



HISTORIC  
FRANKLIN  
TENNESSEE

ITEM #14  
WRKS 09/14/2010

ITEM #15  
WRKS 09/14/2010

ITEM #16  
WRKS 09/14/2010

## MEMORANDUM

August 13, 2010

TO: Board of Mayor and Aldermen

FROM: Eric S. Stuckey, City Administrator  
Eric J. Gardner, P.E., Director of Engineering  
David Parker, P.E., City Engineer  
Paul P. Holzen, P.E. Engineering Supervisor

SUBJECT: Carlisle Lane & Signal Design at HWY 96W

### Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to forward information to the Board regarding the design for the Carlisle Lane & Signal Design at HWY 96W and receive direction for completing the design of the project.

### Background

This item was discussed at the August Capital Investment Committee meeting held August 12, 2010. There are three basic items that require Board decision so that staff can move forward with completing the design of the project. The three items are alignment, landscaping and a retaining wall. The committee unanimously agreed on the alignment and landscaping items, but was split on a recommendation regarding the retaining wall.

In June of 2008 Staff met with Neel Schaffer to review and select 1 of 6 alignment options. At the February 23, 2010 BOMA meeting staff was directed to conduct a public meeting to obtain design comments and public input for the project. A public meeting was held on March 30, 2010 to review the current design as approved by staff. At this public meeting staff was directed to develop 3 additional alignment options to review the ROW impacts to the Tomlinson Fort property and the Carlisle Home Owners Association property. A 2<sup>nd</sup> public meeting was held on July 8, 2010 to review the 3 alignment options and obtain additional public input. Both the Carlisle Home Owners Association and Mr. Tomlinson Fort have indicated they are in favor of changing the current alignment and moving forward with Concept Option #3. Below is a summary of the Pros and Cons for the Staff Approved Alignment and Concept Option #3.

### Staff Approved Alignment Pros:

- No ROW take from the historic Tomlinson Fort property
- ROW impacts to the Carlisle Lane HOA is within the common area and located outside the existing security/privacy fence.
- Meets all current design standards
- No additional design cost
- No additional ROW cost

### Staff Approved Alignment Cons:

- The Carlisle Lane HOA does not approve of the current alignment. ROW and easements acquisition would more than likely require condemnation.



Concept Option #3 Pros:

- Both Tomlinson Fort and the Carlisle Home Owners Association have verbally agreed and shown support for this option.
- Meets all current design standards

Concept Option #3 Cons:

- Changing the alignment will require additional design cost
- Changing the alignment will require additional ROW cost
- Changing the alignment will delay the ROW Acquisition and design phase of the project
- It's our understanding that the Carlisle Home Owners Association will require approval from all home owners to sell land within their common area. If 100% homeowner approval is not obtained condemnation will still be required.

In addition to shifting the alignment the Carlisle Home Owners Association has requested additional landscaping and a retaining wall be incorporated into the final design. The purpose of the landscaping and retaining wall would be to buffer their development from HWY 96 and Carlisle Lane.

**Options/Financial Impact**

Proposed Alignment

Option 1 - Approve the staff approved alignment and move forward with resolution 2010-15. This resolution will authorize condemnation. At this time the Carlisle Home Owners Association is the only property remaining to complete the ROW acquisition for this project. The financial impact would include payment of the appraised value for \$6,000 and any cost associated with condemnation.

Option 2 – Approve the alignment for Concept Option #3 shifting Carlisle Lane west. This option will require additional design and additional ROW acquisition on the Tomlinson Fort property. The financial impact could include an additional \$4,000 for ROW cost, additional \$13,000 for design cost and will delay the design phase of the project.

Additional Landscaping

Staff would propose that, if the Board chose to include landscaping, it is located outside of the City's ROW and easements and that the maintenance of the landscaping is the responsibility of the Carlisle Home Owners Association.

Option 1 – Include no additional landscaping into the current design. No financial impact.

Option 2 – Approve additional landscaping in the Carlisle Home Owners Association common area. All landscaping should be on private property and outside all existing easements. At the completion of the project the landscaping will be owned and maintained by the Carlisle Home Owners Association. Financial impact would include additional landscaping design cost, construction cost and will delay the design phase of the project.



### Retaining Wall

The Carlisle Home Owners Association requested that a retaining wall be installed to buffer the subdivision from SR 96 and replace an existing rock outcropping that will be removed during construction. The installation of a retaining wall is not necessary for the infrastructure improvements, only for additional buffering. The length of wall would approximately be 450 feet, with the final length determined through the additional design. It is important to know that the sloping that would be done without the retaining wall would still provide a buffer for the subdivision.

Option 1 – Approve the current design with 3:1 slopes graded up to the existing elevation located on the Carlisle Home Owners Association property.

Option 2 – Approve a retaining wall or outcropping along SR96 to act as a noise buffer for the Carlisle Home Owners Association. The financial impact would include an additional \$15,500 for geotechnical engineering services/design and additional construction cost. The additional construction cost was estimated to be around \$100,000 for the construction of a new retaining wall. This cost could be higher depending on the extent of the decorative face used and would delay the design phase of the project

### Recommendation

Based on the financial impact alone staff would recommend moving forward with the current design and approving option 1 for the proposed alignment and additional landscaping. If the relatively small additional costs for alignment #3 are acceptable to the Board, the design is acceptable from an engineering and roadway standard perspective. The retaining wall is not recommended due to the additional cost. Landscaping and the retaining wall can be included, if the Board chooses, regardless of the alignment chosen.

The Capital Investment Committee voted unanimously (4-0) to approve:

1. Alignment 3 for the intersection.
2. The incorporation of landscaping into the design of the project.

The committee forwarded to the full Board without recommendation the incorporation of a retaining wall in the design of the project.