

Final comments on August 10, 2017 Planning Commission agenda items, received before the noon deadline on August 10

Items 1a/b/c, Madison Community Plan Amendment/1201 Neely's Bend SP/Odom Sausage Company PUD (Cancel)

From: reichert jaynes [<mailto:reichertjaynes@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:25 AM
To: Shepard, Shawn (Planning); Pridemore, Bill (Council Member)
Subject: Neelys Bend rezoning

Dear Sirs,

As a Neely's Bend resident living one block from the proposed development area, my wife and I are adamantly opposed to increasing the density allowed in this area at this time. We are not opposed to progress or development as long as it is driven by quality and enhances the property and life-style quality of existing residents. This is presently not the case in the proposed development.

I completed the Nashville Civic Design Center planning course for lay persons and somewhat understand and expect growth, especially in Nashville today. But the present state of Madison seems to be at a fragile crossroads: *tenuous growth and potential for growth on a grass-roots level that would define a positive direction of economic growth or forced development to provide for present-market demands but which will stunt potential long-term, higher-priced investment and present property-value growth.*

The rezoning to higher density on Neely's Bend will facilitate the latter and will, consequently, stunt any real qualitative and economic growth here, and is inappropriate at this time.

As a resident of Neely's Bend, I am most interested in seeing the quality of life increase for all residents, and this is largely a function of timing. Developers are inherently eager to cash in on trends, regardless of local impact, and it is the responsibility of residents and local government to "hold the reigns" of the ever-eager steeds of development. Resistance to development is a normal response to change and *should be the driving force to protect residents of the area.* There will always be developers ready at any time to cash in at the lowest financial level.

I can't help but compare the visual similarity between the southern part of Neely's Bend and Bell's Bend. I recall an energetic campaign by residents there, and others, to thwart development efforts and have witnessed the success of preserving the rural character of Bell's Bend.

I realize that Madison is, by contrast, mostly urbanized and sub-urbanized, but maintaining the quantitative character in Neely's Bend would be necessary to protect the diversity of its character: extremely mixed, varied, and diverse living opportunities found here. Adding more houses, more traffic, in an area already saturated relative to other less-dense parts of Davidson County, would benefit only the developer and would thwart qualitative growth and, consequently, future economic growth.

As for mixed use development, I lived in Pleasant View Village, a mixed use development, located on Highway 41 in Pleasant View. The concept was inspired and very well executed, but people in small towns don't really know what a coffee shop is or what to make of a "progressive" plan like Pleasant View Village. The market in Madison drives investment, and it doesn't take long to see what the market demands in Madison are. People who live in Madison don't have time to go to a coffee shop because they're going to work and then eating at home because they can't afford or choose not to eat out. The types of people who are looking for new-build, high density, lower-cost housing in an area that is *not* presently experiencing any grass-roots commercial or residential development are not the types to venture out after supper to walk down the sidewalk to enjoy meeting their neighbors at the local coffee or ice cream shop. Neither is that, empirically, the character of the present residents.

Let the "build it and they will come" concept begin in the low-impact, low-cost, grass roots business sector, which will seed higher-priced commercial development, which will seed higher residential demand and higher financial development, done more carefully, in response to a decided growth trend. This is, as I mentioned, a function of time, not a popular sentiment with developers.

There is very little grass roots commercial activity in Madison. This growth should be the priority of local government, while, at the same time, preventing premature growth in an area that would provide short-term gain for a developer but would define an area, similar to Antioch, as a low-cost and over-developed housing area.

Future residents and future commercial investors have to see a direction, defined by grass-roots activity, that will give them the confidence that the area is heading in a direction that will benefit them in the future. Building lower-cost, high density neighborhoods in an already saturated area will prematurely define Neely's Bend, and Madison, as an area designated by the city government, endorsed by re-zoning, to meet the present demands of lower-cost housing, rather than an area rich in potential for economic and residential development.

Davidson County is large and has vast open areas that could provide for a start up community. Madison, especially Neely's Bend, is not one of them. Please exercise your influence to re-direct

or postpone residential development of this type in Madison until it can catch up with the rest of the county in defining itself as a place of promise.

Sincerely,

Reichert Jaynes

What are the results of any traffic study done for Neely's Bend Road?

-----Original Message-----

From: Jared Dickens [<mailto:jared.dickens@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:14 AM
To: Shepard, Shawn (Planning); Pridemore, Bill (Council Member)
Subject: Neelys Bend Zoning

I am writing on the behalf of my family, with their permission to vote "NO" for the new houses in the old Odom's Pride property.

All in Madison, TN
1417 Brannom Dr : Jared, Meredith, & Kaylee Dickens

1017 Jasperson Dr: Ottis Pilkinton (grandfather)

741 Tahlana Ave: Gary and Lori Dickens (parents)

We don't believe this is in the best interest of our community. Please count these as our voting "No" to not have this property become developed as such.

Thank you.

From: Ginny Parnell [<mailto:ginnyp1@comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:46 AM
To: Pridemore, Bill (Council Member); Shepard, Shawn (Planning)
Subject: 1201 Neelys Bend(Old Odom's Sausage Plant)

My name is Ginny and my husband & I live in the Kimbolton subdivision just off Neelys Bend.

We want you to know that the majority of the people that live in this area are highly opposed to the rezoning of the old Odom's Plant properties! This is one of the last areas in Madison that still has the "country" feel and it needs to stay that way.

Please use your voice as the voice of the voters to oppose the rezoning at tonight's meeting.

Thank you,

Ginny Parnell

From: Crystelle Brown [<mailto:embracehealing@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Pridemore, Bill (Council Member); Shepard, Shawn (Planning)
Subject: Neelys Bend rezoning

Dear Councilmen,

I am writing to let you know that I am highly opposed to The High Density Rezoning of 1201 Neelys Bend.

I would appreciate your help in this matter.

Sincerely,
Crystelle Brown

1124 Berwick Trail
Madison, TN 37115
615-473-3467

Item 4, The Livery at 5th and Monroe SP

From: Ron Hogan [mailto:rhogan@mindspring.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 12:02 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member)

Subject: A Suggested 25th Condition on The Livery Approval

Dear Planning Commission –

Should you decide to approve the rezoning today of The Livery, would you please seriously consider adding a 25th condition to the approval, one that would prohibit the addition of any A/V equipment, either permanent or portable, on the deck of The Livery at any time.

Having 100+ people taking in the beauty of the downtown skyline on a roof without music will be a lot easier to take and provoke many fewer complaints, if any, from the neighborhood, and keep us from becoming another 12 South.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Hogan

1227 5th Ave N

Nashville, TN 37379

(423) 243-4398

From: Kelly Williams [mailto:kellysuzannewilliams@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:52 AM

To: Planning Commissioners; Birkeland, Latisha (Planning)

Subject: The Livery Vote today

Dear Planning Commission and Committee Members,

By now you are all tired of receiving letters from Germantown neighbors expressing opposition to the proposed zoning change for the The Livery building, to be built at the corner of 5th and Monroe. I can only imagine. I want to thank you, first of all, for the effort and time it must have taken to get the provisions attached to the proposal that you have. It is a long and detailed list. At first reading, I thought perhaps this was the best outcome we, as neighbors, could expect. But the more I read and the more complicated those provisions became to me, it dawned on me that these rules and guidelines will never be enforced. The burden of this project lies (as it always has) on the neighborhood. And now the enforcement of these stipulations will also lie upon the neighborhood. I sincerely ask the members of this committee to explain to me how we are to hold this business accountable to these rules? Do we need to carry a copy of the SP agreement on us at all times? How will a Police officer called out to The Livery ever know what the exact details of the agreement are? How will we explain that the The Sloane is violating the agreement because they've used all 6 of their 1 am closing time exceptions for this year? It is so complicated and hopeless that it actually elicits tears from me. This is not the solution.

I believe there are members on this committee who are outright opposed to this zoning change. I have to believe that the reason it was deferred 7 times from a vote speaks to the complicated opinions of this committee. And I am speaking to those individuals who know deep down that Metro Police will not be able to devote the kind of attention and man power to this little corner that it will require. Please, please reconsider this proposal. It isn't right to allow a party venue of this size into a historic neighborhood in Nashville. Let me say that one more time: this is a Historic Neighborhood. It is old and requires vigilant care from all of us. Our public resources are taxed beyond service right now. Right now. With at least 2 enormous apartment complexes set to come on board in the coming months. We need a chance to get our feet under us before trying something out like this zoning change. We need trash cans, street lights, sidewalks. These are all topics of discussion at our Neighborhood meetings. Our neighborhood is discussing paying for these things ourselves because Metro can't keep up with our needs. What we absolutely **don't need** right now is a party venue in the heart of our community. We are waiting for the Police to arrive much longer for issues deemed much more substantial already. Please don't saddle them or us with this burden.

This neighborhood is gaining nothing with the passing of this proposal. Nothing. This is not a public building project, this is not a public space that most of us can afford to experience. But it will burden all of us in this neighborhood. It will change our quality of life. It will forever change this Historic Neighborhood. I just don't see that the benefits even come close to outweighing the cons.

Respectfully,

Kelly Williams, homeowner

1319 7th Avenue North

Nashville, TN 37208

From: Vaughan Scott [<mailto:Scott.Vaughan@Healthtrustpg.com>]

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:12 AM

To: Planning Staff; Planning Commissioners; O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member)

Subject: Opposed to The Livery MUN to SP change

Hello, I'm a resident of Germantown and currently own a house and live within about 75 feet of the proposed Livery development, across the street at 1224 5th Ave N.

I hope you will vote against this zoning change and hold the developer to the use/size constraints afforded to him under current MUN zoning, which myself and many others in Germantown feel is already liberal enough and more appropriate for this area. An open rooftop event space that will bring a high concentration of traffic and noise to the corner of 5th and Monroe is not what our neighborhood needs and not at all congruent with the feel/livability of this block. We have seen and appreciate the constraint criteria your department has added onto the SP application, in hopes of tempering some of the concerns neighbors have, but as neighbors we currently experience lack of enforcement with existing laws, conditions, etc so we are skeptical many of these added conditions will help at all. Case in point, currently the valets at 5th and Taylor restaurant are acting outside of the intended permitted zones allocated to them (taking up additional public street parking), as well as allowing loading/unloading of rideshares and valet patrons in the travel lanes of 5th Ave N. Even after repeated contact with Diane Marshall with the Parking department, the valet infractions continue to negatively impact neighbors because there is zero enforcement or concern about neighbors from her department. So of course we do not think the City will hold The Livery operation to certain standards, because this is not happening today as we speak with other businesses in the neighborhood.

Myself and many other neighbors will be at the meeting tonight to expand further on our concerns.

Thank you.

Scott Vaughan | Sr. Financial Analyst, Financial Operations

HealthTrust | 1100 Charlotte Avenue, Suite 1100 | Nashville, TN 37203

o: 615.344.3927 | f: 615.344.3166 | e: scott.vaughan@healthtrustpg.com | healthtrustpg.com

From: Lee [mailto:leeclevine@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:59 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Case 2017SP-005-001

To Planning Commission Members:

I appreciate the considerable effort made by staff members to find solutions for deep concerns about The Livery at 5th & Monroe, but it's not enough.

No amount of work can make a square peg fit a round hole.

After seven deferments, it seems ill-advised to pass this zoning change at the last opportunity before MHZC is set to adopt new guidelines for Germantown development -- ***guidelines which this project does not meet.***

To be clear, I am 100% opposed to this SP. The zoning in place is a primary reason I purchased a home in Germantown. Allowing an exception for this development opens the door for more requests and more exceptions, and before you know it, our neighborhood of "mixed use" will be gone.

Should you still choose to consider and approve The Livery's application, please at least add a condition that the developer comply with those guidelines adopted by MHZC next week--including guidelines regarding rooftop decks, lighting and outdoor AV equipment.

Thank you for considering my request.

Lee C. Levine

1350 Rosa L. Parks Blvd #445

Nashville, TN 37208

Item 6, Twin Hills SP

From: Burnette, Brandon (Council Office)
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2017 1:48 PM
To: 'Mike Delvizio'
Cc: Michael Dewey; Pardue, Doug (Council Member)
Subject: RE: Twin hills SP

Mike:

I just spoke with Councilmember Pardue, who is cc:d on this email.

He will be unable to attend tomorrow's meeting due to a conflict on his calendar.

He'll await comments on the proposal from his constituents, as well as the discussion amongst Commission members, and then choose how to move forward after the MPC meeting tomorrow.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Thanks.
Brandon

From: Mike Delvizio [<mailto:mike@delvizio.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2017 1:26 PM
To: Burnette, Brandon (Council Office)
Cc: Michael Dewey
Subject: Twin hills SP

Brandon

In followup to my text message yesterday.

Please call me regarding the MPC meeting Thursday regarding Twin Hills.

Coming out of the neighborhood meeting I understood Councilman Pardue will support our SP request now. Also that he might attend the MPC meeting to voice support.

I would like to confirm this is still the case

Thank you

Mike Delvizio

615-947-3663 mobile.

Michael S. Delvizio, PE, President

MSD Consulting LLC

[\(615\) 947-3663](tel:6159473663)

Engineering – Development – Planning – Zoning – Entitlement

Item 7, 1811 Kimbark Drive SP

From: Kurt Denny [mailto:ezkd@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:50 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: 'Richard Horton'; russpulle@gmail.com

Subject: SP at 1811 Kimbark Drive

Please see the attached letter I am writing in favor of the SP at 1811 Kimbark. I am writing the letter because I may not be able to attend to Planning Commission meeting today and I want to show my support for the SP.

Kurt Denny

The Clubhouse

615-972-9568

ezkd@comcast.net

(attachment follows)

To: Metro Planning Commission

From Kurt Denny, property owner at 1900 Warfield Drive and 1820 Warfield Drive
1577 Woodmont Blvd
Nashville, Tn 37215
615-972-9568
ezkd@comcast.net

Dear Commission Members –

I am writing this letter because I do not think I will be able to attend today's meeting.

I am fully in support of the proposed SP at 1811 Kimbark Circle. This 6 family development is completely consistent with the other development in the area. I have seen some drawings of the houses at community meeting and the layout of the development and it appears to me that the homes will fit nicely with the design features of the newer homes in the neighborhood and that this is a well planned and excellent best use of the land available. I have been on Warfield as a property owner since the early 90's and I fully support this project.

I hope you will recommend the same.

Thanks for your time,

Kurt Denny

Item 8, Amanda K. Berry Land, Resub Lot 2 Subdivision Amendment

From: Sledge, Colby (Council Member)
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:18 AM
To: James Kirby
Cc: Planning Commissioners
Subject: RE: 838 Kirkwood Ave

Mr. Kirby,

Thanks for your email, and please know that I am taking all the input from residents into account. Whenever anyone applies for anything in the district, whether it be a zoning request, beer permit, etc., I try to be responsive and provide guidance where appropriate.

In the case of Mr. Chestnut's request, I have indicated to him that while I generally can see his reasoning for the setback change, that Planning staff's recommendation plus the voices of several neighbors like yourself will likely make this a difficult path for approval for him, and I have not provided a formal recommendation of either approval or disapproval.

Mr. Chestnut and I have no personal relationship, other than that he made a separate appeal to the BZA on an unrelated property in the district nearly two years ago. I find you both to be affable and knowledgeably involved in various matters, which is surely advantageous to our city.

Sincerely,

Colby

From: James Kirby [docjkirby@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:46 AM
To: Sledge, Colby (Council Member)
Cc: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 838 Kirkwood Ave

Greetings,

I am writing in regards to the proposed alteration of the setback at 838 Kirkwood Ave. as I will not be able to attend the meeting scheduled tonight on 8/10/2017.

I would like to **reiterate my opposition** to the amendment of the side setback at this address. I attended the meeting with Mr. Chestnut at the property a few weeks ago and still believe adjusting the setback is not the way to go. In addition to the reasons listed in the letters sent to the Planning Commission, many neighbors on the street are concerned that if the setback is adjusted, the door will be opened for Mr. Chestnut to place four or more units on this property, completely altering the street and neighborhood we have grown to love.

While I realize a personal relationship between Mr. Chestnut and Mr. Sledge is evident in other emails pertinent to this case, I hope the council will realize that Mr. Chestnut has no ties to this street or neighborhood as a resident. Those that have written in and expressed concerns most certainly do.

Thanks again for your consideration on this subject.

James Kirby

2824 West Kirkwood Ave

Items 11a/b – East Nashville Community Plan Amendment/Cayce Place SP

From: Withers, Brett (Council Member)

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:24 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Harbison, Jim (MDHA)

Subject: Letter in support of Agenda Items 11A and B - Envision Cayce

Planning Commissioners:

I am not certain that my work schedule will permit me to arrive at today's Metro Planning Commission hearing at 4:00 PM, and so I hope that you will accept this email as my formal request for approval for Items 11A/B for Envision Cayce.

Obviously, the Envision Cayce Master Plan has been discussed through dozens of community meetings over the course of nearly four years. The request before you today is to apply consistent Community Plan policies and Regulatory SP design guidelines to some parcels that MDHA recently acquired near the center of the campus. These requests are consistent with your recent recommendations of approval for the application of these policies and regulatory guidelines to the adjacent MDHA-owned parcels. MDHA's acquisition of these parcels will enable the addition of relatively high density mixed-income housing units once Planning Commission and Metro Council approvals are in place. This request was discussed at an Envision Cayce Town Hall meeting and there were no questions from community members other than construction timelines.

Please let me know if there are any questions that I can address via email. I hope to be present at the meeting as soon as my work schedule permits so that I can answer any questions in person should this item not remain on the Consent Agenda.

Thank you for your service to our county.

Brett A. Withers

Metro Council, District 6

Mobile (615) 427-5946 | [facebook.com/Brett.A.Withers](https://www.facebook.com/Brett.A.Withers) | [twitter.com @brettawithers](https://twitter.com/brettawithers)