

Comments on April 27, 2017 Planning Commission agenda items, received April 21-24

Item 1, Earhart Subdivision SP

From: Heather Smith <heathersmith514@gmail.com>

Date: Monday, April 24, 2017 at 9:15 AM

To: <Brenda.Diaz-Flores@nashville.gov>, <Brian.Tibbs@nashville.gov>, <Burkley.Allen@nashville.gov>, <Greg.Adkins@nashville.gov>, <Jeff.Haynes@nashville.gov>, <Jennifer.Hagan-Dier@nashville.gov>, <Jessica.Farr@nashville.gov>, <Lillian.M.Blackshear@nashville.gov>, <Pearl.Sims@nashville.gov>, <Ron.Gobbell@nashville.gov>, <doug.sloan@nashville.gov>, <patrick.napier@nashville.gov>

Subject: Earhart Road

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

First, I would like to thank you for your public service. I appreciate that public service is about your commitment to the public interest and often that meets more criticism than praise.

Next, I would like to express my views on item Earhart / Meadows Subdivision. I am a Davidson County homeowner in the Lakeside Meadows Subdivision. I would like to object to the proposed zoning change on 3110 Earhart Road. Following are some of the reasons:

1. Earhart Road and surrounding areas have experienced tremendous growth in the past 15 years. Existing roadways do not have shoulders, are narrow and winding. Even without further development, this creates the following issues:

- A. Large vehicles and watercraft routinely visit the area to access the Seven Points Recreation Area. More homes may also reduce the appeal for residents and tourists seeking open spaces and natural areas. Development and residential homes continue to encroach on the surrounding areas.

B. Destruction of natural habitats: animals are injured and killed on a routine basis due to increasing traffic and the destruction of their natural habitats. This also creates increased danger to those vehicles that strike deer, rabbits, squirrels, etc. Many residents chose to live in this area due to their appreciation of wildlife.

2. I am concerned that the public hearing date has been changed several times (originally 3/23 to 4/13 to 4/27). The mandated hearing notification sign still reflects the March 23rd date. If not for online resources (Nextdoor.com) many neighbors would not know the status. I believe that these changes make it even more difficult for tax-paying citizens to be involved.

3. There are two other large-scale developments currently in process nearby. While development can lead to improvements in our community, overdevelopment ultimately leads to the reduction of quality of life for Davidson County residents. Many of us who chose to live in this area made decisions based upon access to the interstate and other points of interest in a reasonable amount of time. We chose this area in order to enjoy the quality of life that living closer to Nashville no longer offers.

I ask that the proposal to re-zone this property to allow more residents and/or units be denied.

Sincerely,

Heather Smith

From: Candida Boggs [mailto:didacan23@me.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 1:52 PM

To: Brenda.Diaz-Flores@nashville.gov; Brian.Tibbs@nashville.gov; Allen, Burkley (Council Member); Greg.Adkins@nashville.gov; Jeff.Haynes@nashville.gov; Jennifer.Hagan-Dier@nashville.gov; Jessica.Farr@nashville.gov; Lillian.M.Blackshear@nashville.gov; Sims, Pearl (NCAC); Ron.Gobbell@nashville.gov; Sloan, Doug (Planning); Napier, Patrick (Planning); Planning Commissioners

Subject: 3110 Earhart Road Planning

Afternoon,

I am sending this mass email in hopes to have my voice heard on this item 16. 2016SP-062-001

EARHART SUBDIVISION . I strongly oppose this item.

I am a davidson county homeowner in the Lakeside Meadows Subdivision and object to the proposed zoning change on 3110 Earhart Road. Earhart is a narrow road and with already many large developments around the area. The proposed zoning change will allow more homes to be built and is a major concern to the existing homeowners in the area.

There is already increased traffic and nothing is being planned to deal with this concern. The planning commission has continued to push the date of the meeting from 3/23 to 4/13 to 4/27. I will not be able to attend because I will be out of town working.

Thank you

Candida Boggs

2621 Lakeside Meadows Drive

Mount Juliet, TN 37122

615-305-3322

From: Leslie Gurrola [mailto:lesliegurrola@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 2:03 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Glover, Steve (Council Member); greg.adkins@nashville.gov; jessica.farr@nashville.gov; Leslie Gurrola; Alfredo Gurrola

Subject: 2016SP-062-001 EARHART SUBDIVISION

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We live in the Lakeside Meadows community off Earhart Road and are writing to express our objection to the rezoning of the subject area. With other developments already in progress in this area, we (as many of our neighbors) are greatly concerned about the traffic impact to Earhart. Has the potential traffic impact of the proposed rezoning been studied, and if so, where can we view the results?

Earhart is already a narrow windy road with no shoulder. In fact, in some areas, there are steep drop offs with no guard rails. The proposed subdivision will have one entrance and exit onto this road. This will create, at a minimum, inconvenient congestion. Of more concern, however, is the potential for a dangerous traffic situation.

Please consider our concerns in your decision. We understand this is rapidly growing region -- smart, thoughtful growth is critical. Squeezing in the most occupants possible into an area not designed for this type of community is not the best solution for anyone.

Sincerely,

Leslie & Alfredo Gurrola

From: chris.romer@comcast.net [mailto:chris.romer@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 8:47 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2016SP-062-001 EARHART SUBDIVISION

Good Morning...

Just wanted to respond to the proposal: I'm not opposed to growth...but...the infrastructure must grow as well.

I know you're all aware of the added burden this development will place on traffic/schools/utilities, and I'm not trying

to educate you (way above my pay grade).

I'm just asking that the developers and the planning commission slow down a bit and allow the growth to occur

in a way that supports the huge number of new households. I just moved to the area 18 months ago...in new construction:

not opposed to others having the same opportunity...let's just not favor developer profits above the other concerns.

Thanks...and is the meeting still set for the 27th? Seems to be a moving target.

Chris Romer

2845 Lakeside Meadows Circle

Mt Juliet, TN 37122

(Davidson County)

Items 5a-f, short-term rental properties

From: Rhonda Freeman [mailto:rjfree55@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 3:06 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Short Term rentals

Dear Commission

I am opposed to short term rentals in non owner occupied homes in residential areas. There have been already too many instances where parties have gotten out of control. It presents a safety and hazard concern for everyone. The bad apples have tainted the program for others but this is also the reason the some communities forbid them in residential neighborhoods. They are commercial operations and should be in areas with the appropriate zoning, period.

Rhonda Freeman

2306 Sterling Rd

Nashville, TN 37215

From: Bell Newton [mailto:bella.bella@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 1:55 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Murphy, Kathleen (Council Member); Cooper, John
Subject: Item 5a-f Short-Term Rental Property (2017Z-004TX-001/BL2017-608/609/610/611/653/685)

Dear Planning Commissioners, I am asking that you consider doing the following:

Approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

Disapprove Amendment No 1 to Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

I also support the recommendation of the FEE RESOLUTION as shown from the Planning Staff.

I strongly feel that short-term rentals in our R and RS neighborhoods are a significant threat to our quality of life and property values. Please eliminate type 2 permits (non owner-occupied) from R and RS zoned neighborhoods as quickly as possible.

Thanks in advance for your consideration and thank you for your continued public service to our fine community.

Best,

Bell Lowe Newton
3950 Woodlawn Drive
Nashville, TN. 37205
(615) 385-0493

From: Green Hills Neighborhood Association [mailto:greenhills37215@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 12:56 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: STRPs - Please approve Substitute BL2017-608, Disapprove Amendment 1

Please open and read the attached letter. Thank you for your consideration.

The GHNA Board

(attachment follows)



April 24, 2017

Metro Planning Commission
700 Second Avenue S
Howard Office Building
Nashville TN 37210

SUBJECT: Short-Term Rental Property – 2017Z-004TX-001 – Item 5a-f

Good Afternoon Commissioners:

The Board of the Green Hills Neighborhood Association fully supports the Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608, but opposes Amendment 1. As Board members, we represent hundreds of residents in the Green Hills Community. After diligent research and discussion, we believe phasing out not owner-occupied short-term rentals in R and RS zoned neighborhoods is in the best interest of not only our Green Hills neighborhoods, but neighborhoods across Nashville. We do not believe STRPs operating in residential neighborhoods is consistent with the General Plan.

We strongly oppose Amendment 1 to Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608; if approved it would allow STRPs as a commercial use permitted with conditions in R and RS zoned districts. This appears to completely contradict the purpose of BL2017-608 – to phase out STRPs in R and RS zoned districts.

We do not oppose all not owner-occupied STRPs; there are some districts that are appropriate for STRPs (mixed use and some commercial come to mind). However, our members, as well as thousands of other Nashville residents, never imagined when purchasing their residential homes that one day a commercial business – such as a mini hotel – might operate next door, or across, or down the street. Yet that is exactly what these investor-owned, not owner-occupied Type 2 STRPs have become – commercial businesses operating in our residential neighborhoods.

We respectfully request that you approve the Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608, but disapprove Amendment 1. Thank you for your service to Nashville.

The GHNA Board

Charlotte Cooper – President
Bartley McGehee – Vice-President
Lisa Zhito – Secretary
Sallie Nortob – Treasurer
Vicki Claycombe – Board Member
Connie Cowan – Board Member
Beth O’Shea – Board Member
Ronna Rubin – Board Member
Russ Willis – Board Member

From: CHNA 37215 [mailto:chna37215@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 12:47 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Approve Substitute BL2017-608 - Disapprove Amendment 1

Please read attached letter.

(attachment follows)



April 24, 2017

Metro Planning Commission
700 Second Ave South
Nashville TN 37210

SUBJECT: 2017-004TX-001 – Short-term rental property

Dear Commissioners:

As Board members of the Castleman-Hobbs Neighborhood Association in the Green Hills area, we urge you to approve the Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608, but disapprove Amendment 1 to that substitute ordinance. The amendment seems counterintuitive to the ordinance. As we understand BL2017-608, not owner-occupied STRPs will be phased-out in R and RS zoned neighborhoods. Amendment 1 appears to be a loophole in order to allow not owner-occupied as a commercial use permitted with conditions in R and RS zoned districts. This doesn't make sense.

We believe now is the time to start phasing-out these not owner-occupied STRPs. Not owner-occupied STRPs are commercial businesses. Transients are their customers; these strangers enter and leave our residential neighborhoods at all hours of the day and night. Neighborhoods should feel safe for its residents. Individuals purchase homes in residential zones for a reason – to have a safe environment in which to raise children, a place to relax and enjoy peace and quiet, and to be among neighbors who share common values and goals. Transients are not neighbors; they are strangers.

Please approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608, but disapprove Amendment 1. Thank you for your time and consideration

Castleman-Hobbs Board of Directors

From: Hayes, Roseanne (Council Office)
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 4:13 PM
To: Sloan, Doug (Planning)
Cc: Logan, Carrie (Planning); Adams, Kelly (Planning); Leeman, Bob (Planning); Burnette, Brandon (Council Office); VanReece, Nancy (Council Member)
Subject: RE: BL2017-610

This correspondence is being sent at the request of Councilmember Nancy VanReece.

Rosie

Roseanne Hayes, Chief of Staff
Vice Mayor/Metro Council Office
One Public Square, Suite 204
Nashville, TN 37201
Office: 615.880.3350
Fax: 615.862.6784
Cell: 615.305.4330

(attachment follows)



METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

Member of Council

Nancy VanReece

Metro Council 8th District
209 Marlin Court • Madison, TN 37115
Telephone 615-862-6780

April 20, 2017

**Mr. Doug Sloan, Director
Metropolitan Planning Department
800 Second Avenue, South
Nashville, TN 37210**

Dear Mr. Sloan:

RE: BL2017-610

We respectfully request that BL2017-610, case # 2017Z-006TX-001 be withdrawn from the April 27th Planning Commission agenda. We plan to withdraw the bill at the May 2nd Council Public hearing. Thank you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**Nancy VanReece
Councilmember, District 8**

**cc: Ms. Carrie Logan
Ms. Kelly Adams
Mr. Bob Leeman**

From: lhowarth@aol.com [mailto:lhowarth@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 7:11 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Barry, Megan (Mayor)
Subject: April 27 Planning Commission Meeting on STRs

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

I cannot attend the April 27 meeting of the Planning Commission to express my views on the six ordinances you will be considering regarding short-term rentals (STRs). So I am writing to you instead about this complicated, and to me and many in my Cherokee Park neighborhood, alarming issue.

The only type of STR that I do not oppose is Type 1, where residents may rent a room or apartment in their own home as long as they live onsite to supervise their guests. This is the only type of STR that does not threaten to negatively impact the residential character of a neighborhood.

I very much oppose allowing Type 2 rentals, where an investor buys a house in a residential neighborhood and uses it exclusively for short term rentals, while no owner or manager lives onsite. I also strongly oppose Type 3 rentals, where an investor buys a condo or apartment and rents it short term.

Type 2 and Type 3 rentals amount to unsupervised businesses operating in residential neighborhoods, where most other people are trying to form a community of neighbors, protect their children, live close to their children's schools and their own places of worship, reduce dangerous traffic, and improve their house and yard property.

The Nashville planning commission should follow the lead of Brentwood and Chattanooga in resisting the pressure of real estate investors and the STR industry lobby to allow Type 2 and Type 3 rentals in residential neighborhoods. Caving to their demands is not standing up for Nashville residents.

There is value in protecting city neighborhoods people have chosen to live in long term because they want to be "in the city," rather than the suburbs. My neighborhood is not lined with mansions or acreage laws. Its fairly modest homes and lawns date back to the 1920s, and the people who have moved here were always attracted by the feel of a quiet city neighborhood, with easy access to downtown and college

campuses, and schools, churches, synagogues, hospitals, restaurants, grocery stores, and other shops. They didn't want to live in the midst of a commercial district, but liked not having to drive long distances to find good commercial amenities.

Nashville is changing very rapidly, and some of that change is welcome. But don't mistake the undermining of old residential neighborhoods by investors who don't live in those neighborhoods, and who have no personal stake in their safety, health, or happiness, to be a good change. Please say to no to Type 2 and 3 STRs.

Thank you,

Lydia Howarth

230 Lauderdale Road

Cherokee Park, Nashville

From: Roddy Story [mailto:rstory@tennbank.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 6:32 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Short Term Rentals

I have lived in Nashville my entire life and want to make sure that we balance our growth potential and quality of life. As an owner of rental property I understand the potential of STRPs to investors. What I also understand as a resident is the potential disadvantage to residential neighborhoods. I would like to limit STRPs to those where owners reside in areas R and RS

Approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

Disapprove Amendment No 1 to Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

Cordially,

Roddy L. Story, Jr.

Executive Vice President

Commercial Division Manager

4007 Hillsboro Rd.

Nashville, TN 37215

615-298-8009

NMLS #936645



From: Patrick Brakefield [mailto:jpbrakefield@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:13 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Type 2 and 3 STRs

No to type 2 and 3 STRs.

From: Charlotte Cooper [mailto:cscoopernash@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:05 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Pls vote YES for Substitute BL2017-608 and vote NO for Amendment 1

Good Afternoon Commissioners:

As a longtime neighborhood advocate, I support Substitute BL2017-608; however, I do not support the proposed Amendment 1. I do not believe Type 2 permits for not owner-occupied short-term rentals belong in residential (R and RS) neighborhoods. These are simply commercial businesses with no actual residential going on. Since 2015 many neighborhoods have been invaded by investors wanting to cash in on the unintended consequences of Metro's short-term rental regulations that allow "mini hotels" to operate in residential neighborhoods. For as long as I can remember commercial businesses where customers/clients come to the home have not been allowed in residential neighborhoods. This includes, but is not limited to lawyers, accountants, architects, insurance, hairdressers, recording studios, etc. The "accessory use" for STRPs in the current regulations work as a loophole for these not owner-occupied STRPs businesses.

We have heard the arguments from the STRP owners, as well as the industry lobbyists, about how unfair it is to remove Type 2s from neighborhoods; at the January 2017 public hearing at Metro Council on BL2016-492, every STRP speaker voiced concern over losing their business and their income from their business in their residential neighborhood. I believe this comes down to proper land use and zoning; Metro should not be giving consideration to economics and profits for individual businesses. A 12-month permit does not establish property rights.

Neighborhoods zoned R and RS should be used as intended – for single family and two family housing. Individuals need to know when they purchase a house in a R and RS zoned area, they do not have to worry about a commercial business operating next door.

Please vote YES for Substitute BL2017-608 and vote NO for Amendment 1. I also ask for you to approve the Fee Resolution recommended by the Planning Staff. Thank you for your consideration.

Charlotte Cooper

3409 Trimble Rd

Nashville TN 37215

District 34

From: Alexa Herndon [mailto:nashvillenative@icloud.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 12:52 PM
To: Council Members; Planning Commissioners; Barry, Megan (Mayor)
Subject: Keep STRPs Legal

Good Morning Fellow Nashville Residents,

I am writing to ask you to support keeping STRPs legal in Nashville. As a Nashville native, I understand how important our neighborhoods are and we do not want them to lose their charm. It is my belief that tighter restrictions need to be placed on who can own STRs in our city. A good rule of thumb would be to restrict anyone who does not possess a Davidson county permanent address. Another is to require that all unsupervised STRs(Type1,2&3) be managed by a LOCAL 24hr management company. A third idea would be to set a max across the board. There is no reason 16 people should be staying in any single residence. Only accepting Type 1 STRs is NOT the answer as the majority of Type 1 STRs are completely unsupervised.

- 1) Did you know that most Type 3 STRs have onsite offices?
- 2) Did you know that most Type 1 STRs are only rented out when the home-owner is out of town, leaving them completely unsupervised?
- 3) Did you know that there is still a huge portion of properties running illegally? Most type 1 & 2

Thank you,
Alexa

From: Diane Sesler [mailto:dianesesler@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 5:29 PM
To: Council Members; Planning Commissioners; Barry, Megan (Mayor)
Subject: Keep STRPs Legal

Dear Council Members,

We are proud owners of 2 vacation homes. We are responsible citizens who care about their community and go beyond what is expected of us to make our neighbors and guests happy. We treat everyone the same way we would want to be treated. This means being courteous, respectful, quiet, clean, legal permit holders, and a happy place for people to enjoy. Our neighbors are well aware of what we do and have our phone numbers to contact us anytime they want to do so.

We have many families who come back every year to stay with us . We had a family who wanted to come and spend time with their dying brother who wished to see Nashville before he passed away. Our quiet home met their every need. They wanted to be together as if they were in their own home.

There's so many good stories we can share with you. We love what we do. Our home has become a nest for many people and we are proud of what we have created. We have had over 100's of reviews and they are all positive.

We oppose Bills BL2017-608, BL2017-609, & BL2017-610. Please support all of us who are responsible owners. We thank you for your time and listening to all of us who have wonderful and positive stories to share with all of you.

Sincerely,

Diane & David Sesler

1912 Shelby Avenue, Nashville, TN 37206

204 Scott Avenue, Nashville, TN 37206

From: Heidi Welch [mailto:welchart4@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 5:16 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Heidi Welch
Subject: Approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608 please

Dear Planning Commission,

I agree with the Board of the Green Hills Neighborhood Association. Please don't allow "not owner-owned" short term rental properties. I am sorry I can't be at the meeting on April 27 but I have to stay late at work to man a reception.

Therefore, the Board of the Green Hills Neighborhood Association recommends the following:

Approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

Disapprove Amendment No 1 to Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

The GHNA Board also supports the recommendation of the FEE RESOLUTION as shown from the Planning Staff.

-Heidi Welch

--

Heidi Welch
welchart4@gmail.com

“In all things of nature there is something of the marvelous.” - Aristotle

From: Michael Bradley [mailto:mabradley4248@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 4:57 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Short Term Rentals

I would very much like to recommend that the Planning Commission take the following actions on April 27, 2017 agenda:

1. Approve Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608
2. Disapprove Amendment No 1 to Substitute Ordinance BL2017-608

I do not believe that allowing absentee owners to establish and operate short term rentals is in the best interest of our Nashville neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration,

Michael Bradley
4248 Jamesborough Place
Nashville, TN 37215

From: David Rachel Peiffer (A Google User) [mailto:davidandrachelpfeiffer@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 2:00 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: STR HEARING- April 27th

Hello,

We live at 1601 Jones Ave and are against type 2 and 3 Short Term Rentals. These rentals are commercial businesses and should NOT be allowed to operate in residential neighborhoods. They are destroying Nashville residents way of life by allowing loud, unmonitored constant guests to use residential properties as hotels.

Before moving to Jones Avenue we previously lived at 1411 Stainback Ave. During the last 2 months of living in this home we had two Type 2 Short term rentals that began operating at 1405 Stainback. It was an overnight change to our neighborhood. The first weekend of renting we called the police after we woke to glass breaking and watched a houseful of loud partiers break into a building next door. They were up all night drunk and partying. Over the next two months loud parties seemed to be constant. Not only that but a constant swarm of new renters every few days created problems on an already tight neighborhood street. Multiple cars from many people would block traffic and take up many street parking spaces.

We were very thankful we only had to live next to these Type 2 rentals for a few months. It is not fair for residents to have to "police" these properties every weekend. There are so many people who want to move and live long term in these wonderful Nashville neighborhoods. Let's call these Short Term Rentals what they should be: Commercial Businesses. And let's keep them out of our residential neighborhoods.

On behalf of Nashville residents please vote to remove Type 2 and 3 Short Term Rentals.

Warmest regards,
David and Rachel Peiffer
1601 Jones Ave
615.585.7473

From: Kathryn Campbell [mailto:nanuet.1954@icloud.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 1:20 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Investment...

I bought not only for a roof over my head but as my home!, as well as an investment. Having boisterous, don't give a damn ruckus, partying next door, does not help in the value of selling. What happened to just being a neighborhood?! Like most of us, when we were growing up, had? Has GREED become the threat!!?? Do these investors have any of these rentals in their neighborhood where their 'children' play?

From: Kathy Austin [mailto:KAustin@levineorr.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 22, 2017 6:47 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: SRT

As I understand it, the bills refer to owner-occupied and investor-owned rentals. I think investor-owned is too broad a category. The third category is STR owned by Davidson County residents, not out-of-town investors. These folks are likely not investors. My neighbor owns one such rental property. She and her husband were each homeowners when they got married. Instead of selling, they rented one home and are now doing a STR. It is near to her home and is a good source of income for her. I think it is fine if you ban investors from out of county but why ban locally owned rentals? Maybe limit each owner to one property. Require the owner to give the neighbors his or her name and number so that he or she can be called directly. Since they will be reasonable close by, they can get there quickly. Also, local folks who own these are likely much more interested in supervising their rental because they don't want their property trashed any more than the neighbors do. So I think a third category is appropriate. I'll bet there have been few, if any, complaints about locally owned properties. It's the out-of-town investors who are the problem.

Thanks,

Kathy Austin

1419 Roberts Avenue

Item 17, Conservation Overlay District along Eastdale Ave., Riverwood Drive, and Plymouth Avenue

From: deborahlunn@comcast.net [mailto:deborahlunn@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:25 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay

Dear Commissioners,

I live and own property within the borders of the proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay, and I support this measure.

Eastdale Place was founded as one of Inglewood's first subdivision in 1923 and is the earliest planned development within the Jackson Park Historic District. Today, it stands as an unusually intact architectural record of Nashville's growth over the past century, with 93% of the properties deemed contributing.

I have spoken with the majority of our neighbors, going door-to-door, and we support the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay because it strikes the right balance between preserving the past and ensuring responsible growth moving forward. I believe that the conservation overlay guidelines are fair, manageable, and balanced. Significant benefits include retention of smaller, affordable homes, promotion of responsible development, and preservation of Nashville's history. While the conservation overlay will impose some limitations on what I can do with my property, this is a small price I'm willing to pay.

Our neighborhood embraces this unique opportunity to be a custodian of Eastdale Place's past and a good steward of its future, and I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay.

Deborah Lunn
1127 Riverwood

17 years in Eastdale Place

From: Erica Hester [mailto:erica.p.hester@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 11:35 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: I support the NCZO for Eastdale Place

Dear Commissioners,

I live and own property within the borders of the proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay, and I support this measure.

Eastdale Place was founded as one of Inglewood's first subdivision in 1923 and is the earliest planned development within the Jackson Park Historic District. Today, it stands as an unusually intact architectural record of Nashville's growth over the past century, with 93% of the properties deemed contributing.

My neighbors and I, both new and lifelong residents, support the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay because it strikes the right balance between preserving the past and ensuring responsible growth moving forward. I believe that the conservation overlay guidelines are fair, manageable, and balanced. Significant benefits include retention of smaller, affordable homes, promotion of responsible development, and preservation of Nashville's history. While the conservation overlay will impose some limitations on what I can do with my property, this is a small price I'm willing to pay.

Our neighborhood embraces this unique opportunity to be a custodian of Eastdale Place's past and a good steward of its future, and I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay.

Erica Hester, owner
1223 Plymouth Ave 37216
3 years in current residence

From: ROD BOEHM [mailto:rodboehm@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: I support the NCZO for Eastdale Place

Dear Commissioners, I live and own property within the borders of the proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay, and I support this measure. Eastdale Place was founded as one of Inglewood's first subdivision in 1923 and is the earliest planned development within the Jackson Park Historic District. Today, it stands as an unusually intact architectural record of Nashville's growth over the past century,

with 93% of the properties deemed contributing. My neighbors and I, both new and lifelong residents, support the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay because it strikes the right balance between preserving the past and ensuring responsible growth moving forward. I believe that the conservation overlay guidelines are fair, manageable, and balanced. Significant benefits include retention of smaller, affordable homes, promotion of responsible development, and preservation of Nashville's history. While the conservation overlay will impose some limitations on what I can do with my property, this is a small price I'm willing to pay. Our neighborhood embraces this unique opportunity to be a custodian of Eastdale Place's past and a good steward of its future, and I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay.

Rod and Marsha Boehm

1248 Plymouth Ave and we have lived at this address since 1980

From: Lawrence, Karen B. DDS Nashville [mailto:Karen.B.Lawrence@ssa.gov]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 9:55 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: I support the NCZO for Eastdale Place

Dear Commissioners,

I live and own property within the borders of the proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay, and I support this measure.

Eastdale Place was founded as one of Inglewood's first subdivision in 1923 and is the earliest planned development within the Jackson Park Historic District. Today, it stands as an unusually intact architectural record of Nashville's growth over the past century, with 93% of the properties deemed contributing.

My neighbors and I, both new and lifelong residents, support the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay because it strikes the right balance between preserving the past and ensuring responsible growth moving forward. I believe that the conservation overlay guidelines are fair, manageable, and balanced. Significant benefits include retention of smaller, affordable homes, promotion of responsible development, and preservation of Nashville's history. While the conservation overlay will impose some limitations on what I can do with my property, this is a small price I'm willing to pay.

Our neighborhood embraces this unique opportunity to be a custodian of Eastdale Place's past and a good steward of its future, and I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay.

Karen Lawrence
1131 Riverwod Drive

Resident since 2012

From: eric conn [mailto:ericconn87@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 9:41 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: I support the NCZO for Eastdale Place

Dear Commissioners,

I live and own property within the borders of the proposed Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay, and I support this measure.

Eastdale Place was founded as one of Inglewood's first subdivision in 1923 and is the earliest planned development within the Jackson Park Historic District. Today, it stands as an unusually intact architectural record of Nashville's growth over the past century, with 93% of the properties deemed contributing.

My neighbors and I, both new and lifelong residents, support the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay because it strikes the right balance between preserving the past and ensuring responsible growth moving forward. I believe that the conservation overlay guidelines are fair, manageable, and balanced. Significant benefits include retention of smaller, affordable homes, promotion of responsible development, and preservation of Nashville's history. While the conservation overlay will impose some limitations on what I can do with my property, this is a small price I'm willing to pay.

Our neighborhood embraces this unique opportunity to be a custodian of Eastdale Place's past and a good steward of its future, and I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Eastdale Place Conservation Overlay.

ERIC CONN
1302 PLYMOUTH AVE
NASHVILLE TN 37216

4 YEARS IN EASTDALE PLACE

Item 22, Contextual Overlay District on Audubon Road/Dale Avenue/Galloway Drive/Glendale Lane/Gray Oaks Drive/Lealand Lane/Milesdale Court/Milesdale Drive/Scenic Drive/Tower Avenue

From: Green Hills Neighborhood Association [mailto:greenhills37215@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 12:53 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Pls approve Contextual Overlay District 2017Z-038PR-001/BL2017-670

Please open and read the attached letter. Thank you for your consideration.

The GHNA Board

(attachment follows)



April 24, 2017

Metro Planning Commission
700 Second Avenue S
Howard Office Building
Nashville TN 37210

SUBJECT: Contextual Overlay District – 2017Z-038PR-001/BL2017-670 – Item 22

Good Afternoon Commissioners:

The Board of the Green Hills Neighborhood Association fully supports the Contextual Overlay District for various properties on Audubon Road, Dale Avenue, Galloway Drive, Glendale Lane, Gray Oaks Drive, Lealand Lane, Milesdale Court, Milesdale Drive, Scenic Drive and Tower Place.

As we have watched neighborhood after neighborhood lose its character to “McMansions” and “tall skinnies,” we welcome this tool that offers guidelines for future development for this wonderful neighborhood. We certainly understand that change and growth will come, and we welcome it within reason. We believe the Contextual Overlay offers the least restrictive of all overlays, yet helps retain the existing character of our neighborhoods and does not affect zoning that is already in place.

We respectfully request that you approve this Contextual Overlay District. Thank you for your service to Nashville.

The GHNA Board

Charlotte Cooper – President
Bartley McGehee – Vice-President
Lisa Zhito – Secretary
Sallie Nortob – Treasurer
Vicki Claycombe – Board Member
Connie Cowan – Board Member
Beth O’Shea – Board Member
Ronna Rubin – Board Member
Russ Willis – Board Member

From: Carol Dick [mailto:wwd3rd@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 3:24 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Pulley, Russ (Council Member)
Subject: Council Bill No. BL2017-670, Case BL 2017Z-038PR-001

Metro Planning Commission

April 24, 2017

Howard Office Building

700 2nd Avenue South

Nashville, Tennessee 37210

In Regards to:

Council Bill No. BL2017-670

Case BL 2017Z-038PR-001

Dear Commissioners,

We own a home at 4310 Scenic Drive, Nashville, Tn 37204. We are writing this letter to let you

know that we are in favor of applying a Contextual Overlay to our neighborhood. We

understand that a contextual overlay district provides appropriate design standards for

residential areas necessary to maintain and reinforce an established form or character of

residential development in a particular area. This is a good thing! With Nashville's continued

growth it is very important to preserve and develop existing neighborhoods in a responsible way.

We would appreciate your recommendation of this bill to the Metro Council and we look forward

to their approval.

Sincerely,

Carol and Bill Dick

4310 Scenic Drive

Nashville, Tn. 37204

From: Dwayne Sagen [mailto:D.Sagen@Comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:51 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Overlay for Lealand Tower Place, etc

Dear Metro Planning Commission:

I am in favor of the overlay plan for Lealand Lane/Tower Place/ Dale Ave/ Glendale. Please approve and submit to the Metro Council. Thank you.

Dwayne Sagen Ph. D.

1001 Tower Place 37204

Director of Bands, Retired

Asst Dean of Blair Admissions, Retired

Vanderbilt University

From: Debbie Linn [mailto:debbie@Leadershipmusic.org]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:50 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: dlschwartz@comcast.net
Subject: Please approve BL2017-670 – Contextual Overlay in Green Hills)

To the Commissioners:

I hope you will approve BL2017-670, a Contextual Overlay in the Green Hills area. This overlay will still allow for development and infill while also respecting the character and history of this beautiful neighborhood I've lived in for over 20 years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Debbie Linn

4040 Overbrook Drive

Nashville, TN 37204

From: Charlotte Cooper [mailto:cscoopernash@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Pulley, Russ (Council Member)
Subject: Pls vote YES for the Contextual Overlay - 2017Z-038PR-001/BL2017-670, Item 22

Good Afternoon Commissioners:

As a longtime neighborhood advocate, I support the Contextual Overlay as described in 2017Z-038PR-001/BL2017-670, Item 22.

I believe the Contextual Overlay is a great tool for many of our older, stable neighborhoods, especially those where the lots are smaller. As I drive through some of the neighborhoods with smaller lots I hate to see two large tall-skinny houses crammed onto a quarter acre where one house once stood. I believe this overlay is the right solution for this neighborhood.

Please vote Yes for the Contextual Overlay. Thank you for time and consideration.

Charlotte Cooper

3409 Trimble Rd

Nashville TN 37215

District 34

From: Brian Hylbert [mailto:brianhylbert@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 1:49 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Glendale contextual overlay - BL 2017Z-038PR-001

Hello,

I am writing to urge the planning commission to green light the Glendale contextual overlay. There are, unfortunately, five massive houses being built right now on the lot next to us on Glendale lane. It's pretty much a travesty, this "infill Nashville" philosophy -and everyone knows it. But only you all can really do anything about it on our behalf. Gradual growth and development is one thing - what is happening in this beautiful neighborhood and others is gross and irresponsible.

Please do the right thing for Nashville, lest we quickly become Nashlanta. Help us say enough is enough to this gold rush-style greed, and help preserve the character and beauty of our lovely neighborhood.

Sincere thanks,

Brian, Naomi, Elsa, and Lottie Hylbert
1015 Glendale Lane

From: Ronna Rubin [mailto:ronna@rubinmedia.biz]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 1:38 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: In support of BL2017-670 - Contextual Overlay for Glendale Park (Green Hills)

To the Commissioners:

I am asking you to please vote to approve **BL2017-670**, the request for a Contextual Overlay for the Glendale Park area of Green Hills.

Much of the acreage in question was part of Nashville's original zoo, the Glendale Park Zoo which closed in 1935, and as a result, mature trees and beautiful green space dots the area.

A Contextual Overlay will still allow developers to erect the largest house on the block but at the same time, will provide a bit of peace of mind and respect to longtime residents who've beautifully maintained their homes and property.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ronna Rubin

4320 Dale Avenue

37204

From: Patrick Rickelton [mailto:patrickelton@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 1:34 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: SUPPORT for BL 2017Z-038PR-001

Der Planning Commissioners - I will be unable to attend this Thursday's meeting to voice my **STRONG** support for this proposed overlay, so please consider this email as you receive comments and make your decision.

My primary concern is preserving the character of our neighborhood - quiet, uncrowded, wooded. I believe the proposed overlay allows for growth and expansion at a reasonable rate, but with respect for existing properties.

I have lived on Scenic Drive for over 14 years and have watched the face of neighboring streets change drastically during that time. Walking my children to school on Biltmore Drive, half a mile away, I've witnessed single-story houses leveled, one after another, and replaced with TWO 2-stories houses. Besides the unending construction and the inconsistent look of the neighborhood, what effect will tripling/quadrupling square-footage have on traffic this area? I'd like to still be able to walk these streets safely with my children as they grow up.

Thank you for your time, and for the work you do to keep Nashville beautiful!

Patrick Rickelton

owner AND occupant

4304 Scenic Drive

From: Steve Vanden Noven [mailto:svandenoven@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 11:07 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Pulley, Russ (Council Member)
Cc: Marnie Vanden Noven; Steve Vanden Noven
Subject: Proposed Contextual Overlay - Council Bill No. BL2017-670; Case 2017Z-038PR-001:
OPPOSITION
Importance: High

Dear Planning Commission Members and Councilman Russ Pulley:

Please read and put into record the attached letter from my wife and me noting our opposition to the proposed contextual overlay for our RS20 zoned neighborhood on Milesdale Court in Nashville. I hope that you will read our concerns regarding the proposed overlay and vote AGAINST the measure.

Please feel free to contact me directly with any questions or for further discussion. Thanks.

Steve Vanden Noven

4424 Milesdale Ct.

Nashville, TN 37204

414-303-7050 (c)

svandenoven@gmail.com

(attachment follows)

4424 Milesdale Ct.
Nashville, TN 37204

April 23, 2004

Mr. Russ Pulley
Planning Commission Members
Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County
Planning Department, Metro Office Building
800 Second Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37219-6300

RE: Council Bill No. BL2017-670, Case 2017Z-038PR-001 - OPPOSITION

Dear Council Member Pulley & Planning Commission Members:

We are writing to express our **firm opposition** to the Contextual Overlay proposed as Council Bill No. BL2017-670, Case 2017Z-038PR-001, for Subarea 10, Green Hills – Midtown (2005), Council District 25, which includes my residence in Lealand Heights Subdivision at 4424 Milesdale Ct., Nashville.

My wife and I have lived at 4424 Milesdale Ct. for just over a year. We purchased the property because of its location close to her work at Belmont University and our children's present and future schools. We also specifically wanted to live in RS20 zoning, as it did not allow for investors to knock down a home and put two side-by-side homes in its place. We value the low-density single family environment. We also wanted the ability to expand and remodel our small ranch home, which was originally only a two bedroom home, then expanded to a three bedroom home by converting the garage to a master bedroom. Because of a very quirky layout in our home, we desire to "build up" and add a full second floor and possibly an attic for storage. While doubtful at this time, a complete raze and rebuild is not out of the question.

My wife and I are opposed to the proposed contextual overlay for a number of reasons:

- 1) **The RS20 base zoning already protects our subdivision from investors/builders building two side-by-side residential units on one property, thereby preserving the low density, single family environment it was meant to protect – the overlay is not needed for this restriction.** The woman who came to our house asking for us to sign a petition to support the overlay clearly did not have her facts straight, as she was telling the people on our street that the proposed contextual overlay would protect the neighborhood from side-by-side twin development on single half-acre lots. This is simply not true and I believe that this false narrative is driving support for the contextual overlay. People are simply misinformed.
- 2) **The overlay restricts our property rights as homeowners to expand or rebuild our homes on our private lots.** As mentioned, we purchased the home with the plan to add a full second story to our home to overcome its small size and quirky layout. We should not have that right taken away from us. The contextual overlay overly restricts that right by limiting us to 125% of the current height of the two homes on both sides of our lot (all ranch houses), not to exceed 1.5 stories if the 125% average is below 27 feet, which it would be in our case. As long as our

improvements meet zoning and building code requirements for RS20 zoning, we should not be burdened with additional restrictions.

- 3) **The proposed overlay will reduce property values over the long run, as the value of our location will be diminished by restricting homes to their current small size and 1.5 story height.** Possible buyers will seek alternate neighborhoods with equally attractive locations where they have the freedom to expand their homes or build new without the burdens placed upon them by the contextual overlay.
- 4) **The ranch homes in the Lealand Heights subdivision are not of historical significance and do not meet the needs of today's families.** Ranch homes have been built all over the country and enjoyed substantial popularity in the 1950's and 1960's for their relatively low cost and single floor living. Most were only 2-3 bedroom homes with only 2-3 non-sleeping rooms and rarely have accessible attics for storage. Frankly, many of the existing homes in our neighborhood are poorly maintained and landscaped and need improvements or replacement. Very few new ranch homes are built today as they are not popular and their layouts are not conducive to modern, open layouts.
- 5) **The addition of modern home expansions and new builds actually add needed housing stock diversity to neighborhoods and make formerly monolithic neighborhoods more attractive.**
- 6) **The addition of modern home expansions and new builds raise property values!** Forcing a neighborhood to be stuck in the past with dated homes and layouts is a recipe for disaster.

As such, we are firmly opposed to the proposed contextual overlay. Please consider taking one of the following actions:

- 1) Vote "no" on the contextual overlay Council Bill No. BL2017-670; Case 2017A-038PR-001, OR
- 2) Eliminate the Lealand Heights neighborhood, including Milesdale Dr. and Milesdale Court from the contextual overlay, OR
- 3) Modify the contextual overlay to relax the current height and coverage restrictions to more reasonable standards.

Please do not let some misinformed neighborhood activists convince you that the contextual overlay is a positive thing for our neighborhood. As mentioned, the RS20 Zoning already protects us from side-by-side "double" development on 20,000 s.f. single family lots. In addition, the feared "mega-mansions" are not being built on half acre lots – they require more land.

Please contact me if you have any questions or prefer to discuss the matter further. I can be reached at 414-303-7050.

Sincerely,

Steve & Marnie Vanden Noven

Steve Vanden Noven
Marnie Vanden Noven

From: Ginger Byrn [mailto:gbyrn@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 6:50 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: BL 2017Z-038PR-001 - Contextual Overlay for Glendale Park Neighborhood

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of BL 2017Z-038PR-001, the Contextual Overlay for Glendale Park.

A contextual overlay will help maintain the character of our neighborhood, protect the quality of life of everyone who lives there and ensure new construction and additions are in context with the existing homes.

Ours is an old and established neighborhood with consistent housing sizes (plus a few, large new houses), big trees and yards. Without the protection of the contextual overlay design guidelines, everything that we value about our neighborhood will be lost to bulldozers. Without the overlay, more residents will find themselves living next door to 3-story, 6,000 sq. ft. houses that tower over their homes and their yards, and treetops will be replaced by rooftops.

Please support the Contextual Overlay for our neighborhood.

Thank you!

Ginger Byrn

4323 Lealand Lane

Nashville, TN 37204

From: Jennifer Broad [mailto:jenbroad@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 2:18 PM

To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Contextual overlay

Hi, I live near Lealand Land and am writing to express my strong support for the request of the contextual overlay for my surrounding neighborhoods. Item 22 (a request to apply a Contextual Overlay District (20167Z-038PR-001/BL2017-670)), will be discussed at the April 27 meeting, from what I understand. Please grant us this request! It will be a great benefit to the future of our neighborhood! It does not inhibit or prohibit growth, but gives guidelines to grow well.

Thank you!
Jennifer Broad

From: Mary W. Francis [mailto:bluwaboo@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 12:16 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Contextual Overlay

I would like to put in my affirmation for the Contextual Overlay regarding the Green Hills Neighborhood which comes up on Thursday, April 27th. As a native Nashvillian and a longtime resident of Green Hills, I feel it is imperative to maintain the integrity of our neighborhood. I am assured that this overlay will go a long way in maintaining this integrity.

Sincerely,

Maryland W. Francis

From: Emily Landers [mailto:emmy.landiers@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2017 11:04 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: In favor of the Contextual Overlay

Hi there!

My name is Emily Landers and I live at 4419 Milesdale Ct. 37204.

I am absolutely in favor of the contextual overlay.

The bill number is - **BL 2017Z-038PR-001**

Thank you so much for taking my opinion and the opinion of my neighbors into consideration.

Emily Landers