TOWN OF LOUISVILLE, TENNESSEE
LOUISVILLE MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
LOUISVILLE TOWN HALL
OCTOBER 21, 2025
6:00 P.M.

Present: Kent Vaught – Chairman, Steven Kelley – Vice Chairman / Secretary, Jill Pugh – Mayor, Rick Fuller, Mary Wingo, Fran Hatley

Absent: None.

Others Present: Jordan Rockwell - Town Planner, Hailey Russell - Administrative Assistant & 28 Citizens

Chairman Kent Vaught called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

During the approval of the previous meeting's minutes, Chairman Vaught stated that he believed Vice Chairman Kelley's motion to approve the minutes had included consideration of adding the additional information that Chairman Vaught provided to the board at the last meeting.

Vice Chairman Kelley clarified that his motion was solely to approve the minutes as written. He explained that, separate from that motion, he had stated the board could consider at the next meeting whether they wished to add the additional information. However, this consideration was not part of his original motion to approve the minutes.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Kelley to approve the minutes as written. Second by Mary Wingo. VOTE: AYE: Vice Chairman Kelley, Mayor Pugh, Mary Wingo, Fran Hatley. NAY: Chairman Vaught, Rick Fuller. **MOTION PASSES**.

Mayor's Report

Mayor Pugh reported on the History Talk event held the previous evening with Phil Mummert. Approximately 130 people attended, and the event was a great success, offering an engaging discussion about the town's history and the journey that has shaped it into what it is today.

Mayor Pugh also highlighted the Town's Fall Festival held in September, noting its strong turnout and overall success.

Administrative & Building/Codes Report

Hailey Russell provided the board with an updated draft of the Zoning Ordinance, which now includes all amendments adopted since 2017. She advised board members to take the draft home for review prior to the next meeting, as it will be on the agenda for a recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen regarding adoption of the updated Zoning Ordinance.

Hailey also informed the board that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approved a new procedural resolution at their meeting last week. She highlighted several key provisions within the resolution. Notably, beginning on the second page, it outlines the new standard format for Planning Commission agendas going forward. The resolution also details the process for adding items to the agenda, including required submission deadlines and procedures.

Additionally, she noted that last month the board adopted Resolution 2025-10, establishing the public input section of meetings. This resolution provides up to five minutes for public comment, with any extension beyond five minutes requiring a majority vote of the board. Hailey explained that the overall purpose of the new resolution is to provide clearer guidance on meeting procedures and to promote greater order during meetings. She encouraged members to review the resolution, keep it in their binders, and reach out with any questions.

Town Planner Jordan Rockwell reported that he recently consulted with Sam Edwards, a highly experienced land-use attorney, to clarify questions regarding the Chairman's or Planner's discretion in placing items on the agenda that were previously denied for cause. Mr. Rockwell noted that Attorney Edwards confirmed the following:

- When the Planning Commission provides a hearing for a subdivision plat, site plan, or commercial plan, and the plan is denied for cause—meaning it fails to meet regulations—the Commission is not required to rehear the item unless the applicant makes substantial changes that would bring the plan into compliance.
- If no meaningful changes are made, the applicant's next step is to seek judicial review by filing a writ of certiorari. They do not appeal the denial to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.
- Mr. Rockwell emphasized that this guidance comes directly from Attorney Edwards, who has practiced land-use law for more than 40–50 years.

Mr. Rockwell also shared Attorney Edwards' clarification regarding precedents in Planning Commission decisions. According to Edwards, past decisions by earlier Planning Commissions or staff do not bind the current Commission. There are no formal precedents in land-use law that require a Commission to repeat or mirror a prior decision.

Mr. Rockwell stated that he wanted to ensure the Commission had accurate legal guidance on these matters, especially given recent issues. He added that he is willing to consult Attorney Edwards again if additional questions arise.

Public Input on Agenda Items

Anna Gibson addressed the board and stated that she remains strongly opposed to the proposed development. She explained that she had prepared a timeline over the weekend to illustrate why she is emotional and frustrated that the matter continues to be heard. She stated that, in her view, the process has been inconsistent and problematic.

Ms. Gibson expressed concern about the June 3rd special meeting, stating that she did not realize Chairman Patrick O'Hara served as a government-appointed official on the Design Review Committee and believed that information was not clearly disclosed. She also stated that she initially confused him with another individual. She further stated that, during that meeting, Building Official Barry Ottinger made statements that she believes were incorrect regarding density standards and the ability to combine parcels to meet requirements. Ms. Gibson also stated that she believed comments made by Mayor Pugh and Building Official Ottinger about sewer capacity related to the Bryce and Patrick development were inaccurate based on information she said she received from South Blount County Utility. She additionally expressed concern about comments made regarding the possibility of building duplexes on the property without commission approval. Ms. Gibson noted that eighteen citizens spoke against the development at that meeting. She stated that subsequent public reaction on social media led to the adoption of a new public comment resolution on June 10. She also stated her understanding that, sometime between June 10 and July 8, a member was removed from the Planning Commission, and that the Mayor filled the seat on July 8 when hearing the related appeal. She expressed frustration regarding statements made at that meeting about the status of a permit associated with the property. Ms. Gibson continued her timeline through the July 15, August 12, and August 19 meetings, stating her belief that additional inaccurate statements were made regarding past approvals of the Cloud properties. She stated that she filed ethical complaints but was informed by the town's attorney that members of the public cannot file such complaints. She concluded by expressing concern that, on September 9, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen adopted a social media policy that she believes was prompted by public reaction to comments being turned off. She also noted the approval of a raise for a staff member she believed was involved in the matter. Finally, she stated that on September 12, site plans from the 1990s and early 2000s were posted publicly, which she believes were unrelated to density or site plan requirements, and she expressed concern about the intent behind posting them.

At this point, Ms. Gibson reached the five-minute limit for public input. She then asked the board if she could continue her comments.

MOTION by Mary Wingo to allow Ms. Gibson to finish her comment. Second by Chairman Vaught. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES**.

After receiving permission to continue, Ms. Anna Gibson resumed her remarks. She stated that she and John Loope had spoken during a previous meeting and that she had conducted extensive research to fact-check statements made by the Building Official, as she believes several of those statements were incorrect. She stated that her research showed that density regulations did not arise until around 2012, and questioned why older site plans were being referenced. She also noted that Mr. Loope had shared his perspective during those discussions. Ms. Gibson stated that during a subsequent Board of Mayor and Aldermen workshop, Building Official Barry Ottinger acknowledged filing an ethical complaint against Vice Mayor Daniel Franklin. She stated that she believes this action was taken because Vice Mayor Franklin had raised concerns about the permit in question. Ms. Gibson expressed frustration that the complaint was handled differently after legal guidance was provided and stated her concern that Mr. Ottinger remained employed and had received a raise. Ms. Gibson stated that at a later meeting, Aldermen Loope voted that the ethical complaint had merit, but the Town's attorney advised that employee-related complaints must be handled through a different process. She further expressed concerns about the agenda for the October 17 meeting, noting that the PUD referenced was labeled as "The Cove at Lackey Creek." She stated her belief that the change in naming was misleading and manipulative. Ms. Gibson also expressed concern about the removal of John Loope from the Planning Commission, stating her belief that it was connected to his voting record.

Chairman Vaught clarified that, as Mayor, Jill holds the seat on the Planning Commission and has the privilege to occupy it at her discretion. He explained that John had been serving in her place, and she chose to resume her seat, which she is fully entitled to do.

Jacob Harper addressed the board and stated that he first met Mayor Pugh in 2021 and had been proud to vote for her. He explained that he is not in favor of Planned Unit Developments (PUDs). Mr. Harper shared that he lives on Mentor Road near several other residents who are also concerned about the proposed development. He stated that traffic conditions in the area, particularly from the Alcoa and TDOT construction activity, are already strained, and adding another subdivision would worsen congestion. He noted impacts related to the Louisville Road project, increased traffic from Smith & Wesson, and concerns about how state roadway changes affect small businesses. Mr. Harper stated that Louisville already experiences significant pass-through traffic from Alcoa and Knoxville and expressed concern that the town cannot support additional growth. He also expressed safety concerns regarding speeding and crime, noting conversations he has had with the Sheriff about speeding on Mentor Road. Mr. Harper questioned the need for additional housing in Louisville and asked the board to explain why more residential development is necessary. He expressed concern for the safety and quality of life of his family if further growth continues. He referred to clearing activity on Topside Road near Samples Road and asked what type of development was planned for that location.

In response, it was clarified to him that the development will include a farm store, a coffee shop, and an ice cream shop. Mr. Harper replied that he did not believe additional commercial uses such as another coffee shop were needed.

Mr. Harper stated that he has lived in Louisville since 2018 and completed his service in the U.S. Army in 2020. He emphasized that he loves the town and its small-town character. He expressed concern that additional subdivisions would change Louisville into something more similar to Northshore or Hardin Valley, which he believes would be inappropriate for the community.

Mary Wingo responded to Mr. Harper's comments regarding the need for PUDs and broader development concerns. She noted that, during the workshop prior to this

meeting and Planning Commission discussions, the board has reviewed several plans and that Mr. Harper's comments align with concerns she has also observed.
Ms. Wingo stated that the Town now has an amended Zoning Ordinance that incorporates all changes made since 2017. She pointed out that, even within the current year, numerous zoning amendments have been made. She expressed concern that the Town does not have an up-to-date comprehensive master plan to guide these decisions, explaining that Louisville's existing plan is 21 years old and no longer reflects current conditions. She stated that without a current master plan, the Town may be making zoning and procedural changes without a clear long-term vision of what it wants the community to become. She emphasized that this is a significant concern and questioned whether recent changes truly reflect the future direction the Town desires.
Ms. Wingo recommended slowing down non-essential zoning changes and prioritizing the development of a comprehensive master plan to establish a clear direction for growth. She stated that while progress and population growth are inevitable, the Town is behind in planning for that growth. She suggested limiting changes to only those that are critical or urgent until a new vision and plan can be established.

Greg Presnell addressed the board and stated that he did not see any new drawings posted on the Town's website for The Cove at Lackey Creek item scheduled for the meeting. He stated that, in his understanding, for the development to be reheard, the plans would need to include major changes, and he had not seen any such updated materials made available to the public. He expressed the view that the previous plan had been denied for multiple reasons and had not constituted a complete submittal package under Town regulations. Mr. Presnell stated that he remained opposed to the project. He further stated that, based on his calculations, the property does not meet density requirements and does not have sufficient area for sewer capacity. He noted that Blount County septic regulations would further reduce the number of allowable dwelling units. Mr. Presnell also spoke more broadly about Planned Unit Developments (PUDs). He stated that many PUD standards are designed for larger cities and townships and that Louisville lacks the necessary infrastructure—such as sewer, water capacity, and roadway systems—to support development of that scale. He emphasized that Louisville is primarily a residential community and questioned why additional commercial or mixed-use components were being considered when existing commercial zoning is already available elsewhere in Town. He stated that the property's original zoning supported residential use, and he questioned the need to change it to accommodate additional uses. He also noted that some examples referenced in discussions, including those provided by staff and himself, were based on larger jurisdictions unlike Louisville. Mr. Presnell expressed concern that approving a PUD creates a "town within a town" and questioned whether Louisville has parcels of land large enough to support that model. He referenced a specific property with environmental and TVA easement constraints and noted potential access issues related to future airport and roadway planning. He suggested that approvals could potentially be used to market the property rather than to develop it. He also referenced anticipated transportation projects, including possible road expansions and the southern loop concept, stating that these could significantly impact both the proposed development and existing neighborhoods. He expressed concern about the lack of traffic impact studies and stated that additional development would increase traffic without providing proportional benefit to the Town, as many tax revenues flow through Blount County before being distributed. Mr. Presnell concluded by stating that Louisville remains largely residential, and he believes the Town should slow down consideration of a new PUD ordinance until additional planning and analysis can occur.

Greg Alldredge addressed the board and stated that he attended the History Talk event the previous evening and was impressed by the large turnout. He noted that one of the main takeaways from that event was how, approximately 35 years ago, a group of visionary residents incorporated the Town of Louisville largely to protect it from the encroachment of Alcoa and commercial development. Mr. Alldredge reflected on the success and character of the community over those 35 years. He then stated his concern about how future generations might view the decisions made today, particularly regarding the proposed development under consideration. He questioned whether this moment could be seen, in hindsight, as the point at which leadership failed to uphold the original intent of protecting the town's character.

Joy Lauderdale offered a brief comment regarding the proposed development. She stated that, in addition to the concerns raised by others, she is worried about the environmental impact. Ms. Lauderdale noted that red birds roost in front of the property each winter and that the area supports various forms of wildlife that could be displaced if the development proceeds. She also expressed concern about potential light pollution associated with the project.

New Business Items:

a. **A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF LOUISVILLE TENNESSEE APPROVING THE TOWN HALL PARK IMPROVEMENTS CONCEPT PLAN**

Chairman Vaught presented the resolution to the board and asked for any questions or concerns. Vice Chairman Kelley asked if the concept plan will now move to the Design Review Committee. Hailey Russell advised that it would not at this time. This resolution is for the contract with TDEC and they needed it to continue moving forward with the contract.

MOTION by Mayor Pugh to approve the resolution approving the town hall park improvements concept plan. Second by Vice-Chairman Kelley. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.**

b. **A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF LOUISVILLE, TENNESSEE, TO AMEND THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS, APPENDIX III OF THE SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) SECTION III.2 DESIGN STANDARDS FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SUBSECTION (2), TO ALIGN WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARD REGARDING MINIMUM SITE AREA.**

The Town Planner stated that he has no objection to the proposed change, as it would update the Subdivision Regulations to align with the minimum lot size established in the Zoning Ordinance. He noted, however, that the amendment must be advertised at least 30 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting and must include a public hearing.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Kelley to approve the resolution to be put in the newspaper and have a public hearing after 30 days of circulation. Second by Mary Wingo. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES**.

c. Subdivision of Plat Map 25, Parcel 212.03, the Sexton Property

Town Planner Jordan Rockwell noted that no surveyor or property owner was present to represent the plat, which is typically required. He explained that, after speaking with Building Official Barry Ottinger, he became aware that the submittal would create a lot containing only an accessory building. He stated that the Town does not permit a lot to contain only a garage; a dwelling must be present in order for an accessory structure to be allowed. As submitted, the plat would therefore create a non-conforming lot. Mr. Rockwell stated that he had discussed the issue with the surveyor, who indicated that a home is planned for the site. Mr. Rockwell advised the surveyor that he could still attend the meeting, understanding that the plat might be denied, but no representative appeared. Because the lot as proposed would be non-conforming, Mr. Rockwell recommended denial rather than tabling the request. He noted that subdivision plats must be acted upon within 60 days of receipt or they become automatically approved. He added that denial at this time would not prevent the applicant from returning later with a building permit for a home and a revised plat that conforms to regulations.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Kelley to deny the subdivision of the plat. Second by Chairman Vaught. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.**

d. Site Plan Approval for the Development at The Cove at Lackey Creek

Town Planner Jordan Rockwell stated that his comments on the request relate back to the lengthy and detailed discussion held at the previous meeting. He explained that, based on the Town's Planned Unit Development (PUD) Regulations—specifically Section 11-408, Minimum Site 3A—no PUD may have an area smaller than what the reviewing body considers adequate for the proposed project. Additionally, the minimum site area cannot be less than ten times the minimum lot size required in the zoning district where the project is located. Mr. Rockwell referenced Section 11-801, the Area, Yard, and Height Table, noting that the minimum lot size in the R-1 zoning district is 30,000 square feet. Although the "square feet per additional family" standard was previously 20,000 square feet at the time the application was submitted, he stated that the minimum lot size has consistently been 30,000 square feet, both then and now. He clarified that the 20,000-square-foot figure applies to multifamily density calculations, not to minimum lot size. Using the minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet, Mr. Rockwell explained that the PUD regulations require a minimum site area of 300,000 square feet

(10 times the minimum lot size). He noted that the proposed development is approximately 40,000 to 50,000 square feet short of this requirement. Mr. Rockwell stated that the PUD regulations do not include any provision allowing the Planning Commission to deviate from the minimum site requirement. Because the proposal does not meet the regulatory standard and did not meet it at the time of original submittal, he recommended denial of the request.

Mary Wingo responded to Mr. Rockwell's explanation, stating that she believes the Town may be "ahead of its skis" regarding some development activity and recent ordinance changes. She noted, however, that she struggles with this particular interpretation because, when reviewing the previous meeting minutes, there was extensive discussion about how the calculations were determined at that time.
Ms. Wingo acknowledged that the "additional family dwelling" standard was 20,000 square feet when the application was originally submitted. She emphasized that the wording of the regulations is important, and that the PUD section states the minimum site shall not be less than ten times the minimum lot size required in the district for the proposed project. She pointed out that the project is located within the R-1 district with public water and referenced a footnote in the zoning table indicating that multifamily dwellings have two applicable lot size standards:

- 30,000 square feet for the first unit, and
- 20,000 square feet for each additional dwelling.

Ms. Wingo stated that, based on the wording of the ordinance and the footnote, she does not interpret the requirement as a single 30,000-square-foot standard without consideration of the multifamily provisions. She noted that the minutes from earlier discussions reflected the same interpretation at the time and said this is why she struggles with applying only the 30,000-square-foot figure without accounting for the footnote and the type of project being proposed.

Melanie Davis, speaking on behalf of the applicant, stated that her understanding was that the remaining issue before the Planning Commission was whether the proposal meets the minimum square-footage requirements for a Planned Unit Development (PUD). She noted that, based on prior discussion, all other site-plan requirements had been determined to be met. Ms. Davis first addressed the procedural question of whether the application could be reheard. She explained that she serves as the City Attorney for Maryville, Greenback, and Rockford and has 29 years of municipal-law experience. She stated that Louisville's Subdivision Regulations contain no provision prohibiting resubmittal of a plat unless substantive changes have been made. She noted that such language does exist under Section 11.3.18 for Board of Zoning Appeals matters but does not appear in the Planning Commission regulations. She stated that state law is silent on this issue and that the Municipal Technical Advisory Service (MTAS) confirmed her interpretation. Therefore, she stated that the Planning Commission is required to act under the regulations as written, and in her view, the Commission does not have the authority to refuse to hear the application.

Ms. Davis explained that the application was originally heard on June 3, 2025, and that discussion at that time centered on whether the minimum site requirement for a PUD was 10 acres or 300,000 square feet. She stated that the applicant disagrees with the interpretation that 300,000 square feet is required. She referenced Section 11-701, which permits multifamily dwellings in the residential district in accordance with Section 11-408, the PUD regulations. She stated that Section 11-408 requires the minimum site area to be no less than 10 times the minimum lot size required in the district. She noted that the language could have specified a fixed acreage but instead uses the "10 times" standard. Ms. Davis then reviewed the minimum lot size table in Section 11-801, explaining that at the time the application was submitted—September 3—the minimum lot size for the first dwelling in R-1 with public water was 30,000 square feet, and the minimum square footage per additional family dwelling was 20,000 square feet. She stated that under Tennessee's vested-rights law, the application must be judged based on the regulations in effect at the time of submittal, not on amendments adopted later, such as those approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on September 9.
She further explained that minutes from the June 3 meeting showed discussion about removing the 20,000-square-foot standard, indicating that the previous standard had substantive meaning. She stated that the 20,000-square-foot standard applied to duplexes, multifamily dwellings, and mobile home parks, and that PUDs were historically referenced as multifamily developments. Ms. Davis pointed out that the PUD standards included as an appendix to the Subdivision Regulations specify a minimum size of 4.5 acres, and the proposed site is 5.69 acres, which meets that threshold. She stated that multiplying the 20,000-square-foot minimum by 10 also results in 200,000 square feet (approximately 4.5 acres), supporting the conclusion that the 20,000-square-foot standard applied. She provided additional density calculations, noting that even if the 30,000-square-foot standard is applied to the first unit and 20,000 square feet to each additional unit, the total acreage would allow for up to 12 units. The proposal includes 11 units and therefore fits within that calculation. Ms. Davis also referenced historical plats showing numerous lots between 20,000 and 27,000 square feet, stating that this demonstrates that the minimum lot size has not always been 30,000 square feet, contrary to prior discussions. Ms. Davis cited case law, *Stone Man, Inc. v. Rutherford County Regional Planning Commission*, explaining that a Planning Commission cannot deny a plat that meets all written requirements based on public opposition or dissatisfaction with the regulations themselves. She stated that the Commission must apply the regulations as written and cannot deviate from them. She concluded by stating that, in the applicant's position, the proposal meets all zoning and subdivision requirements applicable at the time of submission. She asked the Planning Commission to approve the application.

Chairman Vaught asked Ms. Davis to confirm that the interpretation she presented was her opinion. Ms. Davis acknowledged that it was her opinion. Chairman Vaught then stated that Ms. Davis's comments represent the applicant's position, while Town Planner Jordan Rockwell has provided his own professional opinion. He noted that the

Commission would now need to discuss the matter, ask any questions they may have for either party, and then open the floor for public comment.

Mary Wingo asked whether there were any issues with the previously submitted plan beyond the lot-size discussion. She noted that both she and Fran joined the Planning Commission after the original presentation and requested clarification to help them understand any additional concerns that may have been raised at that time.

Chairman Vaught noted that only three members of the current Commission were present for the original meeting at which the project was first considered. He stated that he could recall several points from that discussion. He commented that the project presentation at that time was excellent and that the proposal itself was viewed favorably in many respects. However, as the Commission reviewed the details, the primary issue that emerged was that the project did not meet the ten (10) times the minimum lot size requirement, which became the determining factor in the decision. Chairman Vaught recalled that Vice Chairman Kelley had asked questions regarding density and ultimately made the motion to deny the request, which Chairman Vaught seconded. He noted that the Commission concluded the proposal did not meet the applicable standards for Louisville. He further stated that while additional information has since been presented and the applicant has demonstrated significant investment in the project, the concern at the time of the previous review was that the proposal did not fit within the established standards of the Town.

Mary Wingo stated that, based on the information provided by Ms. Davis, it appears that neither the Zoning Ordinance nor the Subdivision Regulations contain language preventing the application from returning to the Planning Commission. If that is the case, she said the Commission would be required to review the proposal again in accordance with the applicable regulations. Ms. Wingo explained that, because she and Fran were not members of the Commission when the project was first presented, they lack background on portions of the original submittal and have several questions they would need addressed. She emphasized that this is not a criticism of the previous review but simply a need for full understanding. She noted that the proposal reportedly includes a self-contained wastewater or septic system and asked for clarification regarding how that system would operate, who would be responsible for managing it, whether it has been evaluated by TDEC, and whether any approvals have been granted. She also raised questions about stormwater controls and how potential unintended impacts—such as flooding of adjacent areas—would be prevented. Ms. Wingo stated that, if the Planning Commission is required to reconsider the application, she would like the full presentation and complete submittal package provided again so that all commissioners, including newer members, have the opportunity to review the materials in their entirety.

Chairman Vaught explained that the materials currently available are the same materials originally submitted by the engineer to the Town Planner. He stated that he and Town Planner Jordan Rockwell reviewed the submittal and, based on their understanding of the regulations at the time, determined not to place the item on the agenda. He noted that, following comments presented by Ms. Davis, there were discussions with the Town's attorney, Rob, who concluded that the application should be heard again. Chairman Vaught stated that this determination is the reason the Planning Commission is considering the matter at the present meeting.

Ms. Davis stated that, during the previous review, all aspects of the application were found to be in compliance with the applicable regulations except for the minimum site-area issue currently under discussion. She noted that the applicant relied on those prior findings, as none of the other components of the proposal had changed. She added that the applicant has detailed information available for all site-plan elements that were previously determined to meet the requirements. Town Planner Jordan Rockwell advised to have the Town Engineer review the plans as well to give his opinion, but from his own review, all items appeared acceptable aside from the site-acreage issue. He acknowledged that Ms. Davis was correct in stating that the acreage requirement was the only unresolved matter.

Mary Wingo stated that she preferred to place the item on the agenda for the next month's meeting, allowing the Commission additional time to review the materials before making a decision. Chairman Vaught advised that the committee would ultimately need to make a motion to approve or deny the plan. Town Planner Jordan Rockwell corrected Chairman's Vaught's comment and stated that the committee may request additional information or time for review prior to taking action.

Mary Wingo stated that she believed it would be unfair for her and Fran to vote on the item without having had the opportunity to review the full submittal. She noted that they had not previously seen the materials and should be given at least a couple of weeks to examine the information before being asked to take action.

Hailey Russell agreed that Wingo's request was valid, explaining that the packet for the development was not received by members until their arrival at the meeting. She noted this occurred because she had been out of town on vacation and had not originally been scheduled to assemble or distribute the materials.

Chairman Vaught asked whether there were any time limits requiring the Commission to respond to the application.

Rockwell explained that while subdivision plans must be acted upon within 60 days, this proposal is a PUD plan, and therefore the same statutory deadline does not apply. He stated that, although delaying action is generally not good practice, he understands Wingo's concern about needing adequate time for review. He added that the plans are civil engineering documents, which can be complex, and noted that this is why review by the town engineer is important.

Chairman Vaught informed the citizens in attendance that they could not direct questions to the presenter. However, he stated that they were welcome to ask questions of the board.

Greg Presnell stated that, based on his review, the property contains approximately 5.12 acres. He noted that the development has been presented as individual single-family homes rather than multifamily units. He explained that if the project consists of single-family homes, the 30,000-square-foot minimum lot size should apply.
Presnell stated that the plan includes 11 homes. Using 30,000 square feet per home, he calculated that 330,000 square feet—or approximately 7.5 acres—would be required to meet density standards for single-family development. He also presented an alternative calculation using 30,000 square feet for the first unit and 20,000 square feet for the remaining 10 units, which totaled 230,000 square feet, or approximately 5.28 acres. He stated that because the property is 5.12 acres, he believes it does not meet the minimum acreage requirement under either calculation. Presnell also expressed concern that the submittal packet was not complete. He stated that utility information appeared to be missing, including details related to the proposed force-main system and how utilities would connect through private property or TDOT right-of-way. He referenced missing sheet numbers within the engineering plans and stated that certain referenced drawings were not included. Presnell concluded that, in his view, the packet did not contain all required utility information and therefore did not constitute a complete submittal under Town regulations.

Chairman Vaught noted that the calculations presented by both Ms. Davis and Greg Presnell show that the standards can be interpreted and calculated in different ways. He stated that this is part of the process and one of the reasons the Commission allows individuals the opportunity to present their viewpoints. Chairman Vaught added that he specifically wanted Presnell to have the opportunity to demonstrate his comparison so that Mary Wingo could clearly understand that there is a difference in how the calculations may be interpreted. He stated that the Commission now needed to move forward and either defer the item or take another action.

An unnamed citizen addressed a question specifically to Mary Wingo. The citizen asked whether there is a definition of "single-family dwelling" in the Town's regulations, noting that the proposal presented at the first meeting consisted of 11 single-family homes. The citizen stated that the key difference in the acreage and density calculations depends on interpreting the project as consisting of one single-family home and ten multifamily homes. The citizen expressed disagreement with that interpretation, stating that none of the homes in the proposal meet the definitions commonly associated with multifamily dwellings, such as duplexes, townhouses, apartments, or condominiums. The citizen stated that, based on every definition they had reviewed, the proposal consists of 11 single-family homes, and that this should be the basis for any calculations made by the Commission.

Wingo responded by referencing the definitions contained in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that a single-family dwelling is defined as a building designed, constructed, and used for one dwelling unit. She added that, in accordance with Tennessee Code Annotated §13-24 and the ordinance, a manufactured or modular dwelling is also considered a single-family dwelling. Wingo noted that a dwelling unit is defined as one or more rooms arranged, designed, and intended for use as an independent living facility by one person or a group of persons living together as a single housekeeping unit, containing permanent provisions for cooking and sanitation. She further stated that the ordinance also defines a multi-family dwelling as a building containing three or more separate rental or owner-occupied dwelling units located on a single lot.

Ms. Davis noted that the ordinance references, under subsection (F), that multifamily dwellings developed in accordance with the applicable provisions of Sections 11-408 and 11-410 are permitted. She stated that Section 11-408 is the Planned Unit Development (PUD) section, and therefore this language ties PUDs into the multifamily provisions of the ordinance.

Anna Gibson stated that she had conducted extensive research on the proposal and wished to reiterate that the calculations being discussed involve two separate parcels rather than one. She noted that, in previous cases, applicants were required to combine parcels for consideration, and she questioned whether these parcels could be legally joined since they are separated by a road. She stated her understanding that parcel combination would be handled at the county level and not by the Planning Commission. She emphasized that, in her view, the proposal involves two distinct parcels. Gibson further stated that, according to Greg Presnell's calculations, the parcel proposed for development contains 5.12 acres and does not meet density requirements. She added that, even using the calculations referenced by Ms. Davis, she believes the project still does not meet the minimum acreage requirement. Gibson expressed frustration that the matter had returned to the Commission for a third time and stated that she and other citizens wished for a vote to occur. She asked that Wingo refrain from voting due to not having sufficient time with the materials, noting that she was making this request respectfully. She stated that since the 2017 zoning regulations were replaced, three PUD applications had been presented and all were either denied or deferred. She expressed the view that the applicant in this case was receiving special treatment and stated that, because he is a government official, she believes allowing him to present the proposal multiple times raises ethical concerns. Gibson also stated that site plans from the 1990s referenced in earlier discussions predated density regulations, which were adopted in 2017. She added that the Commission had previously denied a subdivision request involving a potential septic connection across a road and questioned why a similar circumstance would be allowed in this situation. She referenced ordinance language regarding minimum site area and noted that it applies to the "project." She stated that a PUD may consist of as few as three homes, and based on that interpretation, she believes the minimum acreage requirement would be significantly higher than what is proposed. Gibson concluded by stating she wanted to highlight that concern for the Commission's consideration.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Kelley to deny the site plan due to not meeting the overall density. Second by Chairman Vaught.

Mayor Pugh asked Town Planner Jordan Rockwell to explain to the committee how he calculates density under the ordinance.

Rockwell stated that, based on the ordinance definitions, the proposal should be considered single-family since multifamily dwellings are defined as three or more units within a single building, and the applicant is proposing separate buildings with one dwelling unit each. He clarified that this is a different issue from the minimum site-area calculation that had been discussed earlier. Regarding the overall density calculation, Rockwell explained that the wording in the ordinance can cause confusion. He stated that he had consulted other planners in his office, and they interpreted the language the same way he does. He described the 30,000-square-foot standard as the minimum lot size, while the "additional square feet per dwelling unit" is not a secondary minimum but rather an added requirement for multifamily situations. Rockwell stated that the way he reads the ordinance, the PUD requirement of "10 times the minimum lot size" applies to the 30,000-square-foot standard. He emphasized that this interpretation is based on his professional experience and is consistent with how similar language is applied in other zoning ordinances. He added that although he does not personally favor the "10 times" language, it remains the law as written and is the standard that applies to this application.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Chairman Vaught – AYE, Vice Chairman Kelley – AYE, Mayor Pugh – Abstain, Mary Wingo – Abstain, Fran Hatley – Abstain, Rick Fuller – AYE.

Chairman Vaught asked for clarification on whether the vote had passed, referencing Robert's Rules of Order. After reviewing Robert's Rules, it initially appeared that the motion had passed. However, upon further review of the Town's own voting procedures, Hailey Russell explained that the Town does not follow Robert's Rules of Order for voting outcomes. Instead, the Town's standard requires that a motion must receive a majority vote of those present in order to pass. She stated that this means four (4) affirmative votes were required, and because the motion did not receive four votes, it failed. Some citizens expressed disagreement and voiced their opinions about what they believed the correct process should be. Russell informed them that personal interpretations do not determine the outcome; the only standard that applies is the Town's established rules, and her responsibility is to ensure that the Town and its committees follow those rules.

Anna Gibson asked whether the motion would pass if Mayor Pugh changed her vote from abstaining to voting in favor. She was informed that yes, doing so would give the motion the required four votes for approval. Mayor Pugh responded by noting that Ms. Gibson had previously emailed her advising that she should abstain from the vote, and that she had followed that instruction. When Ms. Gibson asked her to change her vote, Mayor Pugh stated that she would not do so.

MOTION by Mary Wingo to table the site plan approval for The Cove at Lackey Creek. Second by Fran Hatley. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES**.

e. Continued Discussion of PUD (Planned Unit Development) Regulation Changes

This item was not discussed, as the meeting had already passed 8:00 p.m. It will be placed on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

Public Input on Non-Agenda Items

A discussion was held regarding the Town's current land use plan and the scope of what it includes. The Town Planner explained that the Town has the option to adopt a new master plan if desired, and noted that a colleague in his office could assist with developing such a plan. Citizens also commented on the need for the Town to stay informed about surrounding jurisdictions. They suggested that the Town consider designating individuals to regularly attend meetings of Blount County, the City of Maryville, and the City of Alcoa in order to report back on projects or plans that may impact Louisville.

Vera Henry stated that there are programs and university partnerships that can assist municipalities with research, feasibility studies, and planning efforts at a relatively low cost. She encouraged the Town to explore these resources as it considers future growth. Henry noted that a master plan is needed but emphasized that growth is inevitable and must be well-controlled and thoughtfully planned. She also shared information about work previously done on the project site, including engagement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and TVA, stating that their reviews did not identify environmental issues such as wetlands concerns or sinkholes. She noted that sewer capacity remains a significant obstacle for future development and that she has worked with professionals exploring potential solutions. Henry concluded by acknowledging the community's passion and encouraged recognition of the time and investment put in by those working on the project.

Adjournment

MOTION by Fran Hatley to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mary Wingo. VOTE: UNANIMOUS. **MOTION PASSES.** Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

______________________ Chairman

______________________ Secretary