



**CHEATHAM COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 2, 2025**

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mark Jarrell

Mark Jarrell called for the roll to be taken and called the roll

Members Present: Matt Von Lunen, Chester Hannah, Brian McCain, Chris Atkins, Brenda Montgomery, Gary Chance, Mark Jarrell

Members Absent: Allen Nicholson, Jill Niccolich

Mark Jarrell declared a quorum present

Others Present: Franklin Wilkinson, Michael Bligh, Peter Westerman, Tim Ellrich, Jaci Whitaker, Cheryl Ellrich, Jeremy Whitaker, P. Plumlee, Bo Sanders, Jana Haskew, Jonathan Haskew, Thomas Carich, Jay Rachels, Jake Rachels, Glenda Williams, Patty Hutchison, Gary Gentry, Spencer Ford, Denise Payne, Joel Holt, Fred Grossi, Jerrod Manning, Angel Fowler, Susan Taylor, Darwin Newton, Danniell Newton, David Taylor, Michael Hayes, Bobby Sells, Nicole Sells, Linda Ryder, Bill Ryder, Kae Whit, Michael Arket, Wayne Milcer, Wesley Haines, Ann Reitmann, Jennifer Pedigo, Jennifer Tejada, Brenda Mason, Frank Tejada, Julie Overstreet, Holly Spann, Walter Weakley, Martha Lynn Newton, Hope Patterson, Richard Murray, John Cannon, Caleb Fuqua, Thomas Donegan, Elisabeth Mensch, Alex Jordan, Teresa Jordan, Sharon Armstrong, Steve Hudson, Chris Spiegel, Jim Gibbs, Carolyn Gibbs, Randy Scott, Zach Pittman, John Claxton, Jim Delanis, Larry Nash, Jann Clair, Ron White, James Christy, Tennyson Magness, Phil Dawson, Beth Dawson, Jay Stanford, Amy Percy, Josh Percy, James Guidry, Joe Delemos, Camra Latourette, Mario Mayes, Jim Delanis, Bob Sanders, Jimmy Hedgepath

Approval of Minutes and Agenda:

Mark Jarrell stated, everyone should have received their meeting packets and a copy of the minutes from the September 4, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. He asked if there were any comments or corrections. Hearing none, a ****MOTION**** to approve the minutes was made by Gary Chance; second by Chester Hannah. The motion passed by unanimous “aye” voice vote.

Mark Jarrell stated, the agenda for tonight’s meeting has been distributed. He asked if there were any comments or corrections. Franklin Wilkinson stated, there have been revisions to eliminate sections from Item #8. Hearing no other revisions or corrections, a ****MOTION**** to approve the agenda was made by Matt Von Lunen; second by Brenda Montgomery. The motion passed by unanimous “aye” voice vote.

PUBLIC FORUM:

Mark Jarrell opened the floor for Public Forum at 6:01 PM. Joey Locker, developer for Locker’s Luxury RV Park stated, his project has been battling the Army Corp of Engineers regarding jurisdictional boundaries and construction has stalled. There being no one to speak Mark Jarrell declared public forum closed at 6:03 PM.

ITEM #1

Mark Jarrell read Item #1 into the record. John Claxton requesting Preliminary Master Plan approval of a Commercial Mixed Use Planned Unit Development for Map 26, Parcel 13. Property is located at 4055

Sweethome Rd., in the 2nd Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. (*Deferred from August 7, 2025*) Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: The applicant is requesting Preliminary Master Plan approval for a proposed Commercial Mixed Use Planned Unit Development (CMUPUD). The proposed CMUPUD includes 197 single-family residential lots with an average size of 7,000 square feet (approximately 2.92 dwelling units per acre). The average lot width is ~50 feet. The development proposes ~21.31 acres of open space (~31.6% of the total site). The proposed development is planned for three (3) phases. The property is proposed to rezone to CMUPUD, Commercial Mixed Use Planned Unit Development (Item 2). Staff reviewed the proposed planned unit development per the Cheatham County Zoning Ordinance (7.030)(1) and identified the following items for consideration: Please provide a copy of the final Traffic Impact Study. (C) The nature of the landowner's interest in the land proposed to be developed and a written statement or concurrence from all parties having a beneficial interest in the affected property. (D) The substance of covenants, grants of easements or other reservations to be imposed upon the use of the land, buildings and structures including proposed easements for public utilities. (E) A stage development schedule, setting forth when the landowner intends to commence construction and a completion period. (F) When it is proposed that the final master development plan will be submitted in stages, a schedule of submission thereof. When an area is submitted for PUD approval, the planning commission in its deliberations shall consider the character of the proposed development in relationship to the surrounding area. No such development shall be approved where the streets providing access cannot handle the additional traffic load or where the water system is incapable of meeting the fire flow requirements. The development shall be so planned, designed, and constructed so as to avoid undue traffic congestion in the surrounding area and provide a satisfactory relationship of land use of the planned unit development with the surrounding area, making use of landscaping, screening, open space, and building placement where required and in keeping with accepted land planning principles. After approval of the preliminary master plan, the planning commission shall recommend an amendment to the County Commissioners reclassifying the property to the appropriate PUD zoning district. Sharon Armstrong reviewed the history of the previous meetings. The request was deferred on August 7, 2025 without consulting the applicant. Any outstanding technical items with the plan should be limited to two meetings. The traffic study has been completed. This location is in the urban growth boundary of Pleasant View. The developer is willing to work toward the traffic improvements to relieve the moratorium. Specific direction needs to be provided to the applicant. Sharon Armstrong asked Jon Claxton if the requirements for the preliminary master plan meet the requirements for a preliminary plat? Jon Claxton stated, yes - the requirements for this CMUPUD preliminary master plan meet the requirements for a preliminary plat. Caleb Fuqua stated, he is willing to invest one million dollars for offsite improvements to address traffic issues. Brenda Montgomery asked, why does the development have to be commercial? She does not think of the character of the area as commercial. She is concerned with the traffic. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to deny the request was made by Brenda Montgomery. The motion failed for lack of a second to the motion. Michael Bligh stated, the submitted preliminary master plan shows offsite improvements. It does not have a dollar amount associated with it. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to deny the request was made by Brenda Montgomery. The motion failed for lack of a second to the motion. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to approve the preliminary master plan as submitted contingent on the applicant addressing the safety concern of the two sharp curves on Sweethome Rd., was made by Chris Atkins. Chris Atkins consented his motion to allow the developer to speak. Caleb Fauqua stated, if the county wishes to address the curves on Sweethome Rd., the funds provided by the developer will be limited to four hundred thousand dollars. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting Chris Atkins restated his ****MOTION**** to approve the preliminary master plan as submitted; second by Brian McCain. The motion passed by roll

call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - no, Gary Chance -no, Mark Jarrell – no.

ITEM #2

Mark Jarrell read Item #2 into the record. John Claxton requesting a zone change from R1 to Commercial Mixed Use Planned Unit Development for Map 26, Parcel 13. Property is located at 4055 Sweethome Rd., in the 2nd Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. (*Deferred from August 7, 2025*) Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to approve the rezone request was made by Chris Atkins; second by Chester Hannah. The motion passed by roll call vote. Chester Hannah - yes, Matt Von Lunen -yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - no, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – no.

ITEM #3

Mark Jarrell read Item #3 into the record. Blake Cobb requesting a zone change from C5 to C1 for Map 39, Parcel 154.01. Property is located at 2018 Milliken Rd., in the 2nd Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: The applicant is requesting to rezone Map 039, Parcel 154.01, located at 2018 Milliken Road. The parcel is +/- 1.28 acres and is currently zoned C-5, Neighborhood Commercial, Mixed-Use District. Public water is available along Milliken Road while sewer is private. The property is accessed from Milliken Rd. There are existing structures on the property. The General Commercial, C-1, district is established to provide areas in which the principal uses of land are devoted to general and highway commercial activities along the principal thoroughfares in Cheatham County. Regulations are designed to preserve the traffic carrying capacity of the streets and roads in Cheatham County and to provide for necessary off-street parking and loading. All lots shall be considered fronting on either arterial or collector roads as indicated on the latest official major thoroughfare plan. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to approve the rezone request was made by Chester Hannah; second by Gary Chance. The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – yes.

ITEM #4

Mark Jarrell read Item #4 into the record. John Cannon requesting a zone change from R1 to C3 for Map 86, Parcel 93. Property is located on Old Sams Creek Rd., in the 5th Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: The applicant is requesting to rezone Map 086, Parcel 093.00, located at an unaddressed parcel on Old Sams Creek Road. The parcel is +/- 3.61 acres and is zoned R-1, Low Density Residential District. Public water and sewer are unknown. The Rural Convenience Commercial (C-3) district is designed to provide shopping and service needs for surrounding rural and suburban households. The permitted establishments are those which provide regular local shopping and which, therefore, are visited frequently by customers. This district may occur along or away from arterial streets, characteristically small and distributed widely for convenient accessibility by local residents. The bulk regulations are established to regulate commercial activity in the district and adjacent residential activity, and to lessen the concentration of vehicular traffic as compared to other commercial districts providing goods and services for a more extensive area. Before recommending this change in zoning, the planning commission should determine whether this request is appropriate for, and in keeping with, the character of the area. John Cannon stated, there is public water available at this location. **Jerrod Manning** stated, he lives in the area and is opposed to the commercial rezoning. **Camra Latourette** stated, she lives down the street and is opposed to the rezone. Fred Grossi stated, he is opposed to the rezoning. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to deny the rezone request was made by Gary Chance; second by Brenda Montgomery.

The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – yes.

ITEM # 5

Mark Jarrell read Item # 5 into the record. Frank Tejada requesting final plat approval for Map 21, Parcel 19 and Map 21, Parcel 20.01. Property is located at 1603 Ridge Cir., Rd., in the 2nd Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: The applicant is requesting final plat approval for Map 021, Parcel 019.00 and Map 021, Parcel 020.01. The applicant is proposing a minor subdivision that will create one new lot but relates to two existing parcels. Map 021, Parcel 019.00 is +/- 10.2 acres and is currently zoned A (Agricultural). Map 021, Parcel 020.01 is +/- 1.6 acres and is currently zoned A (Agricultural). Public water is available along Ridge Circle Road and sewer is private. The properties are accessed from Ridge Circle Road. Staff reviewed the final plat per the subdivision regulations (5-105) and identified the following items for consideration: (10) Please show total acreage within the subdivision – current and proposed. (15) Please show sewage disposal area on Lot 3. Please add Surveyor's stamp and licensing number. Please correct the scales (there are two different scales on the plat 1"=100' and 1"=50'). Please identify owner(s) of current parcel being split into Lot 1 and 2. Please remove 'extra' note "8736.7 Sq. Ft 0.20 Acres) from the plat. Frank Tejada stated, all the noted corrections have been made to the plat. Brian McCain suggested eliminating Lot 2 as it is greater than five acres and make this a two lot a minor plat and submit it for administrative review. Frank Tejada requested the request be deferred until the next planning commission meeting. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to defer the request until the next scheduled meeting unless the plat can be approved administratively was made by Brenda Montgomery; second by Chris Atkins. The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen - yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – yes.

ITEM #6

Mark Jarrell read Item #6 into the record. Steven Hudson requesting site plan approval to construct a one thousand five hundred ninety-six (1,596) square foot restaurant on Map 25, Parcel 2. Property is located on Hwy 49 East, in the 3rd Voting District and is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: The applicant is requesting site plan approval for Map 025, Parcel 002.00. The applicant is proposing a restaurant (1,596 square feet). Public water and sewer are available along HWY 49 E. The property is accessed from HWY 49 E. Staff reviewed the site plan and note the following concerns: 1. The parcel does not meet the minimum lot size requirements for the C-1 district (20,000 sf) making this a noncomplying lot of record. A variance must be requested and approved by the BZA. 2. Parking requirements (5.010) for restaurants with drive-in require one parking space per 100 sq. ft. The minimum number of parking spaces is 18. Staff reviewed the site plan per the zoning ordinance (9.030)(3)(B) and identified the following items for consideration: Please provide the dimensions of the parking spaces (minimum 10x18). Please provide information on drainage and stormwater controls. Please provide information on access permit from TDOT for Hwy 49. (15) Please provide size of all utilities including all fire hydrants. (16) Please provide type of proposed sign. (19) Please provide detailed lighting plans consistent with section 4.140. Staff cannot recommend approval because this is a noncomplying lot of record that requires a variance from the BZA prior to site plan approval. Steve Hudson requested a deferral until he can get a variance from the board of zoning appeals.

Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to defer the request pending any variances from the board of zoning appeals was made by Chris Atkins; second by Gary Chance. The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – yes.

ITEM #7

Mark Jarrell read Item #7 into the record. Amend the Zoning Resolution of Cheatham County, Table II, Bulk, Yard & Density Regulations by requiring the minimum lot size in the Agricultural Zoning District to be five (5) acres with public water and five (5) acres with public water and sewer. Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: Staff recommend Planning Commission consider the minimum size for a dwelling unit along with the requested 5 ac minimum lot size in the bulk, yard and density table. Mark Jarell stated, changing the minimum lot size for the Ag zoning district would change all four-acre conforming Agricultural lots to nonconforming lots. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to deny the request was made by Gary Chance; second by Brian McCain. The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – yes.

ITEM #8

Mark Jarrell read Item #8 into the record. Amend the Zoning Resolution of Cheatham County by:

1. Insert the following definitions in Section 2.010. **Rural Resort:** *An overall mixed use planned development including, but not limited to, the following uses: Residential (Permanent and Semi-Permanent): Dwelling, one-family detached; dwelling, two-family detached; semi-permanent residential establishment; and Rural Resort Housing. Commercial: Food and beverage services; commercial campgrounds and recreational resort areas; Rural Resort Hotel; accessory uses to any Rural Resort Hotel, including but not limited to, health spas, personal services, pools, gym and health club facilities; cultural and recreational services including, but not limited to, commercially guided activities with resort type facilities including a music studio and an event center not to exceed forty-five (45) feet in height; governmental and utility services; wireless communications facilities; entertainment and amusement services; convenience commercial; sale and rental of real estate and real estate development; farm activities and agricultural services (including working farm facilities and functions and livestock and crops); limited manufacturing activities; general retail trade; and indoor and outdoor recreation areas. The minimum area for a Rural Resort shall be three hundred seventy-five hundred (375) acres and must be located adjacent to a Tennessee state park or state wildlife management area at the time of approval. Rural Resort Hotel: Hotel, motel or resort-style property providing transient lodging in a low density, campus style development with guest rooms accessible from either an indoor corridor or an outdoor parking area or walkway, as part of a Rural Resort not to exceed one hundred twenty (120) guest rooms, and resort-style amenities may be located in multiple, separate buildings and may also include Rural Resort commercial activities. Rural Resort Housing: Owner occupied or non-owner-occupied dwellings that are located in a CMUPUD in a rural area and are available for rent as transient habitation for periods of less than thirty (30) days through a rental program managed by a Rural Resort Hotel*

2. Section 3.07.23 shall be deleted and replaced in its entirety with the following language.

Transient Habitation: *Includes the provision of lodging services for transient guests. The term shall include five different types of activities as defined in Section 2.010. Hotel, Motel, Rural Resort, Rural Resort Hotel, Rural Resort Housing*

3. Insert the following as a new subsection in Section 6.012 as an additional use permitted within rural areas:

3. CMUPUD Commercial Mixed Use Planned Unit Development District, provided that the permitted uses under any such CMUPUD located in a rural area shall be limited to Rural Resort uses only.

Pete Westerman presented the planning staff report: Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider all proposed residential and commercial uses and access and street requirements. **Michael Hayes** stated, his group has proposed an amendment to the zoning resolution to create the opportunity for a Rural Resort. He has heard over many meetings and conversations how the citizens of the community value rural and agricultural uses and nature. This area has multiple large tracts of land adjacent to open TWRA land, a state park and beautiful vistas. Over time developers will seek to develop these areas. His group has a different concept called a Rural Retreat. This concept will celebrate agrotourism, agriculture and respect the natural features of the land. This concept limits the density of development and preserves natural features. Development under the current zoning will allow much greater density. The drafted amendment before you presents far lower density than what is currently allowed and is designed to preserve the open environment. A development like this would support the county's vision for a sustainable tourism, tax base and jobs while preserving natural features. **Jim Murphy** stated, the zoning sets out a clear process for dealing with the growth plan through the zoning ordinance. The county has rural areas, urban growth boundaries and urban growth boundaries. A rural area is defined as: Rural Areas (RA) - territory not in a UGB or a PGA that is to be preserved as agricultural lands, forests, recreational areas, wildlife management areas or for uses other than high density commercial, industrial and residential development. Under the definition of Rural Areas, low density commercial, industrial and residential development is allowed. Section 6.011 requires land use decisions that are consistent with the growth plan. Allowed zoning districts in the Rural Areas are Ag, E1, R1 and C3. These zoning districts are considered low density development. Adding a mixed-use commercial PUD as a permitted use in the rural areas and limited to a Rural Resort is defined in such a way to be a low-density development. This proposed amendment would be applicable to other areas of the county. The proposal is designed to locate a Rural Resort in close proximity to recreational activities and features. **Bill Herbert** stated, the proposed amendment strives to preserve agrotourism and rural areas. **Jaci Whitaker** stated, she disagrees. The development will not be low density and that it is out of character with the area. She opposes the proposed amendment. **Jana Haskew** stated, she is opposed to the proposed amendment and read a statement in opposition. **Cheryl Ellrich** stated, she opposes the proposed amendment. **Hope Patterson** stated, she is concerned with traffic and opposes the proposed amendment. **Wayne Miller** stated, he has environmental concerns and opposes the proposed amendment. **Jennifer Pedigo** stated, she is concerned with the traffic and environmental issues and opposes the proposed amendment. **Susan Taylor** stated, she is concerned with flooding, environmental issues, traffic and opposes the proposed amendment. **Julie Overstreet** stated, she is concerned with the change in character and opposes the proposed amendment. **Jeremy Whitaker** stated, he is opposed to the proposed amendment. **Elizabeth Wade** stated, she is concerned how the character of the area may be changed and opposes the proposed amendment. She believes the county should have a means to better protect rural properties. **Jay Rachels** stated, he opposes the proposed amendment and read a statement. **Tim Ellrich** stated, he opposes the proposed amendment and believes it limits future development potential for his property. **Linda Ryder** stated, she opposes the proposed amendment and

requested her written statement be included in the minutes of the meeting: “I learned today that tonight’s agenda has been revised with changes to the proposed amendment, deleting certain sections of the amendment. The agenda published online as of 3:00 pm on 10/2/25 had not been revised. Regardless, ANY CHANGES TO THE AGENDA ITEM MUST BE ADVERTISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH TCA. 13-7-105 and CANNOT BE CONSIDERED FOR VOTING TONIGHT. 2) Members of both the Planning Commission and the full County Commission should be well aware by now that APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IN ANY FORM, AND/OR APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ITSELF, WOULD EACH DIRECTLY VIOLATE BOTH STATE AND COUNTY LAWS REQUIRING DECISIONS REGARDING LAND USE TO COMPLY WITH THE COUNTY’S APPROVED GROWTH PLAN. 3) IT IS ESSENTIAL FOR BOTH THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE COUNTY COMMISSION TO UNDERSTAND THAT APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS IN ANY FORM WOULD AFFECT EVERY SINGLE OWNER OF PROPERTY ZONED AS AGRICULTURAL IN THE COUNTY. 4) C.B. Ragland has misrepresented and continues to misrepresent the density of the proposed development and the impact it would have on county residents and the local community. It is being promoted because it would be a lucrative investment for the private developers, NOT because of its value to the community. It would exploit environmental and community resources, to the detriment of the surrounding community and the county as a whole. 5) Residents of Cheatham County, particularly the 5th and 6th districts, OVERWHELMINGLY oppose this development. Nearly all vocalized public support for the development so far has come from individuals who could or would gain financially from it. 6) There are MANY reasons this development is not appropriate for this location and should be rejected. Financial gain is the PRIMARY reason for any support of it and does not justify any change in zoning. If approved, the developer would be positioned to exert excessive influence on Cheatham County government from that point forward. ALSO NOTE: 1179 signatures on Change.org opposed the development as of 3:20 pm on 10/2/25. 68% of signers were from Kingston Springs, Pegram, and White Bluff zip codes.” **Mario Mayes** stated, he opposes the proposed amendment. **James Wells** stated, he opposes the proposed amendment. **Phil Dawson** stated, he opposes the proposed amendment. **Tennyson Magness** stated, she opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Cheri Overstreet** stated, she opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **James Christy** stated, he opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Richard Murray** stated, he opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Jim Delanis** stated, he opposes the proposed zoning amendment and is concerned with the legal issues regarding the proposed amendment. **Larry Nash** stated, he encourages the commission to craft a CPUD for a rural area. He opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Joey Locker** stated, he believes tourism is a valuable resource for the county and development can be encouraged and regulated to help preserve agriculture, rural settings and historical sites for the future. **Roger Hamiter** stated, he supports the proposed amendment as it will create needed tax revenue, jobs and help preserve agriculture, rural settings and historical sites for the future. **Bob Sanders** stated, he supports generating tax dollars with low impact development and preserving agriculture, rural settings and historical sites for the future. **Jimmy Hedgepath**, 6th District Cheatham County Commissioner, stated, he represents the majority of the 6th Voting District and the majority opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Wes Haines** stated, he is concerned with the future of commercial farming and agricultural uses. He believes property owners have the right to develop their property. **Randy Noe**, 2nd District Cheatham County Commissioner, stated, his best friend, Steve Creech, from high school and served with in the US Army lived in the area. He asked for the planning

commission to represent the majority of the citizens. **Kyle Boone** stated, he opposes the proposed zoning amendment. **Linda Williams** stated, she opposes the proposed zoning amendment and questions any benefits from a development. Based on staff recommendations and discussion had at this meeting a ****MOTION**** to deny the proposed zoning amendment was made by Brian McCain; second by Brenda Montgomery. The motion passed by roll call vote. Matt Von Lunen -yes, Chester Hannah - yes, Brian McCain - yes, Chris Atkins - yes, Brenda Montgomery - yes, Gary Chance -yes, Mark Jarrell – no.

OTHER BUSINESS: None

ADJOURN: Having no further business, a ****MOTION**** to adjourn was made by Matt Von Lunen; second by Chris Atkins. Voice vote carried unanimously by all present. Meeting Adjourned at 9:00 PM.

**BRENDA MONTGOMERY – SECRETARY
CHEATHAM COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**