

**Regular Meeting of the
Cornersville Planning
Commission
Tuesday, March 24, 2026
6:30pm
Minutes**



Those Participating: Doris Arthur, John Luna, Chris Kiser, Trina Rios, Greg Venable
Staff Present: None

Absent: Sharon Pennington

1. Chairperson Rios called the meeting to order.

2. Discussion of Minutes

No changes were recommended, and minutes were approved.

3. Citizens' Comments

No Citizens were present.

4. Introduction of Town Engineer

Jim Patterson introduced himself and Ryan Patterson from St. John Engineering.

4. Report from the Zoning Administrator

The zoning administrator was not at the Planning Commission meeting but provided requests via email on 3/9/26.

- a. An application was provided for preliminary plat review for Collier Rd (Parton Subdivision Phase 3) Preliminary Plat Review. Inclusive of Town Engineer's comments. A revised plat was provided on 3/18/26 addressing Engineer's comments.
- b. Planning Commission informed that the BOMA would evaluate Zoning Ordinance changes on 4/2/26 and requested the Commission's recommendations. The Commission asked if there were any changes that the Zoning Administrator had for evaluation to be included with the Commission's recommendation. Additional input for the revision were provided on 3/18/26.

5. Vote on Officers

Rios recommended Kiser for Chairperson, seconded by Luna. Kiser accepted, and all members present voted in favor.

Kiser asked Rios if she would accept nomination for Vice Chairperson; she agreed. Kiser nominated Rios, seconded by Venable. All members present voted in favor.

Kiser asked Venable if he would accept nomination for Secretary; he agreed. Kiser nominated Venable, seconded by Luna. All members present voted in favor.

6. Review of Preliminary Plat for Parton Subdivision Phase 3 (Lots 8 through 10).

Patterson discussed his review and clarified that the right-of-way (ROW) requirement does not constitute an unlawful taking, but rather is necessary to meet minimum standards. He noted that this item had been addressed in the updated plat. He further observed that Lot 8 had been reconfigured into a "horseshoe" shape, likely to address soil area limitations and fire hydrant coverage. Patterson also stated that, without a clear definition of "flag lot" in the Subdivision Regulations, enforcement is difficult, and recommended that the Commission identify the specific concerns associated with flag lots and tailor definitions and restrictions accordingly.

Patterson additionally noted that the development should have been classified as a major subdivision from the outset, as the plats indicated intent for multiple phases and more than four lots.

Venable noted, and the Commission concurred, that the plat lacked required contour lines (topography) and culvert details as specified in Table 3-1 of the Subdivision Regulations. Patterson stated that, while he has not typically seen infrastructure related to surface water included on preliminary plats, he understood that such requirements are currently included in the Town's regulations. Kiser noted that drainage is a known concern, particularly as a stream crosses two of the subject properties. He further stated that the Commission may consider revising these requirements in the future and observed that inconsistent enforcement of these standards in the past has contributed to ongoing litigation involving other contractors. The Commission agreed to enforce the requirements of Table 3-1 as written moving forward and to conduct a dedicated review of the checklist to ensure it remains relevant and up to date.

Rios made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat for Parton Subdivision Phase 3 (Lots 8-10), contingent upon the following conditions:

Inclusion of drainage information, including locations and types of structures and pipe sizes;
Depiction of contour lines at vertical intervals of not more than two (2) feet (GIS-derived topography acceptable).

Approval is subject to administrative verification and evaluation by the Town Engineer, as well as written acknowledgment and acceptance of these conditions by the applicant within thirty (30) days of receipt.

Venable seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. All present voted in favor.

7. Text Amendment to Ordinance 22-274 (Zoning Ordinance)

The proposed items provided by the Zoning Administrator were discussed and compared to the revision previously developed by the Planning Commission. He noted that a copy with the Zoning Administrator recommendations was provided to the Commission members the previous week and asked if there were any specific concerns or questions; none were heard. Venable suggested using AI to assist in redlining and comparing duplicate paragraphs in the current regulations. Mark ups can be provided to the Planning Commission.

Definitions

Kiser discussed that regulatory requirements should not be embedded within the Definitions section, but instead included within the applicable regulatory sections of the ordinance. He explained that requirements are difficult to enforce when they are not clearly stated within the governing sections and that definitions may be subject to interpretation. The Commission concurred with this approach and retained the structure reflected in the previously developed revision.

For "Accessory Building or Structure," the Commission confirmed that the applicable regulations are addressed in Section 4.9 rather than Section 2.2. For "Addition," the Commission confirmed that the provision is already covered under Section 3.6.C, and no changes were made.

Regarding "Culvert," the Commission confirmed that the applicable regulatory language has been incorporated into Section 4.11.G in the current revision. The Commission further discussed that previously referenced diameters and lengths were not aligned with subdivision regulations and applicable state standards and agreed to adopt the more conservative values, as reflected in the revision.

The Commission also confirmed that fence regulations have been incorporated into Section 4.8 and retained as written in the revision.

Article 3

The Commission reviewed the proposed revisions to Article 3 as provided by the Zoning Administrator and compared them to the previously developed Planning Commission revision.

Regarding the proposed prohibition of liquor stores between Kennedy Lane and North Park Street, the Commission discussed expanding the restricted area to better support and protect the downtown aesthetic. It was further discussed that the boundary should be adjusted to areas outside of Coleman Road and Fairview Avenue, which are located beyond the proximity of schools. The Commission agreed to modify the restriction accordingly within the revision.

The proposed reduction of the minimum lot width in the R-1 district from sixty (60) feet to fifty (50) feet was reviewed. The Commission noted that no supporting context or justification was provided for this change and that existing nonconforming lots may already be rebuilt within their current footprint. It was further discussed that reducing the minimum lot width could encourage smaller home construction in new developments. Based on the lack of supporting rationale, the Commission did not adopt this proposed change and retained the existing standard in the revision.

Regarding setbacks, the proposed addition stating that the "maximum front setback can be increased for septic lots" was reviewed. The Commission determined that this item had already been addressed through correction of a typographical error, revising "maximum setback of 35 feet" to "minimum setback of 35 feet." The Commission retained the corrected language in the revision and did not adopt the additional proposed text. It was further noted that the corrected setback language supports flexibility for potential future road widening and utility buffers.

The Commission also confirmed that previously identified typographical errors throughout the ordinance, including incorrect jurisdictional references such as "Eagleville" and "Nolensville" being replaced with "Cornersville," and "Putnam" being replaced with "Marshall," had already been corrected in the revision and were retained as written.

Article 4

The Commission reviewed the proposed revisions to Article 4 as provided by the Zoning Administrator and compared them to the previously developed Planning Commission revision.

Regarding fences, the Commission confirmed that the applicable regulations had already been incorporated into Section 4.8 in the current revision. Venable recommended increasing the maximum fence height to seventy-two (72) inches (six (6) feet) to align with standard lumber dimensions, while maintaining the forty-eight (48) inch limitation for front yards and corner lots. The Commission agreed to this modification and incorporated it into the revision.

The requirement for sidewalks was reviewed, and the Commission confirmed that this item had already been addressed in the current revision and was retained as written.

The proposed revisions related to paved driveway aprons were reviewed. The Commission agreed to adopt this item with modification, as reflected in the revision.

Regarding standards for signs, the Commission reviewed the proposal to allow Interstate Business Signs and Billboards within the C-1 (Central Business) district and did not agree to include C-1 as an allowable location. The Commission did, however, agree to modify the distance requirements to align with Tennessee Code Annotated § 54-21-103, noting that the current revision did not meet those requirements. The revision was updated accordingly.

Article 5, 6 and 7

Venable conducted a final review of the draft using AI-assisted tools and identified several typographical and grammatical errors, which were corrected.

The Commission discussed coordination with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen (BOMA) and expressed concern regarding the volume of editorial and formatting errors remaining in the current draft. The Commission recommended that BOMA delay consideration of the proposed zoning ordinance amendments to allow for a thorough administrative review and correction of these issues prior to adoption.

Venable made a motion to recommend approval of the Planning Commission's revised draft of Ordinance 22-274, as discussed and amended, to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, with the recommendation that consideration be postponed pending completion of a full administrative and editorial review.

Arthur seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. All present voted in favor.

A full copy of the zoning ordinance with redline changes was provided to the BOMA for review.

8. Adjournment

Rios moved to adjourn. Luna seconded. All members present voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned.

Approved: 