

## Comments on November 9, 2017 Planning Commission agenda items, received November 8-9

### Item 6, Brick Church Lane

**From:** Elise Hudson [mailto:elise@elisehudson.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 12:18 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Cc:** Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Stephanie McGee; Jennifer Hagan-Dier; Zachary Dier; George Ewing; Marcie Hudson; Uncle Wesley Hudson

**Subject:** Brick Church Lane Videos and Photos

This link provides a compilation of several neighbors' videos and photos of the Brick Church Lane area including aerial video, vehicle video with narration, and photos of the lots, forest, and visibility along the proposed entrances. There are also maps and relevant illustrations.

<http://savewhitescreek.com/index.php/bcl-videos-and-photos/>

Please let me know if you have issues accessing the site or the photos/video on it.

Note: This contains the videos that were sent by Stephanie McGee that did not load correctly. You should be able to access them from this site.

Thank you,

Elise Hudson

4601 Whites Creek Pike

**From:** Stephanie McGee [mailto:smcgee0714@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 12:00 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Fwd: Brick Church Lane Subdivision (Item #6) 2017S-266-001

Dear Planning Commission,

The following is video of Brick Church Lane.

The 1st video is an areal view over 536 Brick Church Lane

The 2nd video is filmed traveling east to west on Brick Church Lane. And, the The 3rd video is filmed traveling west to east on Brick Church Lane.

Also, we have included photos of the proposed developments entrance/ exit locations on to Brick Church Lane. Along with mapping photos.

Please keep in mind this proposed development will be landlocked with Brick Church Lane it's only entrance/ exit.

You have the right to oppose this development. I truly hope you will consider the traffic safety issues, and how this proposed development does not match our community.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and we will see you all tonight.

<http://savewhitescreek.com/index.php/bcl-videos-and-photos/>

Sincerely,

Stephanie McGee  
627 Brick Church Lane  
Whites Creek, TN 37189

**From:** Stephanie McGee [mailto:[smcgee0714@gmail.com](mailto:smcgee0714@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 11:53 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** Brick Church Lane Subdivision (Item #6) 2017S-266-001

Dear Planning Commission,

The following is video of Brick Church Lane. The 1st video is not working. I am truly sorry.

However, the 2nd video is filmed traveling east to west on Brick Church Lane. And, the 3rd video is filmed traveling west to east on Brick Church Lane.

Also, we have included photos of the proposed developments entrance/ exit locations on to Brick Church Lane. Along with mapping photos.

Please keep in mind this proposed development will be landlocked with Brick Church Lane it's only entrance/ exit.

You have the right to oppose this development. I truly hope you will consider the traffic safety issues, and how this proposed development does not match our community.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and we will see you all tonight.

<http://savewhitescreek.com/index.php/bcl-videos-and-photos/>

Sincerely,

Stephanie McGee

627 Brick Church Lane

Whites Creek, TN 37189

**From:** Friends of Whites Creek Hagan-Dier [mailto:friendsofwhitescreek@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 10:43 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners; Sloan, Doug (Planning)

**Subject:** Item #6 - Representing Community Rep Time & Disapproval of Brick Church Lane Subdivision (2017S-226-001)

Dear Director Sloan and Planning Commissioners,

This email is intended to notify the Commission that I will be representing the Friends of Whites Creek, a neighborhood group made up of Whites Creek residents, on Item #6 Brick Church Lane (2017S-226-001) during the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for November 9, 2017.

As at least ten of our neighbors on Brick Church Lane are not able to attend the Planning Commission meeting. I hereby request the 5 minutes allowed for representatives of neighborhood groups or organizations to provide the Commission with an overview of the following issues with the proposed

subdivision plan that were identified and will be discussed in further detail by community members and neighbors:

(1) The Planning Commission has the authority to review the character of the proposal in comparison to the character of the community and the "pattern of development." The Planning Commission should hear and consider the input of the community that lives in the area and will be impacted by flooding, traffic, safety issues and the fundamental change this would make in the rural character of our community on and adjacent to our little two-lane one mile long rural road. This is not a "done deal" as was claimed by the developer at the second community meeting this past weekend.

(2) The Planning Commission has the authority to disapprove this proposal as it does not fit within the character of the community and pattern of development in this area nor does it comply with the existing, but incorrect, T3 NE Policy. Further, the proposal does not comply with the subdivision regulations.

(3) The Community had no information about this proposal until recently and remains unanimously opposed to the subdivision in this location as it is out of character with the established pattern of development of rural homes and farms. Comparatively it is over 64 times denser than all other parcels in this area.

(4) The T3NE Policy is the incorrect policy for the area - The Whites Creek community was very involved in the community meetings for Nashville Next. In each meeting where the Whites Creek Community Character plans were reviewed the area in question, landlocked by industrial parcels and a two-lane rural road and T2 rural community policy lots with a minimum of 4.5 acres per lot, was always marked by the community as T2 or at a minimum T3 Neighborhood Maintenance. Every time the draft came back as something else community members made it clear that it was incorrect as there was no "transition" on this side of Brick Church Pike and that this heavily wooded area with steep slopes and abundant wild life should be T2 or T3 NM at a minimum.

(5) Cumulative Development in the area was not considered and clearly supports disapproval - the proposed subdivision should not be viewed or considered in a vacuum, there are over 800 homes already approved for development in more appropriate areas of Whites Creek.

*(6) T3 NE policy may be applied either to undeveloped or substantially underdeveloped "greenfield" areas or to developed areas where redevelopment and infill produce a different character that includes increased housing diversity and connectivity. Successful infill and redevelopment in existing neighborhoods needs to take into account considerations such as timing and some elements of the existing developed character, such as the street network, block structure, and proximity to centers and corridors. T3 NE areas are developed with creative thinking in environmentally sensitive building and site development techniques to balance the increased growth and density with its impact on area streams and rivers.*

The Proposal does not fit within the character of the community nor does it comply with T3 NE policy for several reasons including, but not limited to:

(a) the fact that it is not "transitional" or a "bridge" between rural and urban - the property is bordered by large industrial and T2 rural area. There is no pattern of development consistent with this type of development and this would not begin a new pattern of development given the industrial usage and T2 policies.

(b) the lack of even "moderate" connectivity - the 190 + homes proposed would have to enter and exit the subdivision through two new drives on a one mile two-lane rural road that begins on Brick Church Pike and dead ends onto Knight Road and has a limited sight distance with a blind hill and at least one blind curve. There are no sidewalks on Brick Church Lane because it is a RURAL road featuring approximately 18 homes. Although the map shows it near the interstate and Briley Pkwy, the only way anyone on Brick Church Lane can access either is to enter Brick Church Pike, which is still a two-lane road with NO sidewalks, through a stop sign, past two churches and a new high school. There is no place for sidewalks, bikeways or greenways in this area. There are NO adjacent subdivisions, institutional uses, existing or planned transit or neighborhood centers.

(c) Does not balance environmentally sensitive features, topography or leave any real usable open or green space - would clear cut and grade over 60 acres of land currently wooded with steep slopes;

(d) Inadequate infrastructure - inadequate roads, sewers, etc and given the the environmental considerations and topography the addition of infrastructure would be extremely invasive and destructive.

(6) There are serious environmental considerations and concerns that have not been considered or explored in any detail in the staff report including:

(a) the destruction of further tree canopy during a time when we are concerned with preservation of our tree canopy and looking to "re leaf" Davidson County - parcel is currently completely wooded and this proposal would clear cut acres of tree canopy;

(b) the grading required to make the area suitable for development would disturb steep slopes and other topography, which would reduce water absorption, increase water runoff and result in increased flooding and soil disturbance/landslides in a rural area that is already plagued with serious flooding issues every time it rains more than a few inches;

(c) contrary to the goals of the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan, the proposed development would destroy large sections of forest habitats, which provide quality areas for wildlife habitat and drive wildlife out into the roads and adjacent properties resulting in damage to property and additional safety issues.

We appreciate you, your time, attention and willingness to serve. Thank you for all you do. We look forward to the chance to provide you with a full picture of the area impacted by this proposed project.

Kindest regards,

Jennifer Hagan-Dier

681 Brick Church Lane

Whites Creek, TN 37189

Friends of Whites Creek

**From:** Nina Fortmeyer [mailto:nfortmeyer@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 5:40 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Brick Church Lane proposed development

To the commissioners,

I'm writing to encourage you to oppose the proposed development on Brick Church Pike in Whites Creek (Agenda Item #6, 2017S-226-001.) It is a drastic departure from the surrounding area, which is rural residential, not a suburb. It's too high a density for the area, and nobody seems to have thought through the traffic. Each suburban single family home adds an average of 10 trips a day to a road. That's 2000 trips a day.

The people who live in this area would be bombarded by construction noise, runoff, flooding from water displacement, and traffic, and they gain nothing. The developers will make their profits and go elsewhere. We can do better than this. Keep dense development closer in to the city, and keep the outer areas rural. Once they are ruined, they are gone.

Nina Fortmeyer

5267 Simpkins Rd

Whites Creek, TN 37189

--

<http://www.etsy.com/shop/kickglassenamels>

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

From: Angela Williams [mailto:usdir@bellsouth.net]

Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2017 2:50 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Brick Church Lane Development #6 (2017S-226-001)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to you to oppose the current Brick Church Lane Development. As a long time resident of Whites Creek, we have worked diligently with the planning department protect our unique Rural Character.

This proposed development sits on a piece of property surrounded by T2 rural parcels with large lot sizes. The context surrounding this development is decidedly rural while this development is strictly

urban. It provides no transition to rural. Secondly, the proposed development removes all tree canopy from the property and accelerates the run off water. As part of the Whites Creek Watershed, this presents a hazard to properties downstream and increases the risk of flooding.

Mr. Roy Dale has done similar developments, like Parmley Cove off of Whites Creek Pike that clear cut the trees and remove part of the hillside, replacing it with asphalt. This development now regularly floods the adjacent houses and increases the occurrence of flash floods in the area.

The community has reached out to the developer to work on a better plan, only to be told it is a “done deal”.

I ask the planning commission use it’s authority to protect and promote sustainable development that will enhance our historic/rural community.

Thank you for your time and service.

Angela Williams  
7203 Old Hickory Blvd.  
Whites Creek, TN 37189

**From:** L Purser [mailto:lpurser926@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 9:41 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners; Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item #6 - Brick Church Lane - Opposed

This letter is in opposition to agenda item #6, 2017S-266-001, as it proposes a dense subdivision in an area that has already seen substantial growth in housing development without corresponding growth to infrastructure including streets, lighting, trash pick up and metro water/wastewater management.

The area in which the proposed new subdivision would be built has steep inclines. The proposed entrance is near a hill and limited sight curve on the two lane Brick Church pike. This has been the site of several accidents without the traffic from 200 additional homes.

Currently the area is rural with large lots with mature hardwood canopies and diverse wildlife. The type of development proposed is in opposition to the existing neighborhood.

Thank you,

Lorin Purser

## Items 25a/b/c, STRPs

**From:** Ruben Estevez [mailto:Rubenjestev@ gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 8:42 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Vote YES on Bill 937!

Dear Member Planning Commission,

Thank you for your time and consideration of short-term rental property (STRP) regulations in Nashville.

As a short-term rental supporter, I urge you approve Substitute Ordinance 937, which represents the policy solutions reached by the STRP Ad Hoc Committee, and will allow all STRPs in Nashville to continue to operate responsibly across the city. STRPs have been a part of Nashville's culture for generations, and responsible short term rental operators like me have only enhanced the quality of our neighborhoods and strengthened our local economy.

Bill 937 will protect my right to use my home for short-term rental, while ensuring accountability and responsible renting. Please approve this ordinance and support Nashville's short-term rental community!

Regards,

Ruben Estevez

412 Valley Trace Dr

Nashville, TN 37221

### Seven other community members sent the same message:

Sandy dickey  
2840 Steamboat Dr  
Nashville, TN 37214

Stacey Johnston  
343 Wauford Dr  
Nashville, TN 37211

Natalie Hannigan  
1109 Ordway Pl  
Nashville, TN 37206

Brad adams  
640 Band Dr  
Franklin, TN 37064

Parker Brown  
920 Elvira Ave  
Nashville, TN 37216

John Gresham  
729 Carlyle Pl  
Nashville, TN 37211

Regis George  
1922 14th Ave N  
Nashville, TN 37208

**From:** Andrea Sullivan [mailto:andreasully@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 2:50 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** STRs and your vote tonight

Dear Commissioners,

I have been reading and closely watching the information coming from the City government related to short-term rentals. I am a resident of Edgehill and have lived here in a century home since 2000. In recent years, the community and fabric of our neighborhood has been torn apart by the proliferation of STRs around my neighborhood and on my own block. It is not a community when the 'neighbors' arrive only for a weekend and have little regard for the people who live on the street year-round. Single-family homes replaced by towering duplexes, lack of codes protections, and lack of enforcement of code violations have gone on unchecked for years in my neighborhood. All of that is awful, but the bill BL2017-937, produced in haste and rushed through committee, is simply awful. Our neighborhood and others in the urban core are being sacrificed for the sake of minor modifications to the program in other areas of the city. How can you consider allowing ALL current investment STRs (not occupied by owners) to be allowed to stay active? You are allowing the city to be destroyed if this bill is passed. It has no support from any of the neighborhoods at risk.

I urge you to seriously examine these issues and take more time to consider the problems at hand. STRs are a blight in my neighborhood. They may look pretty, but they are not neighbors and do not contribute to our neighborhood in any measurable way. Stand up and FIGHT for Nashville! It is SO important to pay attention and get this right. Restore the integrity of our neighborhoods. We are counting on you to not cave to special interests and protect the rights of the citizens in the urban core who live and work here.

Respectfully,

Andrea Sullivan

Edgehill Resident

1002 15th Ave South

**From:** Blake Pedersen [mailto:rbpede@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 2:22 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** Support Nashville's New Short-Term Rental Ordinance

Dear Member Planning Commission,

I am writing you to ask for your support in protecting short-term rentals and the value they bring to the Nashville community. It is important for the Planning Commission to vote YES on Substitute Ordinance 937, which will preserve the economic benefits STRPs bring to the city, while creating requirements that make enforcement easier.

Nashville's STRPs have existed in our city for decades. They provide our residents with a critical source of income, bring visitor spending to neighborhoods that traditionally do not benefit from tourism, and expand the opportunities for families to visit the Music City we call home.

Thank you for your work on STRP regulations in Nashville. We have finally found a solution that will work for all groups involved. For this reason, I urge you to support Substitute Ordinance 937 and to pass the bill with no amendments. Bill 937 will protect property rights, preserve the economic benefits of STRPs, and ensure accountability and responsible renting.

Regards,  
Blake Pedersen  
1307 6th Ave N  
Nashville, TN 37208 ◻

### **Seven other community members sent the same message:**

Karla Livingston  
2115 Yeaman Pl  
Nashville, TN 37206 ◻

Jessica Hughes  
321 50th Ave N  
Nashville, TN 37209 ◻

Brooks Beauchamp  
920 Silverdene Pl  
Nashville, TN 37206 ◻

Colin Vincent  
5084 Meta Dr  
Nashville, TN 37211

Julie buhler  
105 McGavock Pike  
Nashville, TN 37214 ◻

Stephen Williams  
5668 Cane Ridge Rd  
Nashville, TN 37013 ◻

Ryan Mullins  
3112 Cloverwood Dr  
Nashville, TN 37214 ◻

**From:** Alex Self [mailto:alex@designtracs.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 4:27 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** Vote YES on Bill 937!

Dear Member Planning Commission,

A phase-out is unreasonable and would hurt too many people in this shared economy. Everyone loves and expects this to be an option for lodging while visiting Music City.

Regards,  
Alex Self  
1009 N 5th St  
Nashville, TN 37207

**From:** Robyn Taylor-Drake [mailto:robynt11@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 3:49 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** non owner occupied STRP

I operate an owner occupied STRP located within the Urban Zoning Overlay, as do some of our neighbors. We've never had any trouble with our guests, nor have our neighbors who also operate and own owner occupied STRP. HOWEVER,

We most strongly feel it's unfair that neighborhoods (within this overlay) have 3% vs 1% usage for non owner occupied STRP's. We work hard to keep our inner core neighborhoods feeling like a REAL neighborhood, with relationships and friendships among our neighbors. This makes for a safer environment because we know who belongs. Our particular neighborhood (Edgehill Village) has a strong neighborhood association and most people are involved to a large degree. Being within a couple of blocks from low income housing, it's important to have a strong neighborhood in which all residents feel included and part of the fabric that is Edgehill and 12th South.

Please don't ask us to have the extra burden of more than our fair share of non-owner occupied housing. It is not fair to us as long time residents who have built this neighborhood over time to be a strong, diverse, and caring community. We want to keep our strong ties as neighbors who look out after each other. I remember a time when people were leaving the inner city for the outlying areas, and where the property values of these inner city areas were greatly undervalued vs their suburban counterparts. Many people have lived here for generations; others came in the 80's and 90's when the

area was not yet a trendy place to live. We have all worked hard to maintain a safe and neighborly atmosphere. That depends on one KNOWING the other people who live on their street and the streets around them.

Having non owner occupied property will not allow us as permanent residents to know the people who come and go..... there will be gaps ~ no next door / over the fence type getting to know your neighbors.....

The 3% rule is too high. It needs to be backed down to 1% to be fair to us..... We now pay more property taxes and it seems very unfair that I'm paying a much higher property tax but will not know who is 'living' on my street or the street behind me.....

Thanks for listening to my feelings about this.

Robyn Taylor-Drake