A dated image from 2025 showed an aerial view of the site with the building pads in place. Ms. Simpson noted it is a nice-looking storage facility in the County.

The landscape plan from the original approval was shown with the six buildings. The staff level plan with the three buildings was displayed. Ms. Simpson noted the unique layout and stated she thought the original intention may have been to have four buildings, but the layer may have been left off. The site was graded to accommodate the additional building.

The proposed layout was shown. It appears the landscape buffer has been left intact. Ms. Simpson highlighted the long, narrow proposed building that is 20 feet in width for a total of 6,000 square feet. The aerial image with the superimposed property lines is off, but quite a bit of vegetation can be seen along the property line on the side where the building addition is proposed.

Ms. Simpson displayed photos to attempt to show the proposed location, noting Mr. Graves is in the audience and can confirm. The existing three buildings as constructed were shown.

This is in the Rural Place Type with commercial uses to the north and south. The proposed signage was shown with the brick monument based included with this amendment. The architectural renderings were shown. Ms. Simpson noted that most of the building will be screened by the hill that is in existence, so the front façade will be most visible rather than the long expanse of wall.

The amendment standards found in the Zoning Resolution were analyzed against the request.

1. The Amendment is not inconsistent with the County's 2035 Comprehensive Plan Framework Map, adopted by the Sumner County Commission, 2010.
2. Longstanding nonresidential use at this location. Request would continue commercial use, specifically with the mini storage use on PUD.
3. Applicant indicates that there is a need for this type of service in this area.
4. Amendment is stated as compatible with the County's 2035 plan, adopted in 2010.
5. Property located along a former Arterial State Route; commercial zoning to the north, south, and west.
6. Water service is available; sewer service is not needed for this use, fronts a Major Arterial Roadway.
7. Will not create spot zoning as property already has mini-storage PUD zoning designation.
8. Will this result in significant adverse impact on property values? No real estate appraisal or expert testimony has been submitted that indicates adverse impacts to property values. *See Sexton v. Anderson County, 587 SW 2d 663 (Tenn App 1979)*
9. Will this result in adverse impacts on the natural environment? No such negative impacts are anticipated with the proposal of this plan.

Ms. Simpson stated that what would happen next is that the Major PUD amendment request will go to Legislative Committee for two readings and then to the full County Commission, noting that it may be sent back to the Planning Commission for review at any point. Any future construction would need to be accompanied by site plan submittal, which can likely be processed administratively as the comments included in the packet addressed both the PUD amendment and site plan (such as the request for irrigation plans), and since the site is substantially built.

The example motions were presented.

Mr. Klein opened the public hearing.

No one spoke.

Mrs. Miller made a motion to discuss. Second by Belcher. Aye: All.

Mrs. Miller asked Ms. Simpson what date this came through. Ms. Simpson stated the original approval was January of 2024 from the County Commission and the amended in October of 2024 to go to the three buildings.

Mr. Belcher stated he noticed some property transfer documents in the packet and asked what they are pertaining to, clarifying the document was a $10 transfer. Ms. Simpson noted the representative could speak to that.

Richard Graves stated the property owner bought the property in his personal name and transferred it into an LLC.

Mr. Belcher referenced the landscape plan showing three existing buildings with the landscape around it. He stated that the south boundary seems to have a gap in the evergreens and are offset with decorative trees, and asked why it was done that way.

Ms. Simpson stated Mr. Suddath had also asked that question in the original staff comments, and she believed that the response to that comment was that due to the existing mature trees and slope, they believed the intent was met.

Mr. Belcher also noted that there was a note stating "this was not prepared under the supervision of a licensed architect" and asked if it was a requirement for the County. Ms. Simpson stated the requirement isn't for a landscape architect, but for a Type 2 buffer and the types of trees required in that buffer is specified in the Appendices with the types of species. She stated what they have is in line with the landscape requirements and is sufficient to meet the requirements.

Mr. Belcher asked the representative the percent occupancy of the three existing buildings.

Mr. Graves stated they are right at 70% and that's why they are anticipating the need for this building. He also added historical context for the building, stating they wanted to add the building when the amendment was done; it was a layer that was turned off by the engineer's staff. He stated he spoke with Mr. Suddath right after the minor change. It was previously an eye sore with the old garage that had been there for years, and Mr. Suddath advised waiting until Mr. Riggs completed the work to see what the product was and come back later. So, they have waited and are now bringing it back, noting that they met with Mr. Suddath before he left and he is pleased with how the site turned out with the drainage, the pond, everything. Staff has been on site and can confirm it is first class.

Mr. Graves further stated they are reaching a point to where the need is there, adding there won't be any access to the rear of the building that is facing to the south so the neighbors won't have anybody on that side of the property. He noted there are three or four big mature trees. They will have to take the curbing out, but the pad was already built during the construction when they laid it out in anticipation, due to the work they did on site, that it might be able to be approved.

Mr. Belcher noted there appeared to be about 18 units with roll up doors are being added. He asked how many existing units are there.

Mr. Graves said he could not answer that.

Mr. Klein asked if the back wall is going to be a retaining wall.

Mr. Graves responded by stating it is a 3:1 slope down to where the original pad was, and they sloped the property down so they wouldn't get into the tree roots, and when they do the site plan, they will take care of the drainage along the back.

Mr. Klein asked if the drainage would be taken care of with a concrete V-gutter. Mr. Graves responded yes, or with a French drain or something; the engineer will do that when the site plan comes back. He stated Mr. Riggs wanted to brick half the building on the owner's side with what would be visible once the plantings mature.

Mr. Strahle referenced the findings checklist, noting his primary concern is safety. He asked if the addition of one storage building will create or increase any known safety issue.

Ms. Simpson stated that they are not adding significant square footage from what was allowed in the original approval, and it was staff's recommendation that it did not warrant a traffic study, though the Planning Commission could request one.

Mr. Elsten asked the representative how much extra impervious area was going to be added.

Mr. Graves stated they are not adding any parking. Mr. Elsten asked if grass was going to be taken away to add rooftop. Mr. Graves stated 6,000 square feet will be added for the building, adding the engineer went back and looked at the pond and it was designed for this building so it all flows to the rear and not the highway. Ms. Simpson added it meets the FAR requirements. Mr. Graves added that about 85' to the northwest corner of the property is a fire hydrant.

Mrs. Miller stated she looked back at all the meetings and they didn't have a meeting in January of 2024; it was cancelled.

Ms. Simpson clarified if the question was related to County Commission, as the approval was from the County Commission in January of 2024, and it went to Planning Commission two months prior.

Mrs. Miller then added that it was approved through the full Commission and through Planning Commission, and then they changed it, but the change wasn't significant enough to come back to the Planning Commission, and now they want to change it again. She asked if they were going to wait another year and want to come back and do another 6,000 square feet, asking, "Where does it end?" She stated she can't support 6,000 square feet of a building, adding "I don't like it."

Mr. Klein asked if there is any other place to put a building on the property. He noted there is water in the back and the front is a setback. He asked Mr. Graves if there was any other place to put a building. Mr. Graves confirmed there was not another location available on this property.

Mr. Issa stated they have been very accommodating to the requests, including Mr. Suddath's requests, and didn't see any reason by the book to deny.

Motion by Issa:

1) **To provide a positive recommendation to the Sumner County Commission related to a Request for a Major Plan Amendment #2 for the Riggs Highway 31W PUD, contingent upon the following:**
    a) **Any future building construction or parking lot expansion shall be preceded by submittal of a commercial site plan; such site plan meet any and all applicable requirements of Chapter 14 of the County Zoning Resolution.**
    b) **Any proposed user of any existing building must obtain a Zoning Compliance Certificate from the County in order to receive a required Certificate of Occupancy for any building.**

Second by Strahle.
Aye: Issa, Strahle, Elsten, Belcher. Nay: Miller. The motion carried 4 to 1.

Mr. Klein turned the meeting over to Ms. Simpson for presentation.

2. **CRUTCHER STATION PUD, PHASE 3 – FINAL PLAT (Major) – Crutcher Station-Midwest LLC. - Represented by Ragan Smith – 24th Commission Voting District (Chrissi Miller).** Applicant is requesting Final Plat approval for 28 residential building lots, located north of **Jenkins Lane, Hendersonville, TN, 37075**. Subject property is on Tax Map 124, Parcel 043.03, contains 14.62 acres, and is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Ms. Simpson began by reviewing the agenda item description, adding that the representative, Mr. Natelli was in attendance. The water provider is White House Utility District. The development is part of a PUD, and this is compatible with the preliminary plat that was

previously approved. The project is fully vested in accordance with Tennessee Vested Property Rights Act of 2014.

Ms. Simpson showed a superimposed overlay of the plat on Google Earth aerial imagery. She reviewed the history, noting the preliminary plat was approved in July of 2022, with continual construction. She added that before a final plat can be reviewed by the Planning Commission, the infrastructure, including curb and gutter must be installed. The application was initially submitted in November, but due to weather, the final installation was delayed until now.

The overall development was shown, and then Phase 3 highlighted with the 28 lots and details. The roads have been constructed. The curb and gutter as well as the binder and base stone have now been installed. As-builts, and surety will be required before recording the plat, and sidewalks are to be installed concurrently with the house construction. The streets will be public. Water lines have been installed. The hydrants have been installed to meet 500-foot spacing requirements. The Stormwater maintenance agreement will be signed and recorded with the final plat.

Photos of Phase 3 were shown. The findings of fact were reviewed, noting adherence to those standards. Next steps were reviewed and example motions were presented.

Mr. Klein opened the public hearing.
No one spoke.

Mrs. Miller made a motion for discussion. Second by Issa. Aye: All.

Mrs. Miller stated this is why it is so important to get the new comprehensive plan correct and efficiently get it done so we don't have repeats of Crutcher Station. This was back when the County Commission was backed by a builder, developer, GNR whatever. "There's nothing we can do, this is a final plat. No ugliness to the builder, they are just doing what they are allowed to do, but this exactly what the entire county would have ended up like if we hadn't done the things that we have done on this Planning Commission. I am proud of what we have done. I have gotten heat for it, but unless you guys want entire Sumner County looking like this, you need to really work on that plan."

Mr. Klein said we would not have had ¼ acre lots approved by this Commission, and in 2013 they had the 2035 Comprehensive Plan approved by the Planning Commission, they just didn't implement it. Other questions?

Mr. Belcher asked about a sewer connection map note in the southwestern corner that reads "Potentially connect to a force main." He asked why they don't know whether it needs to connect to a force main or not.

Director Boyd stated he does not get involved with water and sewer as it is White House that controls what happens, but obviously if there is a problem, they will not sign the plat if water and sewer has not been taken care of.

Mr. Klein asked the applicant to come forward and explain.

Michael Natelli, applicant, explained that outside of when he became involved, it was not clear as to whether any lots would need to have a grinder pump to push material in the force main, and require a force main. It didn't end up being a requirement. Everything is gravity flow so far, in Phase 2 & 3 and we expect the same in future phases since it runs downhill. There is an existing sewer main that runs parallel to the creek, about 12" in size, everything gravity flows to that main.

Mr. Belcher reiterated that he finds it curious that at this stage, being the final plat, we still have a question on some of the documents that wouldn't know whether it's a force main or not. He noted the applicant answered that in that it is not typically a force main, but he found it curious that was included on the documents for a final plat when that should have been figured out by this point, which it has been.

Mr. Belcher then asked Mr. Boyd about a retention pond that drains to a culvert facing Jenkins Lane, and drains off the property. He asked if that was included in the runoff calculations to the adjacent property.

Mr. Boyd said that in terms of watershed breakdown, they have kept the water going the same direction as it was before, so they have reduced the rate at which that leaves the property.

Mr. Belcher stated he would like to piggyback on what Commissioner Miller spoke on, in that the water and sewer availability letter is dated, and everything about this project is dated, and there is a dire need for this commission to put in the regulations time limits for this sort of stuff so that it is not a perpetual project that can hang on and be grandfathered with prior regulations rather than being applicable to the current regulations.

Mr. Natelli asked if he could address and Chairman Klein agreed.

Mr. Natelli explained they have to obtain water and sewer letters from White House for all phases and he is not sure what information is dated.

Mr. Belcher stated the letter was dated 2024.

Mr. Natelli stated a letter was requested for Phases 2 & 3 and another for Phases 4, 5, & 6. They were provided by WHUD, knowing its capacity, and they felt comfortable issuing it, understanding how long construction takes that it was sufficient. He expounded that he understands it sat for a while before he was involved, but he hopes they will be proud as they are proud having built 150 communities over the last 40 years. They take a lot of pride in it and hopes they will be too.

Mr. Belcher stated it is a nice development; he just in agreement with Ms. Miller against density and doubts this Commission would have approved it.

Mr. Natelli said he sat on the Williamson County Comprehensive Plan Committee and shared his philosophy. He said he doesn't believe everything should be paved over and sprawl shouldn't happen. They asked him to join, and he warned them that reducing the acreage to five acre lots would prevent future ownership for future generations as it is too expensive, and they need to be careful about opportunity for differing economic strata, otherwise it will only be rich people who can afford that, and it has to be balanced. The cost of the infrastructure that serves many fewer properties is much higher, so there needs to be a balance of density, which serves more people at a lower cost. Not everything should be paved over or a subdivision. There should be large farms and those home owners can put their farms in a conservatorship to keep it from being subdivided. There are a lot of tools out there. This is a passion of ours and we are proud of what we do. We have numerous master planning awards in the country. I hope you visit the community and enjoy it. He respectfully cautioned to think through the whole process and what they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Klein stated "There are differing opinions, and lot costs are lot costs, and when you take an acre and divide it into four lots, those four lots get expensive, which drives up the price of other lands. You can look at it two ways, but we off topic." He noted it is a nice-looking project.

Mr. Belcher added that we have what he is speaking of with the urban growth boundary, and the urban growth boundary is the higher density near the cities, which controls the growth.

Mrs. Miller asked the starting price of the homes.

Mr. Natelli responded, $600,000

Mrs. Miller asked the size of the lots.

Mr. Klein responded about ¼ of an acre, about the price of the houses in Branham Mill on 2.5 acres.

Mrs. Miller stated that kills the narrative of 5 acres and a million dollars, so you are getting a $600,000 house on a ¼ of an acre.

Mr. Klein directed the meeting to questions or motions.

Motion by Strahle: To find all County Requirements are met, and to approve a Final Plat with all staff comments for Crutcher Station - Phase 3 contingent upon the following conditions:

a) **Applicant shall finalize construction and stabilization of all items as may be noted by County staff prior to signature of the Final Plat by the Planning Commission Secretary;**
b) **Applicant shall provide a surety in an amount of $171,200 for all remaining improvements within the proposed public right of way, as well as for all drainage and other private improvements;**
c) **As-Builts for all road and drainage infrastructure shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to Plat recording;**
d) **Applicant shall maintain any outstanding bonds and/or letters of credit until such time as the County provides authorization to release them.**

Second by Issa. Aye: Belcher, Issa, Elsten, Strahle. Nay: Miller. The motion carried 4 to 1.

Mr. Klein asked about the process for the Resolution. Ms. Simpson clarified the Resolution could be approved by the Planning Commission.

3. **PC RESOLUTION 2026-01: Amending the Sumner County Subdivision Regulations** related to road section specifications, including binder and stone base requirements. A staff presentation summarizing the proposed revisions will be conducted. **The agenda item was advertised in the Gallatin News on Thursday, April 2nd, 2026. THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.**

Ms. Simpson stated the information was presented at the work study session preceding the meeting and the change is to revise the Rural Estate Cross Section from the 2" base to a 3" base. The public notice was published April 2nd. The example motions were presented.

Mrs. Miller made a motion: To approve Resolution 2026-01, related to the adoption of revisions to the County Subdivision Regulations by the Sumner County Regional Planning Commission.

Second by Issa.

Mr. Klein opened the public hearing.
No one spoke.

Aye: Belcher, Miller, Elsten, Strahle, Issa, Klein.
The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Issa asked to speak. Acknowledged by Chairman Klein.

Mr. Issa noted he abstained from voting on the January minutes.

4. SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS JANUARY 8, 2026 - PRESENT:

a) Stacey Durham Property, Minor Plat
b) Lot 2, Daniel Green Property, Plat Amendment
c) Lot 1, Virginia and Royce B. Daw, Jr. Property, Plat Amendment
d) Lot 2, Cold Pond Acres, Plat Amendment
e) Franky J., Woods, Minor Plat
f) Joey Rogers Plat, Minor Plat
g) Colby Smith Subdivision, Minor Plat
h) Lot 5, Calvert Tracts, Plat Amendment
i) Resubdivision of Lot 17, of Section Three of the Arrowood Subdivision, Minor Plat
j) Resubdivision Lot 1, Robert D. Robinson, Sr., Minor Plat
k) Resubdivision of Lots 1 & 3 of The Final Resub Subdivision Plat of Lots 1, 2 & 3 of Emerald Point, Minor Plat
l) Hudson Acres, Minor Plat

Ms. Simpson noted a few interesting staff approvals. The Colby Smith Plat (g) was for a water tower that didn't have an easement, so the legal exemption was discussed. She also showed Kendra's Run, which was part of a PUD with a preliminary plat and final plat approved and recorded. The owner consolidated the lot with a new plat. Typically, three lots would be a Major Plat, but because there was vested PUD approval, a preliminary plat approval, and even a final plat approved and recorded, this was viewed as reverting back to the original approval/vesting rather than treated as a new subdivision. If it was not a PUD, this would have come to the Planning Commission, but it had vested rights in this configuration.

Mr. Strahle asked for a copy of the approval documents. Ms. Simpson noted they will be emailed.

Mr. Klein acknowledged Ms. Miller's request to speak. Ms. Miller asked for an update on the Cottontown Flood Study.

Mr. Boyd noted it was anticipated to start in July, but he would confirm with the Corps to make sure it is on track.

Mr. Klein asked for clarification.

Mr. Boyd explained the Corps has a program for local communities to request a flood study to be done. We put that request in several years ago.

Mrs. Miller clarified there was an issue with Martin Lane, and she wants to make sure the ball doesn't get dropped. She also said she understood Marshall was the interim director and wanted an update on the progress of that.

Mr. Boyd explained that he was confirmed as the Director several months ago and Sydny is the Planner. It is a little different from when Josh was here. Josh was the Director and the County Planner. Now Marshall is the County Engineer and Director, and Sydny is the Planner. I got your vote, so thank you.

Mr. Klein asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Issa made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Klein said before we do that, he is proud of the Planning Commission over the past 3.5 years. Mr. Klein stated that the Commission had responded to citizens' requests to manage growth and believed those efforts had been effective. The 2050 Comprehensive Plan will help to further control the growth. As mentioned earlier, a ten-pound bag doesn't take much more than ten pounds before it splits. When people say it is too hard for a twenty-year-old to buy a house, it has always been hard to buy a first house. That is the way life is. You have to work harder. I wouldn't let any of that get to any of us.

Mr. Belcher requested of Sydny, rather than having "X's" can we put checkmarks and "NA" rather than leaving it blank.

Ms. Simpson noted staff doesn't fill the checklist out, the applicant does, so staff will try to give clear instructions.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Miller made a motion to adjourn.
Second by Issa.
The meeting adjourned at 6:03 PM.

APPROVED BY _____ **DATE** 6/16/26
(Chairman)

_____ **DATE** 6-17-26
(Secretary of the Planning Commission)