

MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

July 9, 2019 Regular Meeting at 7 p.m.

Brandon Butler, Chairman
Daniel Jenkins, V Chairman
Mike Anderson, 1st Secretary
Salvatore Cali, 2nd Secretary
John Blade, Mayor

Derek Burks, Commissioner
Jim Power
Sheree Qualls
Hayley Schulist

Present: Butler, Jenkins, Anderson, Cali, Blade, Burks, Power, Qualls, Schulist

Absent: -

Staff Present: City Manager Scott Collins, Micah Sullivan, City Engineer Kevin Blackmer, City Attorney Tim Potter

- Butler Called Meeting to Order at **7:00PM**
- Opening Prayer and Pledge –**Butler led Prayer and Pledge**
- Approval of Agenda –**Burks made a motion for approval. Blade Seconded. Vote taken; all were in favor.**
- Citizen Comments (limited to the first five citizens to sign in and three minutes each)
None
- Approval of Minutes: **June 11, 2019 – Regular Meeting**
Blade made a motion for approval. Anderson Seconded. Vote taken; all were in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. PC 2019-xx, A Resolution to Adopt Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations for the City of Fairview, Tennessee.
Butler opened Public Hearing. No one was present to speak for or against. Butler closed Public Hearing.
2. PC 2019-04, A Resolution to Adopt Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations for the City of Fairview, Tennessee.
Butler opened Public Hearing. No one was present to speak for or against. Butler closed Public Hearing.

NEW BUSINESS

1. PC 2019-xx, A Resolution to Adopt Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations for the City of Fairview, Tennessee.
Collins stated on fire hydrant installation in our Subdivision Regulations currently the regulation is 1,000 feet this reduces that regulation from 1,000 feet to 500 feet and also prevents a fire hydrant to be considered a part of a subdivision when the fire hydrant is located outside of the Subdivision. So, as a new subdivision is developed all fire hydrants to be considered within 500 feet of each other and must be within the new development not in a pre-existing fire hydrant outside of the development. Which may cause issues such as traffic diversions or hazards as those fire hydrants are in use. Butler asked was there any questions or discussions. Burks made a motion to approve. Power Seconded. Vote was taken. All were in favor.

2. PC 2019-04, A Resolution to Adopt Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations for the City of Fairview, Tennessee

Collins stated the information they have before them relates to cluster mailboxes within certain developments. A general specification regarding the construction of the cluster mailboxes and the requirement that the mailbox locations must have a minimum of two parking spaces and for every 20 units developed an additional parking space must be included. Collins stated they may recall when they discussed this the last time there were a couple of considerations within this 1) The regulation that the City is considering tonight is a regulation to require developers to meet approved or adopted United States Postal regulations. So, whatever United States Postal regulations would be is what the City would require to be done. We would also require some sort of certification from developer or builder that they had gotten those approvals from the United States postal service for that construction. 2) The City of Fairview would not in any way take ownership of these mailbox locations, that is unspecified in the United States Postal Service guidelines. However, since it's a United States Postal Service guideline not a City of Fairview requirement, our only requirement is that it meets the United States Postal Service then we would require some ownership outside of the City of Fairview be maintained for those items. Lastly, he handed out a copy of the United States Postal Service planning guideline for builders & developers. Our last discussion about this Mr. Power ask a question about the adequacy of adding one parking space for 20 locations. Page 6 pacifically addresses this in the handout they have, again this isn't for adoption but just for general purposes, at the bottom of page 6 states, placement of that mailbox within one block of residences. So, as they consider the addition of parking spaces, the guidelines that must be met by builders/developers are that the cluster mailboxes must be within one block of residences. So, if their requiring two parking spaces plus one for every 20, they think the required parking that the City is requiring would exceed what is necessary for what's outlined in United States Postal Service. So, that what you have before you tonight it remains unchanged from the previous reading but we did want to give you that answer as far as the one additional parking space for 20 residences was decided upon. Jenkins asked what does that mean if the development is larger than the one block that you would have multiple mailbox receptacles. Collins stated yes that's how he reads it, obviously if it's going to be in an apartment complex or some other multi family, that will be owned by the developer and managed in that way. The question comes when you have single family residency that are not HOA or not some other management, how that's managed, we don't have an answer for that and he doesn't think the US Postal Service does either but they do require, it reads it must be within one physical walking block and if anything is constructed and if anything is constructed further than a block away then a new cluster mailbox must be constructed. Power asked is the City going to come up with what is defined as a block. Collins stated he doesn't think the City will have to come up with that he thinks at some point the United States Postal Service at some point will have to identify that because, it's silent within this document, but within that you must consider ADA accessibility. Schulist there's no building signoff from Codes, correct it's from the Postal Service? Collins stated there will be two, within the resolution itself it has general design standards construction for the actual type of construction, we will have to sign off on that. So, that will be our requirement

what is in within that paragraph as far as the size and spacing, anything outside of that we would simply require a letter of documentation from the developer that they got from the United States Postal Service that states it meets their requirement. Qualls asked about a cover over these. Collins stated there would be incidences that they would be required to be covered, within this regulation and however it states that and we would inspect that and makes sure it's functional. Burks made a motion for approval. Power 2nd. Vote taken. All were in favor.

3. Site Plan, Innovative Lawns. Property located on Hwy 96 N (Map 18, Parcel 47.09). CG Zoning District. Property owned by R. Eric Grisham.

Jenkins read the staff report, which will become part of these minutes. Exhibit A. Collin stated he would refer to Engineer. Blackmer stated he's on his 2nd review of the process, the next step is to provide his comments back to the applicant. Butler asked owner did he understand, Trent Smith the Engineer with Southern Consulting for this project, also owner Eric present. Smith stated not really, they met with staff two weeks ago and agreed that a lot of the comments that were provided to them at that time weren't applicable, at the end of the meeting there were a few comments that left to remain that they did go and address, this is a little bit of a surprise there isn't a recommendation to take some action. Butler stated it sounds like he just got back some more documents he's reviewed them, he has some more comments so once it comes here it's going to be a list of variances they are trying to adjust, that's what he's feeling. Butler stated so they will get those comments then they will have a chance to adjust them and be back in August. Power made a motion to defer to August meeting. Anderson 2nd. Vote taken. All were in favor.

4. Site Plan. Waffle House. Property located on Fairview Blvd (Map 42, Parcel 168.07). MSMU Zoning District. Property owned by Bowie Commons, LLC.

Jenkins read the Staff Report, which will become part of these minutes. Exhibit A. Blackmer stated the comments were provided the 2nd review last week, just before this meeting we hadn't received revisions based on those comments. Jeremy with SEC Engineering and Ken Williams with Waffle House from the State Department. Jeremy stated they received the 2nd review cycle of comments with some minor little changes to the plan, they've already addressed those, he sent a email to Micah before the left the office today around 4 or 3, that all of those are addressed, he has a set of plans with him that show all the comments are addressed. He would like to submit those and move for a discussion of approval tonight. Butler stated if they are submitting something new tonight, we would probably like a chance to review it before we vote of something that they have seen. Jeremy his only concern is the remaining comments are just a couple minor site comments about erosion hills and stuff like that, he doesn't see why it couldn't be approved pending staff comments, that way they wouldn't have to come back next month. Collins stated the discussion he had and Mr. Blackmer may be able to address, the primary issue was, the usage or discharge of the on-site storm water detention and two matters that would need to be addressed within the property itself. Collin stated Mr. Blackmer can address the storm drain issue

specifically, as he understands it, has to do with inclusion of an offsite storm drain as a part of the development. Mr. Blackmer stated one of the comments on the plans was the storm water site requirements are met by overall subdivision detention ponds, his comments was that the drainage maps that were part of that over all development plan weren't included in the calculations. Micah did forward him an email today showing that from SEC saying that the drainage maps that were provided with that original study were not longer available. So, what he ended up looking at the drainage as a whole, looking at the subdivision regulations and looking at the outfall. Part of the regulations required looking at two storm water structures outside of that outfall. One of those inlets did not provide an invert, it said it could not be obtained, so he can't physically move forward on that not having that information to check to make sure that the drainage on site will not over iodate the drainage system on Highway 100, with that information he thinks they will be fine but he just hasn't been able to see that yet. Jeremy stated so the concern isn't for the storm water detention it's for the downstream conveying system that's handling our on-site water. Blackmer stated correct. Jeremy stated that wasn't expressed to them, they have provided the report and the detention calculations showing how the site met the storm water calculation with the larger plan of development but they weren't under the impression the storm water pipe was in question. They'd be happy to provide any calculations or provide anything else they'd like but this wasn't expressed to them. Collins stated if that's what they are talking about and that's the last issue to be considered on this item and it wouldn't require a variance and we're going to review that and to make sure that function is properly in that way, then if that's the primary concern, it would be the privilege of the Board to approve contingent upon on the City's Engineer confirming that drainage in fact to function as is designed. So that's clearly purview within the Board they could do given that's the only concern. If that was unable to be met, they would simply bring back to The Planning Commission advise them that it had not been met. Outside of that, as long as it could be met with our Engineers approval and the project Engineers stamp, he would comfortable offering that they consider that as approval contingent upon that final Engineering note. Qualls stated if the Engineer is comfortable and the staff is comfortable, she's comfortable. Cali stated it was hard to tell where the property is? Jeremy stated next to Mapco. Butler stated the staff has had a chance to review all the exterior elevations, monument sign, all that stuff, only thing that they are holding up in some drainage. Collins stated yes and the only discussion about the drainage is does it have a negative impact verses what it has today given the on-site detention and if the on-site detention pumps as is then apparently there would be no issue downstream. Butler stated of course we don't have them in front of them tonight so they can't discuss it. Burks stated one concern he always has when they do contingent it always seems to bite them in the backside, just historically. Collins state he's typically not a fan of the contingencies but given the fact that this is just a check of a drainage calculation, seems to be an imposition. Burks stated and considering one of our biggest issues is stormwater &

drainage, those seem to be common things that they have problems with, he would personally feel more comfortable if that was already done and a known product at this point. Power stated he's like Commissioner Burks he doesn't like contingencies, he feels a little more comfortable when it's our people that the contingency rest on opposed to a developer. Mr. Williams stated he thinks what he's hearing tonight is everything is okay with this development, they just have to confirm that the storm water, detention and drainage are adequate, if they would approve this contingent on that. The City Engineer and your staff will hold the reigns and make sure that Jeremy their Engineer provides and he will check these calculations and will make sure that the drainage works. If they have to extend this another 30 day it's not going to change anything except, he will have to go get an extension on his contract, he would appreciate if they would approve contingent on. Quall stated she deals with contingencies in her business and they don't scare her at all, they just have to make sure that the contingencies are met and she trust our Engineer to make sure they are met. She is in favor of approving with this one contingency. Jenkins state made a motion to approve the site plan for Waffle House property located on Fairview Blvd. under the condition that our City Engineer approves the drainage issues that were brought up tonight. Qualls Seconded. Anderson stated he would be for it because it's one parcel of property in front of Bowie Commons we just need to stay make sure they meet the drainage requirements. Vote was taken. All in favor except Burks and Blade. Motion passes.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Sweetbriar Springs Subdivision, Discussion on Current Road and Curb Profile, Owner Marlon Cunningham

Butler asked staff did they have any updates. Blackmer stated the information that was provided is what they requested from the last meeting. He was able to take the original plans lay them out side by side, he discovered there was some construction modifications some of the abilities that were coordinated with the Dickson Water Authority was all approved. All the information they had asked for has been provided, he has seen everything that he needed to take a look at. Butler asked does he make a positive recommendation for the variance for the adjustment. Blackmer stated yes. Burks stated he is glad to see it's going to work but he goes back to the argument they had last time with this applicant and also the applicant that was him also asking for a variance of he was suppose to do it this way and he didn't, no real good explanation as to why, this is what they had ask them to approve, it's what they approved. He doesn't understand why people can't follow through and do what is approved, they have a set of plans. Anderson stated he agrees, also believes if you're a developer and your hiring subs to do the work, their responsibility is to look at the work before they pay them to make sure everything, they have asked them to provide is put in to accordance to the plans and specs. If not, they shouldn't be paid and hopefully the developer had a bond on them. Blade stated he agrees with his two constituents when you draw plans you need to

follow plans, there's a reason they submitted plans for City Staff approval and they were approved based upon what they were recommended to do, he believes they should be held accountable. Jenkins stated sounds like their discussing that it will work per the engineer, that's not the question it's a matter of personal responsibility and integrity are they going to do what they say they will do, for that reason he can't have a clear conscious and say yes let's say yes lets go ahead and approve this. If he allows this it sets up a bad precedence for the future, for that reason he won't be able to approve this. Marlon Cunningham stated he was asked to talk about this, he understood that the Board was okay with this if the Engineer would approve and he understood that the Engineer said it was okay. He doesn't know where he misunderstood this, he's been getting paperwork and jumping through loop holes and getting everything, he needed to get in place for this because he thought that's what they were doing going off what the Engineer said if the calculations would work that the run off would be fine, that's what was at the meetings. Collins stated the general discussion were, as he recalls, at the site itself there were some construction matters that had taken place that were outside of the scope of what had been previously approved. Collins stated Mr. Cunningham had asked for some of those changes to be approved and the discussions were to have his Engineer to draw up the changes he was requesting to be made, show that everything works as that design would be, separate from the previous design and present that to The Planning Commission then The Planning Commission would make that decision whether to approve or deny those variances. Collins stated he believes at the 1st meeting it was all discussion, at the 2nd meeting it was discussion and have the Engineers draw these documents and present them so that staff could review them to make sure what they are presenting actually could or would work. That was done, that was presented now it's now it's back to The Planning Commission to consider the three variances regardless of the process where they were. So, really where they are tonight is where they would have been two years ago having the same variances been presented to them prior to any previous approval or construction. So, what they have before them is a request for variances after construction rather than prior to construction, outside of that the process is the same. The assertions that it would have been voted on or approved by The Planning Commission, that's not an allowable assertion because there's no way that could be approved without a vote of the Planning Commission. So, the request by staff was to have it redesigned in such a manner they propose it going forward to meet the current construction rather than what was approved then The Planning Commission has an ultimate say in whether or not to accept or approve those variances. Butler stated he understands the principle he sees that he's just trying to understand is this product going to cost Fairview long term once we take over that road. Blackmer stated having the curbs going in and out will make repaving a little more difficult milling and overlay will also probably cost a little more. Butler stated they once had a discussion that would be fixed. Cunningham stated that has been fixed, all the curbs have been cut straight in with the catch basins have been changed out with what was recommended by Mr. Collins, of

the 18" grades. The reason that was changed the prior Engineer had told him this would work, that the calculations would work, his Engineer was saying the calculations would work. Cunningham stated what Mr. Collins had told him was that he wanted the grades changed to line back up with the curb line and take that curve out of it and straighten it out and he did that. Right before the holiday a couple months ago he had talked to Mr. Collins about it and said he was going to be over the weekend he was going to be working on this and ask was he wasting his time changing out these catch basins because he wanted him to put in 18" catch basins opposed to 24, he has done a lot of work over there to what he had ask him to do. Collins stated clarify what was discusses was, the issue was the catch basin extended into the asphalt and the curbs were constructed in such a way to meet the catch basin in an S shape along the curb. The discussion was going from a 24" to an 18" so that the catch basins would be within the curb and that the Engineer would have to assert that the 18" catch basin would suffice in place of the 24", was the original discussion. Collins stated he's not any Engineer, he can't approve the storm drain, he can simply state that's the only way it's going to meet the existing curb and the Engineer is going to have to draft some sort of approval whether or not that's going to meet the storm drain as previously approved by the design for the storm drain, outside of that, that's were they are. Butler does the construction drawings not show the smaller drains. Blackmer stated his review is for the storm water and the modifications and how those relate and the design based on what was provided will be sufficient for what's out there. There were some modifications, adding a swell between some properties to kind of mitigate and slow the water down so that it doesn't all come off to quick with a smaller gutter. Blackmer states as far as the design goes it looks to it's going to work fine, as far as construction he can't speak to any of that. Cunningham stated he would like to remind them on the first phase it's an extruding curb, it's a completely different curb as opposed to the second phase. Butler asked is the new road narrower than the old road. Blackmer stated the road isn't narrower but the gutter is, so the roadway width is still the same. Butler stated so that would be either way with the curb detail, right. Blackmer yes. Collins stated he believes as constructed the road is one foot narrower, he believes it was approved at 30 feet and it's 29 feet. Butler asked was the new road the same size as the existing road. Cunningham stated it's the same. Collins stated he believes that is correct. Butler stated if it still functions as designed the runoff the curb & gutter, it's not a main road, it's tying into a road. He thinks it still functions as intended. Cunningham stated he thought he was doing what the board asked he wouldn't have done all this work and spent all this money on the curb and gutter if they turn him down tonight, he is going to have to spend a lot more money and tear all this out. Power stated in recalling it he does feel like that they did tell this gentleman that if he could get into compliance that they could somewhat see their way through this. Power stated Will Owen was the Engineer and he thinks they told him if the Engineer came back and told them it would work then they would be able to think about approving it that doesn't mean that he wants them to think he wants this happening again. Cunningham stated he promises

he wouldn't have made changes if he didn't have a comfortable feeling going forward with it that day, that's what he had told Mr. Collins with make those changes that he felt like the calculations would work. Burks stated Mr. Cunningham here's the problem we couldn't really consider it until they knew it was going to work or not, because if it came back that it the calculations doesn't work, there's no consideration to be had. So, if they have to ask is it even possible to work doesn't mean they are thinking about approving it, they just have to know because nobody knew. That information had to be provided before they could even have a real conversation. When does it stop, at what point do they say this is what the standard is, the standard is do what's approved. We need developers to do what they say they're going to do, if there is a variance that needs to be done, ask for it in advance before they spend the time and money. Anderson stated if they do approve this and someone else comes up and does the same thing and they go to the appeals board and say you let this one goes through why can't they let theirs go through. When does the standards stand for themselves and when does the variances cease to be discussed or taken every time something's not followed through? The general contractor puts up a bond and says he's going to build it according to these plans and specs that he has offered to the City, with that the bonds stands there and a promise to build accordance to plans and specs, this didn't occur in his subdivision, to him it's black and white. Jenkins stated Mr. Cunningham just to retrace this whole process, the developer comes before the Board and says here some plans and we approve the plans and says this is great to you right then you as a developer hands this to the builder and says this is what's approved built this, is this correct. Cunningham states he's the contractor and the developer. Cunningham stated he's on the job, he took the fault, the 1st meeting he took the fault, he never put the fault on anyone. Jenkins stated if he had hired a builder and they didn't follow through the burden of responsibility would be on him. Then at some point in time the decision was made instead of placing the responsibility on himself the burden of responsibility wants to be placed upon the Board, that's why he's uncomfortable. Blade stated two fundamental principles that are in his mind, 1) if they accept this, they are adding a burden to the City as they go forward with the improvements to the paving of the road, it will be more cumbersome upon them as it relates to expense. 2) The system that is installed is already inferior, it already has cracks in it, he's been over there and looked and it and he has serious problems with both those issues. Cunningham stated he had talked to Mr. Collins about that, he had said when driveways are put in the subdivision some of those cracks will all be replaced, whatever he needs to do as they do a walk through, going forward, those that have to be cut out, he has to fix those. Butler stated just for open discussion, he thinks the S curve has been fixed, they've lowered and made the drains smaller, that's what the calculations were showing the smaller drains and if they would suffice. He thinks no matter what the curb size is your probably going to see cracks, those usually, very often are cut and repaired out. Butler ask would anyone like to make a motion. Qualls asked does the City Engineer have a recommendation. Butler stated he thinks his stand point is from functionality,

thinks the calculations work, it's up to them to decide. Blackmer stated the calculations he has been provided the numbers work, the design works from a drainage standpoint, water that hits the site gets delivered off site as intended as designed. The other issues and things that have been discussed he hasn't been a part of, his role is to basically review what has been designed and check and make sure those things has been done. Qualls asked is there any additional cost to repave the roads. Blackmer stated as long as the S's have been taken out the it shouldn't be more; the milling and overlay would be a 12-foot lane and a 12-foot lane. Quall stated so that's good and the drainage is good so what happens if they don't approve it. Collins stated procedure there would be three items that would take place, 1) The Board would take no action, meaning the construction plans of record, that's what would have to be done 2) The Planning Commission can vote to approve the variances. 3) The Planning Commission can vote to deny the variances. He will remind them a silence or no action is in effect a denial of those because they have not been considered. Butler stated he will ask to make a motion one more time if not they will move forward. Jenkins make a motion to deny the variances for Sweet Briar Springs. Burks Seconded. Vote was taken all were in favor except Qualls.

BONDS AND LETTER OF CREDIT –

Reports for Discussion and Information

- City Planning Staff – Sullivan thanks them for being there, next month we do have a 6:00 Workshop next month.
- City Manager – Collins stated yes, the work session, there will likely need to be at the next Planning Commission meeting an executive session. There are some legal matters that have come before the City that will be related to some procedure matters for The Planning Commission. So, they will likely schedule an executive session, likely take place before the meeting is convened on August 13th, likely have the work session at 6:00p.m. and part of that will be an executive session they would adjourn out of the executive session into the regular meeting for that night. Secondly, they are working on a revised training schedule for this fall, they have talked about incorporate as much training as they can and compress that as much as they can. They are going to get a physical training schedule out so they can do a couple of work sessions for that training. Collins stated we've also identified some on line training and other resources that they can do individually so they can do that to get some certifications and time on line. They have all talked about the training agenda that they had; they want to increase that agenda just to make sure they are all getting as much as they can out of that, so if they get some emails from him in regarding that, that's what that will be. If there is on line training or other things to be done there will be links to that so they will be able to have that information back to them and they will be able to track it and make sure that done.
- City Engineer – Nothing
- City Attorney – Nothing

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Qualls – Qualls stated she doesn't want to make things easy by any means, she's in risk management, always weighing the risk on everything in her job and etc. When she feels like it's a very small risk and the risk is just in their hands, she thinks it's wise as a Planning Commission to approve it and let's move on because things are sticky enough as they are out there. Qualls stated there are a lot of business coming into here, if there is just 1, 2 or 5% risk you just have to weight, they have to look at the whole situation as far as what the contingency is and how it could come back on them. Qualls stated their decisions are very important because they impact the whole town of Fairview, she just a big believer to not intentionally being difficult, she hears from other people who does business in Thompson Station, Spring Hill and other places and says coming into Fairview is like pulling teeth, Fairview is so tough, they have so many, she doesn't want to be so difficult. Collins stated if it makes her feel better, they say the same thing everywhere else. She wants everything done right but not be more difficult than we have to

Anderson – Anderson stated this past month the Dickson Water & Sewer had a blockage in an existing line in Dickson not here, where a backflow off a grinder pump in a home, where they had like 2 feet in the home. They had recently taken out a policy to protect themselves against this. What is causing this is the disposable tissue that are being tossed down the sewer systems that cause a back-flow issue where they can't work with these tissues or other solids that would come backwards. The majority of the homes being built in Williamson County have the grinder pumps right out side their house and these houses are being exposed because of those kinds of issues. People are supposed to buy a back-flow Ryder on their home owners policy and he bet none of them has it. It was brought up last month and it's a real issue and it's nothing we're doing wrong, nothing Dickson Water is doing wrong, it's the product that's been sold doesn't do what it says it will do.

Schulist – Nothing

Power – Power stated he hates contingencies, probably if a contractor comes in here and asks for a contingency he will get a no vote from him but when it's on our staff on contingent what they do their job or not or whether they approve something or not he has to trust our staff. We have a new Engineer and he says he'll approve it or says he doesn't approve it; they don't move forward. Power stated if Waffle House had of come in here asking for a contingent, he wouldn't have voted for it but they have to trust their own staff. Power stated the other thing on the road he feels like they did lead him to believe what he was doing was the right thing in the discussion they had had before

Cali – Nothing

- Burks – Burks stated he's actually excited Waffle House is coming his son is astatic, he loves Waffle House. He's just leery of doing contingences because they've come back and bit us so many times, he would just like them to get out of the business of doing contingencies just get it right when it gets up to them. Burks stated he wasn't trying to be difficult with the Waffle House people, he's actually very pro Waffle House. Collins stated he thinks had they gotten that same document at noon today, we would have been able to report to them it does meet what needs to be met. He absolutely completely agrees and completely sympathetic, they got it at 4:30 in looking at the document it

absolutely appears it's going to meet that, they didn't want to give that assertion at this meeting but he has no doubt this time tomorrow that thing is done. Butler asked don't we have that time line if not submitted by a certain date because he would rather us to call them and say they're not going to make the agenda rather than them show up and say they don't know about something and make a ruckus. Collin stated we do but oddly because they had a little bit of time, they added a 2nd review so in all honesty they had more time for more review from the last meeting. Burks stated he's not trying to be difficult with developers and builders if they make a deal with them that they follow through. At some point they have say they have to do what they say their going to do and they have to start holding the people that come before them accountable because it's an agreement.

Blade – Blade stated two things, contingencies can be worked out by they can be disastrous, the second thing is their jobs aren't easy and sometimes saying no isn't an easy thing to say. In his profession as Mr. Burks said, if he makes a mistake, he owns it, he has contracts, he's stuck with it he has to make it right, tonight No was the right answer.

Jenkins – Jenkins stated he agrees with that, that being said there is a time and place for extending grace, extending mercy, he didn't feel like tonight was one of those nights, due to the violation of trust from that developer from past issues. Jenkins stated for the entire time he has served on this Board there was one specific case where this room was full of people complaining about drainage issues from a development that Marlon Cunningham developed, so there has already been a violation of trust there. Jenkins stated that issue as far as he understands still hasn't been fully resolved they just have let it go to this point, they really can't do anything about it and he didn't want to run that risk again. If someone builds up trust and they always come before them and respectfully have their plans together, they do what they say their going to do and then randomly after years of a relationship they do something that just isn't right then maybe right then it's the right time to extend grace, extend mercy in that situation. He just didn't feel like tonight with previous violations of trust from that one developer that tonight was the night to say yes that why he absolutely had to say no.

Butler – Butler stated he would entertain a motion to adjourn. Anderson made a motion to adjourn. Butler stated so moved. Adjourned at 8:10p.m

ADJOURNMENT –

Chairperson

Secretary