

CITY OF FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE

Meeting Notes



Meeting Date: May 26, 2022
Meeting Time: Varies
Meeting Location: Franklin City Hall

Project: Goose Creek Basin Coordinated Study of
Land Use, Infrastructure, and the Roadway Network

May 26, 2022 at 9:00 am (citizens from nearby city neighborhoods and property owners)

Attendees:

- Kelly Brown
- Jennifer Spergl
- Terrence Wittman
- Paul Widman
- Dan Klatt
- Don Harlan
- Rich Buckner
- Tom Climaco
- Amy Diaz-Barriga, COF
- Andrew Orr, COF
- Eric Conner, COF
- Jimmy Wiseman, COF
- Brandon Denny, CDM Smith
- Cynthia Bowen, REA
- Catherine Kazmierczak, REA

Notes:

- Development Pattern and Land Uses:
 - General comments:
 - The number of dwelling units being proposed (the averages being used to calculate dwelling units and floor area ratios) likely will not be supported by the public for either concept.
 - Single-family housing on an acre (1 unit per acre) is not the most attainable strategy.
 - Increase the density of single-family housing on an acre to continue matching development trends happening nearby and in adjacent communities.
 - What about Ironhorse? There might be 12-14 units per building within the development.
 - The Proposed Ag. Expo Expansion is shown on both land use concepts, but there are no firm plans set for this to be developed.
 - Could there be a different/better development plan for this parcel of land?
 - The infrastructure and roadway network in this area is a mess and would need to be addressed before development could continue.
 - This area should not look to repeat what Chadwell and Reams Fleming are doing, but development should be supportive of the uses that are going to be there.
 - The proposed land uses adjacent to the Crest at Ladd Park should be changed to create a better transition between the neighborhood and higher intensity uses. Residents living in this neighborhood would prefer there to be more of a transition between uses.
 - Change the development types from multifamily residential and mixed use to residential mix.
 - Do not want the existing homes to face new apartment developments. Townhomes, duplexes, or multiplex housing options would be more appropriate.



- Partial Interchange Concept:
 - Remove the multi-family residential use from the concept.
 - Single-use developments should not be promoted; single-use apartment complexes should not be allowed in this area.
- Commuting Patterns:
 - Apartment dwellers seem to be generating fewer trips than those in single-family homes.
 - Single-family homes may have more people who drive, or busy schedules that require multiple trips for various activities compared to those living in apartments.
 - Apartment dwellers may make multiple stops during one trip compared to those living in single-family homes.
- Conservation Areas:
 - Supportive of the areas called out for conservation.
 - For the proposed removal of the 12-acres of conservation land, does it make sense to remove it entirely if it is going to be removed for the purpose of extending the roadway?
 - The area is clear of trees, but the whole area may not be 100% developable.
 - There is an opportunity for development to happen with the roadway extension, and developers will fight for frontage along the roadway.
- Other Comments:
 - May want to consider having a meeting with the County (COF and County) to get their thoughts.
 - With all the proposed development happening in this area and the increased population, what about fire, police, schools, etc.? What will be the impacts and needs for these services?
 - Where will these facilities be located? Are they accounted for in these development concepts?
 - What will happen to taxes?
 - How will the development be paid for?



May 26, 2022 at 1:00 pm (Developers and Property Owners)

Attendees:

- David Crofton
- Austin Casselman
- Doug Tomlin
- Gloria Tomlin
- Debbie Poole
- Betsy Turnage
- Steve Smith
- Jim Reedy
- Carole Kim Williams
- Gary Vogrin
- Kelly Beasley
- Heath Adams
- James Webb
- Jamie Reedy
- Greg Gamble
- Dean Martin
- Pete Crutcher
- Cynthia Turnage
- Emily Wright - COF
- Amy Diaz-Barriga, COF
- Andrew Orr, COF
- Eric Conner, COF
- Jimmy Wiseman, COF
- Brandon Denny, CDM Smith
- Cynthia Bowen, REA
- Catherine Kazmierczak, REA
- Cynthia Bowen, REA

Notes:

- Development Pattern and Land Uses:
 - General comments:
 - This area could be the next Spring Hills if more mixed use development was built.
 - Mixed use development could help alleviate the costs of services and infrastructure.
 - Single-family development should be in the County.
 - Single-family development cannot pay for the maintenance and repairs of the roadways.
 - The proposed development patterns for both concepts show a failing transportation network.
 - Should not be proposing a development pattern that the roadways will not support.
 - The interchange was already failing before the project started.
 - With the changes being made to the transportation network, it would be difficult to support everyone's daily travel trips who live/would live in this area or use the roadway to pass through from one end to the other.
 - The transportation network currently is not performing as optimally as we want, and even with improvements, the network will still will not improve much as development builds out.
 - To create the transportation models, we use the knowledge we have today with current trips generated and adjust for development averages to see where the roadways do and do not work before finalizing a design concept.
 - The proposed development around Crothers Parkway and Long Lane might not develop how it is shown on the concepts.
 - There is a lot of interest in this area and an alternative design should be considered for this area.
 - What about uses such as a wellness center? Need to bring more "work and play" to the area.
 - Partial Interchange Concept:



- Density for the multi-family residential should be rethought.
- Not sure if 14 dwelling units per acre is an appropriate representation.
 - 14 dwelling units per acre was the average used to help generate the transportation model and taken from surrounding development such as Berry Farms.
 - Residential multi-family precedent imagery should also be added to.
 - Consider garden-style walkups as a development type that could be developed internally to Goose Creek. Its not appropriate adjacent to the interstate.
 - Show an additional range of varying densities through precedent imagery.
- Density may need to increase to drive development in this area.
 - Parking structures would need to be built to accommodate the higher density developments near the interchange.
- Should densities decrease as development moves further away from the interchange?
 - Yes, densities should and will decrease the further away it is from the interchange.
- Flyover Concept:
 - The “transition” area near the Crest at Ladd Park should be rethought.
 - Would housing along Pratt Lane have to front along Pratt?
 - Would have to update the standards if this is not the intent.
 - If Pratt is proposed to be a three-lane road, homes should not front it.
 - The “big yellow blob” between Pratt Lane extension and Crothers Parkway extension should be more transitional and not just designated for single-family residential development.
 - The new realignment of Peytonsville Road (West and East) should also be more transitional to help bridge development from one end to the other without detracting.
 - Step-up and step-down development patterns are important to incorporate in this area to not negatively impact or detract from adjacent structures and developments.
- Conservation Areas:
 - How was the conservation area created?
 - Based on a series of criteria including tree cover and forested areas, land with a 20% or greater slope, and if hilltops are present.
 - What about Berry Farms?
 - Berry Farms was probably approved before the hilltop ordinance was adopted. Development in the past might not align with what will be happening now and in the future.
 - The proposed conservation areas may harm property owners by decreasing their property values.
 - Many property owners have property that is more than 50% classified as conservation – how will this be addressed?
 - What about the properties along Pratt Lane where part of the land is classified as a conservation area? There is interest in developing in the area, but will the conservation area negatively impact the value of the property if someone was looking to sell/develop?



- The conservation area only applies to those properties who will be annexed into the City.
 - The conservation area should be analyzed again and potentially tailored back.
- Other Comments:
 - Regarding the flyover and partial interchange concept, what is the timeline for both?
 - The flyover would be easier to build and gain approval.
 - The partial interchange would be more difficult to be approve by TDOT and FHWA.
 - Will this study look at projections?
 - Yes, the fiscal efficiencies of the land use will be included in the final report.
 - Need to consider schools.
 - How do we serve the families that would locate here with their children?
 - Roadway network and utilities:
 - The connection from east to west (flyover and partial interchange) does not seem to provide much relief to people traveling.
 - The roadway network will not impact people and properties on the north side (of Goose Creek Boulevard), but the area will still experience an increase of traffic from those traveling north from the flyover to get to Goose Creek.
 - Try to keep the traffic separated and make development more pedestrian-focused (along Pratt Lane and Carothers Parkway).
 - The development along Carothers Parkway extension should be designed to keep people there and preventing them from traveling north.
 - Carothers Parkway and Pratt Lane intersecion – need to come up with a more creative approach for this area.