

Comments on January 11, 2018 Planning Commission agenda items, received January 10-11

Item 1, West Trinity/Katie Hill/Haynes Plan Amendment

From: Karen Dunlap [mailto:karenbdunlap@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:59 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Comments on Haynes Trinity Plan

To the Commissioners:

I am a resident of the Haynes community and a member of the Steering Committee for that area's plan. As such I regret that out of state commitments prevent me from attending this afternoon's hearing. Here are my thoughts in brief:

I appreciate the Planning Department's inclusive and respectful process in developing the Haynes Trinity plan. The result could make this area a jewel in Nashville, with new residents, retail and jobs, while preserving stable neighborhoods, the environment and history. If approved, much remains in the challenge of implementation.

Sincerely,

Karen Brown Dunlap

--

Karen Brown Dunlap, Ph.D.

karenbdunlap@gmail.com

Cell - 813/391-2115

@karendunlap

P.O. Box 78476, Nashville, TN 37207

P.O. Box 47356, Tampa, FL 33646

*Take pride in how far you have come
and have faith in how far you can go.*

From: Winnie Forrester [mailto:wgforrester1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 7:20 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Metro Planning 1/11/2018 Haynes-Trinity Study

To Metro Planning Commissioners:

My name is Winnie Forrester and I am a member of the Haynes-Trinity steering committee. I am President of the Haynes Heights Neighborhood Association and we are located within the Study Area.

Community residents of the Steering Committee and I are in general agreement with the Study Area Plan. We approve the proposed updates to the land use policy for the study area. We worked with the Planning Department, and made every effort to include the community at the charrette project by posting on social media and by word of mouth. Our neighborhood association held an additional meeting to educate nearby neighbors. We felt we were successful as over 200 people came to the Community Visioning meeting.

We have appreciated the Planning Department's professionalism and all their efforts to include the various stakeholders in the charrette process. We felt they understood our desire to preserve the existing neighborhoods yet provide for compatible development along the corridor that would promote economic development with a diverse mix of housing choices and businesses.

The Haynes Heights community did have some specific issues with the Mobility Map on page 48 that was presented to the public at the end of the charrette week. We want to go on record as opposing any additional street connections within the Haynes Heights community or linking it to another street. We already have four entrances to our community and are on the wait list for a traffic calming study. We have asked the Planning Department to add additional language to reflect the community did not support it and clarify that later Study area drafts do not recommend this. While our requests did not make the final draft, the Planning Department has assured us it will be added.

I also want to point out our community (District 2) is prominently African-American and according to the 2010 Census more than 32% live under the poverty line (that is more than double that of Davidson County in general). We have a disproportionate number of children and over age 65 population when compared to the rest of Davidson County. Because of this, our community is especially vulnerable to the fast-moving changes in Nashville. I encourage the Planning Commission - in the months and years to come - every time you approve a developer's request for projects in our community to take this into consideration and ask for specific improvements and contributions to our quality of life by enhancing our green spaces, schools and communities. We need economic development that provides jobs and affordable housing with mixed use and mixed income options. The community, not just the developers, deserve to benefit from the vast changes that are coming our way.

Thank you,

Winnie Forrester

2611 Shreeve Lane

Nashville, TN 37207

Item 3, Marshall Crossing SP

From: devon macpherson [mailto:devonmacpherson@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:08 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: ITEM #3 on Today's Agenda

Dear Planning commission,

My name is Devon MacPherson. I am a 7 year resident at 1431 Lischey Avenue. We have watched a lot of change in our neighborhood over the last 2 years, with tear downs and rebuilds. We have had our street nicely paved, and received new sidewalks, which are appreciated. Crime is way down and rents are way up, which is good for some people. What is good for no people is the proposed development at Marshall Crossing. The historic street, flanked on both sides by 150+ year old historic homes and several mansions, is a single

family street with large yards and old growth trees. Houses are set back from the street, and the vast majority of them have either been torn down or rebuilt beautifully.

I am vehemently opposed to building 15, 13 or even 10 units on the small parcel towards trinity lane, known as the Marshall crossing development. This development would substantially uproot the fabric of our quiet neighborhood, putting town-home like buildings close to the street, right on top of the sidewalk. It would set a dangerous precedent for future development. Houses on lischey avenue have large yards, and is becoming a wonderful place to raise my 5 year old child. We are planning on bringing another one into the mix here shortly. I know all my neighbors, and attend my neighborhood meetings. Most people have been here longer than I am and I consider myself still a new arriver at 7 years.

This development will bring a neighborhood within a neighborhood into Highland Heights, with a 10-12 small homes with no yards, and a terrible parking design. It is not a place suitable or desirable to raise a small child, with the yards being so small and close to the street. We as resident are concerned this would lead to transient occupancy, as once professionals begin to have families they will move out of these homes and they will become a revolving door instead of part of the fabric of our neighborhood.

We as the HH association have worked very hard to bring community to our small neighborhood and we are very disturbed that the N.M. Policy that was adopted without the approval of our full support is threatening to change that.

This is being paraded as a must-develop-area because lischey avenue is a 'transit corridor'. Let me be frank. The 10 buses that pass down Lischey avenue daily do not make this a transit corridor. The speed limit is 30. There are children at play outside at all hours of the day. There are residents, old and young, walking their dogs and riding their bikes. This is not an area safe for infill, or for more traffic-- as the only people using this as a 'transit corridor' are the ones that speed down it at all hours of the night rushing from Douglas to Trinity to beat traffic patterns or just show off how loud their motorcycle can go. Vroom Vroom.

In closing, this proposal has 0 neighborhood support. It is in direct opposition to what I and the neighborhood association want to see as changes in our small, quiet, old, established neighborhood. 10-15 single family homes would dramatically shift the quality of life several slots down the bell curve. Please help us in preserving what we've worked so hard for the last few years to achieve.

Sincerely,
Devon MacPherson
1431 Lischey Ave

From: Davis, Ashonti [mailto:DavisA17@aetna.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 4:39 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: 'ashontidavis@gmail.com'
Subject: RE: Item 4 - 1/11/18 Agenda - Marshall Crossing SP

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to reiterate my concerns and opposition to the proposed SP reflected in the above-referenced agenda item. While I understand that the proposed SP is consistent with the existing policy of Urban Neighborhood Evolving, it is important to highlight that the proposed SP is directly adjacent to streets where the Urban Neighborhood Maintenance policy is in effect. As a result, the proposed SP does not fit within the existing character of the neighborhood, and it poses a negative impact on the existing quality of the streets that are within the Urban Neighborhood Maintenance policy.

Additionally, as the Commissioners have wisely observed at previous meetings, this particular neighborhood has experienced a high volume of rezoning petitions over the past several months, and it is critical to consider the aggregate impact of the total number of rezoning plans in this one area. In fact, over the last several months, approximately 600 new units have been approved within a single mile radius for this neighborhood through several different rezoning petitions. This is an older neighborhood with aging infrastructure and small roads. I respectfully ask the Commissioners to weigh the aggregate impact of another rezoning petition and deny this SP proposal.

Additionally, if rezoning petitions like this one are routinely approved, the existing character of this neighborhood will deteriorate thereby diminishing the quality that has existed for over seventy years. At the last public hearing on this matter, the Planning Commission instructed the applicants to work with the neighborhood and reach a compromise. The reduction of 15 units to 13 units is not a compromise, and there was not any significant involvement with concerned neighbors about this project.

I sincerely appreciate your time and consideration of these concerns.

Regards,

Ashonti

321 Edwin Street, 37207

Ashonti T. Davis

Counsel

Aetna Senior Supplemental Insurance

800 Crescent Centre Drive, Suite 200

Franklin, TN 37067

Phone: 615-807-7655

Email: davisa17@aetna.com

This e-mail may contain confidential or privileged information. If you think you have received this e-mail in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this e-mail immediately. Thank you.

This e-mail may contain confidential or privileged information. If you think you have received this e-mail in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this e-mail immediately. Thank you. Aetna

Item 7, Riverview at Cumberland Hills

From: Karen Dunlap [mailto:karebdunlap@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:59 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Comments on Haynes Trinity Plan

To the Commissioners:

I am a resident of the Haynes community and a member of the Steering Committee for that area's plan. As such I regret that out of state commitments prevent me from attending this afternoon's hearing. Here are my thoughts in brief:

I appreciate the Planning Department's inclusive and respectful process in developing the Haynes Trinity plan. The result could make this area a jewel in Nashville, with new residents, retail and jobs, while preserving stable neighborhoods, the environment and history. If approved, much remains in the challenge of implementation.

Sincerely,

Karen Brown Dunlap

--

Karen Brown Dunlap, Ph.D.

karebdunlap@gmail.com

Cell - 813/391-2115

@karendunlap

P.O. Box 78476, Nashville, TN 37207

P.O. Box 47356, Tampa, FL 33646

*Take pride in how far you have come
and have faith in how far you can go.*

From: John Sturdivant Jr [mailto:junior@junctionstudio.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:31 AM
To: Leeman, Bob (Planning); Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSITION To 2017S-254-001 Riverview at Cumberland Hills

Members of the Planning Commission,

As a resident of North Hill Estates Subdivision, I respectfully submit the following facts and concerns in opposition of the Concept Plan 2017S-254-001 Riverview at Cumberland Hills.

1. Based on the SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS of the Nashville/Davidson County Metropolitan Planning Commission this concept does not meet those guidelines.

Chapter 3. Requirements for Improvements, Reservations, and Design

d. The proposed lots are consistent with the community character of surrounding parcels as determined below:

1. Lot frontage is either equal to or greater than 70% of the average frontage of surrounding parcels or equal to or greater than the surrounding lot with the least amount of frontage, whichever is greater. For a corner lot, only the block face to which the proposed lots are to be oriented shall be used; and
2. Lot size is either equal to or greater than 70% of the lot size of the average size of surrounding parcels or equal to or larger than smallest surrounding lot, whichever is greater. For a corner lot, only the block face to which the proposed lots are to be oriented shall be used; and
3. Where the minimum required street setback is less than the average of the street setback of the two parcels abutting either side of the lot proposed to be subdivided, a minimum building setback line shall be included on the proposed lots at the average setback. When one of the abutting parcels is vacant, the next developed parcel shall be used. For a corner lot, both block faces shall be used; and
4. Orientation of proposed lots shall be consistent with the surrounding parcels. For a corner

lot, both block faces shall be evaluated.

Under the requirement the minimum would be .95 acre lots with single homes. This is with an omission of a 12.9 acre lot with a home.

2. Also as outlined in Nashville Next Volume III: Community Plans it states:

Intent of Community Character Policies

Each Community Character Policy has a stated intent — to *maintain*, to *enhance*, or to *create*. This acknowledges the diversity of development, redevelopment, and preservation needs present throughout Nashville/ Davidson County.

A healthy neighborhood in the T3 Transect Category that needs to be maintained with little change is a candidate for the T3 Neighborhood Maintenance (T3-NM) Community Character Policy since the intent is to maintain the neighborhood. Meanwhile, another neighborhood may be facing redevelopment pressures due to outdated housing stock, proximity to centers, or unsustainable features such as lack of connectivity. T3 Neighborhood Evolving (T3-NE) policy, with the intent of enhancing the area, would be applied to this neighborhood to encourage appropriate infill and redevelopment.

Our area is now T3-NM under Nashville Next. The mention of R20 in the concept plan was given to homes in this area in 1971. North Hill Estates was changed to RS40 in 1995 by the Planning Commission when development started to the east of the subdivision to maintain and protect its character.

3. At the last Planning Commission meeting it was stated that N/A from the Fire Department meant that they approved plan. This is not the case. The Fire Department states that 30+ homes built in a new subdivision requires two accesses. The Concept Plan submitted for approval has only one access for 46 homes. The Concept Plan does show a Road C for future access, however, there is a home on the land blocking access to East Hills. The Concept Plan does not list the rightful owner of this parcel nor does it show a home. I have provided an overlay of the parcels adjacent to the Concept Plan to provide a more accurate depiction. Please note the change of the Fire Department comments in the plan submitted for approval. It is not evident that access to East Hills will be permitted at anytime in the future.

4. Stormwater. The Concept Plan shows an area designated for storm water. This area is located on a hill. This would mean that they are going to have to dig into the hillside and possibly have to

blast or drill into the rock underneath. This could impact the surrounding homes and cause rock from the bluff to fall onto the railroad tracks. It would also seem to create more drainage into the existing neighborhood since the natural drainage is at the east of the reserved area. I have provided some pictures of the hillside and the property that will be affected as well as the railroad.

5. Traffic. As previously mentioned North Hill Estates has a traffic light at the end of the subdivision on Northside Drive. This light remains red for 4:30 and green for 7 seconds. This allows for three cars to make it onto Gallatin Road if everyone is paying attention and traffic volume is low. This light is also an exit point for a shopping center to the west, a furniture store to the east, and car dealership to the north. The Concept Plan would increase traffic in the North Hill Estates by 75%. North Hill Estates have no side walks, no shoulders, or lights. There are only two stop signs at the north of the neighborhood for the side street before the traffic light. We have no bike lanes so this would impact the safety of those that ride and the children that play in the neighborhood. I contacted Traffic and Parking about their recommendation for approval. It was explained that it is stipulated upon the fact that any two-lane road can handle 10,000 cars a day and that the final decision was up to the Planning Commission. The residents need to address their concerns at the public hearing. I also inquired as to whether the documentation of the dedication and acceptance of the roads, as per *Sections 13-3-405 and 13-4-305 of Tennessee Code*, for North Hill Estates ensured a right of way at Cumberland Hills Drive. Residence that bought homes when the subdivision was first built have reason to believe that in this document it was designated that no access be granted. They could not tell me where to find the documentation. I am now reaching out to the Greater Nashville Regional Council to find an answer.

6. Well Being and Property Value. Properties in North Hill Estates on East Hill and south were not allowed access to sewer lines because of a high pressure sewer line that was run from Sumner County to Edenwold to the treatment facility. These homes are on septic systems. Adding homes on half acre lots to the neighborhood would impact their value. Adding the increased amount of homes to the neighborhood would also impact the well-being and safety for the number of reasons previously stated as well as the wildlife.

I have also included pictures of the neighborhood that surrounds the Concept Plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these facts.

Sincerely,

John Sturdivant, Jr

(attachments follow)



Stormwater





Item 25, Simpkins Grocery (Development Plan Revision)

From: Kevin Hamrick [<mailto:krhamrick@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:02 AM

To: Planning Staff; Planning Commissioners

Subject: Bike Shop 1627 Shelby

Dear Planning Staff & Commissioners:

My name is Kevin Hamrick and I am the homeowner (with my partner, Vallena Forrister) at 1607 Shelby Avenue, 37206.

I am writing in strong support of the proposal to allow the requested modifications to the operating hours and signage at 1627 Shelby to allow a bicycle shop to open.

After attending a neighborhood meeting on the issue, I was impressed with the owner's proposal and am convinced that this is precisely the type of neighborhood small business that the city and our neighborhood should encourage. The question on the table is NOT whether there will be a business operating in the space, but what type of business it will be. A bike shop fits with the neighborhood culture.

I urge the planning commission to approve the requested changes.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hamrick

1607 Shelby Ave

Nashville, TN 37206

615-974-2723

Members of the Planning Commission,

As a resident of North Hill Estates Subdivision, I respectfully submit the following facts and concerns in opposition of the Concept Plan 2017S-254-001 Riverview at Cumberland Hills.

1. Based on the SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS of the Nashville/Davidson County Metropolitan Planning Commission this concept does not meet those guidelines.

Chapter 3. Requirements for Improvements, Reservations, and Design

d. The proposed lots are consistent with the community character of surrounding parcels as determined below:

1. Lot frontage is either equal to or greater than 70% of the average frontage of surrounding parcels or equal to or greater than the surrounding lot with the least amount of frontage, whichever is greater. For a corner lot, only the block face to which the proposed lots are to be oriented shall be used; and
2. Lot size is either equal to or greater than 70% of the lot size of the average size of surrounding parcels or equal to or larger than smallest surrounding lot, whichever is greater. For a corner lot, only the block face to which the proposed lots are to be oriented shall be used; and
3. Where the minimum required street setback is less than the average of the street setback of the two parcels abutting either side of the lot proposed to be subdivided, a minimum building setback line shall be included on the proposed lots at the average setback. When one of the abutting parcels is vacant, the next developed parcel shall be used. For a corner lot, both block faces shall be used; and
4. Orientation of proposed lots shall be consistent with the surrounding parcels. For a corner lot, both block faces shall be evaluated.

Under the requirement the minimum would be .95 acre lots with single homes. This is with an omission of a 12.9 acre lot with a home.

2. Also as outlined in Nashville Next Volume III: Community Plans it states:

Intent of Community Character Policies

Each Community Character Policy has a stated intent — to *maintain*, to *enhance*, or to *create*. is acknowledges the diversity of development, redevelopment, and preservation needs present throughout Nashville/ Davidson County.

A healthy neighborhood in the T3 Transect Category that needs to be maintained with little change is a candidate for the T3 Neighborhood Maintenance (T3-NM) Community Character Policy since the intent is to maintain the neighborhood. Meanwhile, another neighborhood may be facing redevelopment

pressures due to outdated housing stock, proximity to centers, or unsustainable features such as lack of connectivity. T3 Neighborhood Evolving (T3-NE) policy, with the intent of enhancing the area, would be applied to this neighborhood to encourage appropriate infill and redevelopment.

Our area is now T3-NM under Nashville Next. The mention of R20 in the concept plan was given to homes in this area in 1971. North Hill Estates was changed to RS40 in 1995 by the Planning Commission when development started to the east of the subdivision to maintain and protect its character.

3. At the last Planning Commission meeting it was stated that N/A from the Fire Department meant that they approved plan. This is not the case. The Fire Department states that 30+ homes built in a new subdivision requires two accesses. The Concept Plan submitted for approval has only one access for 46 homes. The Concept Plan does show a Road C for future access, however, there is a home on the land blocking access to East Hills. The Concept Plan does not list the rightful owner of this parcel nor does it show a home. I have provided an overlay of the parcels adjacent to the Concept Plan to provide a more accurate depiction. Please note the change of the Fire Department comments in the plan submitted for approval. It is not evident that access to East Hills will be permitted at anytime in the future.

4. Stormwater. The Concept Plan shows an area designated for storm water. This area is located on a hill. This would mean that they are going to have to dig into the hillside and possibly have to blast or drill into the rock underneath. This could impact the surrounding homes and cause rock from the bluff to fall onto the railroad tracks. It would also seem to create more drainage into the existing neighborhood since the natural drainage is at the east of the reserved area. I have provided some pictures of the hillside and the property that will be affected as well as the railroad.

5. Traffic. As previously mentioned North Hill Estates has a traffic light at the end of the subdivision on Northside Drive. This light remains red for 4:30 and green for 7 seconds. This allows for three cars to make it onto Gallatin Road if everyone is paying attention and traffic volume is low. This light is also an exit point for a shopping center to the west, a furniture store to the east, and car dealership to the north. The Concept Plan would increase traffic in the North Hill Estates by 75%. North Hill Estates have no side walks, no shoulders, or lights. There are only two stop signs at the north of the neighborhood for the side street before the traffic light. We have no bike lanes so this would impact the safety of those that ride and the children that play in the neighborhood. I contacted Traffic and Parking about their recommendation for approval. It was explained that it is stipulated upon the fact that any two-lane road can handle 10,000 cars a day and that the final decision was up to the Planning Commission. The residents need to address their concerns at the public hearing. I also inquired as to whether the documentation of the dedication and acceptance of the roads, as per *Sections 13-3-405 and 13-4-305 of Tennessee Code*, for North Hill Estates ensured a right of way at Cumberland Hills Drive. Residence that bought homes when the subdivision was first built have reason to believe that in this document it was designated that no access be granted. They could not tell me where to find the documentation.

6. Well Being and Property Value. Properties in North Hill Estates on East Hill and south were not allowed access to sewer lines because of a high pressure sewer line that was run from Sumner County to Edenwold to the treatment facility. These homes are on septic systems. Adding homes on half acre lots

to the neighborhood would impact their value. Adding the increased amount of homes to the neighborhood would also impact the well-being and safety for the number of reasons previously stated as well as the wildlife.

I have also included pictures of the neighborhood that surrounds the Concept Plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these facts.

Sincerely,

John Sturdivant, Jr

From: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:58 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Planning Staff; austin@greenfleetbikes.com
Subject: Item 25: 2014NL-002-003

Planning Commissioners:

I regret that my schedule will not permit me to attend this afternoon's Planning Commission hearing due to having a conflict with other Metro Council Committee meetings on Short Term Rentals, the Transit Improvement Plan, and Metro General Hospital. Please accept this email in my place.

I write to offer my general support for the proposed site plan revision for the Neighborhood Landmark Overlay for 1627 Shelby Ave with the condition that the General Retail hours not be permitted on Sundays. I would remind everyone that the expansion of the number of days when General Retail hours are permitted at this site does not apply to the proposed business owner himself nor to the proposed business itself but rather to General Retail as a category. General Retail is a broad category of businesses to which the immediately adjacent neighbors are being asked to be exposed.

I appreciate the fact that bicyclists might want to have a bike shop open on Sundays in the unfortunate event that a needed bike repair should arise on a Sunday. There are any number of businesses that any of us might wish to have available on Sundays that it is sometimes necessary for us to adjust our work or other schedules around in order to patronize them on other days. Therefore, the possibility of necessary bike repairs arising on Sundays does not convince me that the needs of the immediately adjacent neighbors should be ignored. The immediately adjacent neighbors are willing to be flexible in expanding the number of days when general retail uses can be permitted next door up to six days. All that they ask is that one of those days not be Sunday. I believe that their request is a reasonable one and I request your favorable consideration.

Certainly the business owner brings with him a terrific reputation for community mindedness. I appreciate his efforts at community outreach within the Shelby Hills and Lockeland Springs Neighborhoods, as he has appeared at three community meetings, one of which was unfortunately contentious, as well as a neighborhood association board meeting. When the business owner contacted me initially, I advised him that the immediately adjacent and most affected neighbors would likely not support Sunday hours. That advice was sound, and you have letters from those neighbors expressing opposition to Sunday hours. Therefore, my request to honor the requests of the immediately adjacent neighbors not to include Sunday hours is consistent with advice that I have provided throughout this application process. Certainly the business owner could purchase or rent virtually any commercially zoned property in East Nashville without having to negotiate the days and hours of operation with neighbors. But this site plan change affects the immediately adjacent neighbors and they do have a say in today's public hearing, and they are willing to expand the number of days when General Retail is permitted next door to them provided that Sunday is not one of those days. Again, I request your favorable consideration of that request.

Certainly I support having businesses that are within walking distance to residences in East Nashville, and certainly I support making East Nashville a bike-friendly place. But again, the request before you today is not limited to a bike shop but rather to General Retail. I believe that the immediate and most affected neighbors' request not to have Sunday General Retail hours is reasonable.

Thank you for your service to our county.

Brett A. Withers

Metro Council, District 6

Mobile (615) 427-5946 | facebook.com/Brett A. Withers | twitter.com @brettawit

From: Vali Forrister [mailto:vali.forrister@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:28 AM

To: Planning Commissioners; Planning Staff

Subject: Support for the Bike Shop at 1627 Shelby Ave

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I own a home at 1607 Shelby Avenue, in the same block as the old Simpkins Grocery, the proposed site of the new Shelby Bike Shop owned by Austin Bauman.

I regret that work keeps me from attending today's meeting in person to show my support for the Bike Shop and the change to the neighborhood overlay.

As a creative maker whose work is mostly nights and weekends, I find myself at home and walking the neighborhood a lot during the hours the bike shop would be open. I can say it would be a welcome presence in the neighborhood, providing a sense of community and security in what can otherwise seem a pretty lonely landscape during the day. (And, if you believe the "neighborhood watch" pages on Facebook, this is when our neighborhood crime is at its worst.)

Austin Bauman has a strong community vision and would contribute to the sense of place that would make our neighborhood more desirable, safer and more cohesive.

I love living close to Shelby Park. I believe there is no better business to be in our neighborhood than one that can cater to those wanting to enjoy the park and the greenway. Having more people on bikes (and fewer in cars) through our neighborhood and in the park will be of benefit to everyone.

I attended a neighborhood meeting to discuss the bike shop and was surprised by the vocal opposition of two of my neighbors. At the root of their displeasure are old grievances against a former councilperson and perceived injustices of bygone days. I'm sure they will be at the meeting this evening to share their thoughts with you.

I don't know much about the history, but I do know that in the present moment, a bike shop would attract the right kind of energy and vibe to the neighborhood, could potentially decrease traffic, increase our neighborhood's sense of place, improve our health, and bolster positive use of Shelby Park.

A business with more regular hours will increase safety. Weekend hours are obviously essential since most folks only have weekends free for a gorgeous bike ride through Shelby Park and down the greenway.

I am excited about the bike shop on my block. Of all the businesses we could have on our street, I think this one will do the most to improve our neighborhood cohesiveness, health, safety, and property values.

With respect,

Vali Forrister

1607 Shelby Ave

Nashville, TN 37206

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

From: Bastarache, Lisa [mailto:lisa.bastarache@Vanderbilt.Edu]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:06 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Withers, Brett (Council Member)

Subject: please modify or disapprove 2014NL-002-003

To the Planning Commission:

I am writing to oppose the proposed site plan for 1627 Shelby ave. The proposed plan will be likely be disruptive to the nearby neighbors, and the requested hours are beyond what is needed to fulfill the

goals of the neighborhood landmark overlay. While the new business is being billed as a neighborhood bike store, I am concerned that it will be oriented towards serving tourists more than locals. Mr. Bauman's current business relies on bike tours and rentals to tourists. Given the proximity of 1627 Shelby to an existing neighborhood bike store, it seems likely he will use this same business model in his new store. The site plan does not contain any language that would prevent tours and other uses that would be far more disruptive than a neighborhood bike store. The inclusion of Sunday hours is also problematic for the immediate neighbors. On Sunday morning and early afternoon that section of Shelby ave is completely parked up with the cars of church attendees. Having a business that relies on street parking would exacerbate this issue both for the churchgoers and immediate neighbors.

Like many of my neighbors, I see the appeal of having more businesses within walking distance of my house. However, the tool that is being used in this case, the "Neighborhood Landmark Overlay" (NLO), is not intended to address this need. Rather, the NLO was created with the intent to preserving vulnerable structures that are important to the neighborhood by allowing for additional uses, while taking into account the potential impact such use would have on adjacent and nearby neighbors. This site plan, given its request for Sunday hours that many of the nearby neighbors forcefully oppose, is not sensitive to the impact a 42 hour a week business might have on the nearby neighbors. For these reasons, I ask you to modify the site plan by removing Sunday hours and, if possible, adding language that would prevent group tours.

Sincerely,
Lisa Bastarache
1626 Shelby Ave.

From: Laura Hutchison [mailto:lnhutchison@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 7:45 AM
To: Planning Commissioners; Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: Please disapprove plans for 1629 Shelby

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am a resident of the 1600 block of Shelby Avenue. I am asking that you disapprove the current plans for 1629 Shelby Avenue. Please disapprove this plan as written to remove Sunday hours and add language preventing group tours and events. The location is in the heart of a residential neighborhood and adjacent to a very active and growing church.

The hours that are being requested will apply to this business and also any business following. I would like to ask that you help protect the neighborhood and limit the hours of operation for this location.

As a neighborhood we have met with business owners on several occasions and expressed these concerns. He continues to push on demanding his plan be passed over the desires of the immediate neighbors.

The commercial zoning of this property is new. We did not purchase our homes beside a commercial business, as it was zoned residential at the time. A NOLD was passed a few years ago. The NOLD was intended to help preserve historic property by allowing a commercial use. This was never necessary for this property which is covered by a separate overlay and is financially stable as a residence only.

Please disapprove this plan as written to remove Sunday hours and add language preventing group tours and events.

Best,
Laura Hutchison
1603 Shelby Avenue

From: Julie M [<mailto:jmatt8890@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 1:59 AM
To: Planning Staff; Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: Shelby Avenue bike shop

Hello,

I'm writing in support of the Shelby Avenue bike shop, and the modifications they seek to ensure that a great service is provided and that they succeed as a neighborhood small business.

I find the requests regarding signage and hours to be both reasonable and necessary. The Green Fleet bicycle shop, owned and managed by the same folks, has shown great respect and reverence to the

history and culture of Jefferson Street. I have every confidence they will do the same with the signage at the new bike shop. Visibility and identity are important for any small business to succeed, where they rely on drop in customers to grow and thrive. This is particularly true of a bike shop, where commuting, touring, and recreational cyclists will all have the chance to happen upon the shop as they roll by. And those driving by will have that seed planted to get themselves out on a bike. Fortunately a bike shop doesn't need a whole lot of explanation, so simple and elegant signage will do, but folks do need to know it's there.

As to the hour modifications, they will also serve the community well. The Sunday hours are quite manageable, and vital to customers in need. Whether it's a problem that crops up on a weekend ride, or "this is the weekend I'm going to get back on a bike", having the shop available on both of the most busy cycling days will be necessary to building a loyal customer following and keeping folks rolling to their next shopping, dining, or recreational destination. Most of the "traffic" to the shop will be people on bicycles, so will not add noise or congestion.

One of the reasons I moved to East Nashville is the vibrant and supportive biking community - a community that cherishes their neighborhoods and actively supports local small businesses. And the accessibility by bike to the restaurants, shops, and parks in the area. With Nashville's exponential growth, traveling by bike is now more than ever a great way to get around the city and to explore local businesses. I'm very excited to have a shop so close by, and one that I know will be a helpful and respectful asset to the community.

I appreciate your time and look forward to your support of this effort to serve and nurture the great community feeling in East Nashville.

Best,

Julie Mattes

South 14th St resident

From: edwin [mailto:edwin@willmore.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 10:47 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: 2014NL-002-003

Planning Commissioners and Councilman Withers;

My name is Edwin Willmore. I live at 1626 Shelby Avenue, across the street from the Simpkins grocery and residence. As an immediate neighbor to the property I am strongly opposed to the site development plan as it is currently written because of numerous concerns. In order to ameliorate the drawbacks for me and my family, I simply ask the Planning Commission to please add the condition that business can not be conducted on Sundays.

All the surrounding lots are residential, except for the very active church which is catty corner. The law states that any Neighborhood Landmark Overlay development plan must be sensitive to the abutting properties (Metro Nashville Code, Chapter 17.40.160 - Neighborhood landmark (NL) district section E). And I feel that adding Sunday hours is not sensitive to the surrounding homeowners and families. We immediate neighbors have talked and we feel this plan does not take our various concerns into consideration. What we do think is that removal of Sunday hours is not too much to ask as a protection against many of the possible disruptions.

Please, leave us Sunday to enjoy our homes and neighbors, with our families and friends.

Sincerely,

Edwin Willmore

1626 Shelby Ave

Nashville

From: Nora Kern [mailto:nora@walkbikenashville.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 5:59 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Support for Item 25, 2014NL-002-003, Revision of Simpkins Grocery

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to support agenda item 25, 2014NL-002-003, the Revision of the Simpkins Grocery Overlay to allow for the proposed bicycle shop.

This small, local bicycle shop would be a significant asset for our East Nashville community. Not only would it provide easy access for the numerous people who ride recreationally in Shelby Park and on the Shelby Bottoms greenway, but it would also provide needed support for people who commute by bicycle from East Nashville on of the neighborhoods with the highest bicycle ridership in all of Nashville.

I have worked with Austin Bauman and Green Fleet Bicycles and found them to be strong community partners, conscientious neighbors, and focused on working closely with the neighborhood in which they work.

In particular I would strongly support allowing this business to operate on the weekends. It is essential for community members to have access to a bicycle shop when it is typically used, weekends. I would also note that bicycle shops frequently have significantly lower parking requirements than many other similar sized business, as many customers arrive on bicycle. Based on my observation of Green Fleet Bicycles and other local shops in the city I am confident the impact of traffic and people looking for car parking would be minimal to surrounding neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nora Kern

Executive Director

[Walk Bike Nashville](#)

Work Address: 943 Woodland Street

Home: 938 W Eastland Ave