

## Comments on April 12, 2018 Planning Commission agenda items, received April 9-10

### Item 2, 1223 Stainback Avenue (Amendment)

From: Omid Yamini [mailto:omid1130@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 1:06 PM  
To: Hill, Levi (Planning)  
Cc: Planning Commissioners; alexlintonrn@gmail.com; Will Tyson  
Subject: another public hearing on 2015SP-049-003 - 1225 Stainback Ave.?

Levi,

I was wondering if there was going to be another public hearing on on Thursday for this item since the applicant was required to hold the community meeting?

I've CC'ed the neighbors, please reply all so they also know what the answer is.

Thanks,  
Omid

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Victoria Woodard [mailto:victoriawoodard3@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 11:13 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** Fwd: 2015SP-049-003 OPPOSE (1225 Stainback)

Resending from March as the vote was tabled to the meeting this week.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Victoria Woodard

615-448-8263

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Victoria Woodard** <[victoriawoodard3@gmail.com](mailto:victoriawoodard3@gmail.com)>

Date: Tue, Mar 20, 2018 at 6:19 PM

Subject: 2015SP-049-003 OPPOSE (1225 Stainback)

To: [planning.commissioners@nashville.gov](mailto:planning.commissioners@nashville.gov)

Dear Planning Commission:

My name is Victoria Woodard. My husband Jeffrey & I live at 1025 Dickerson Pike in the Cleveland Park neighborhood of Nashville. We are owner occupants of one of the attached townhouse in the 1st North development on the corner of Dickerson and Evanston. These townhomes are very similar to the ones being built at 1225 Stainback Ave.

I'm writing because we have been carefully watching the situation regarding the zoning at the Stainback address and we have both signed the petition to oppose. My husband & I feel that we have a unique perspective as one of only two owner occupants in our nine unit development. Of the other six units there is one long term renter and five Airbnbs. We are against this zoning change primarily because of the proposed parking for the development and what it may mean to have any of the four units become STRs.

Where we live there are two attributed parking spots per unit. In addition to these 18 parking spots we also have a visitors spot and a handicapped spot to make 20 total. Furthermore, we have ample street parking on Evanston - yet even with all of this available parking we still see an overflow of vehicles from visitors causing an issue and parking shortage. We simply cannot imagine 4 units of roughly the same occupancy of ours with only 6 parking spots & no street parking! If say, one or even two of the 4 units is owner occupied (& the others airbnb) - it could very well be a nightmare for them. Obviously we understand this is an unknown at this time, the chance of this could be very disturbing to any owner occupants. We know this from personal experience.

Parking problems aside, we have also experienced noise, litter, theft and other issues including metro police involvement with the airbnbs. We work hard as neighbors to embrace the out of town guests and give grace - especially because we personally know all of our investor neighbors and understand that using their units as an airbnb is revenue generating and building equity for them. Even with this in mind, we DO oppose the change in zoning for Stainback to allow STR's. We believe that anyone who purchases there (if airbnbs are allowed) as an owner occupant is set up for future problems - especially in regards to parking. In our experience we feel that these concerns will flow over to the adjacent neighbors and directly affect our wonderful neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration and vote to oppose this zoning change. We are counting on to you to set the precedent of what is best for the future of Cleveland Park,

our home. Should you have any questions regarding the content of this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at the number below.

Sincerely,  
Victoria (& Jeffrey) Woodard  
1025 Dickerson Pike  
Nashville, TN 37207  
615-448-8263 cell

## **Item 6, 1088/1090/1092 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. South**

**From:** Janet Shands Mutual Contractors [mailto:shands.janet@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 7:35 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Cc:** Shepard, Shawn (Planning); Sledge, Colby (Council Member)  
**Subject:** 2017Z-122PR-001 1088, 1090, & 1092 12th Ave South

As a member of the Edgehill Coalition, I am writing to ask for disapproval of this case. The applicant came to the 3-15-2018 meeting of the Coalition to present. On 4-3-18 three members of the Coalition met with him and a planning staff member on 4-3-18. This case is a request to go from R-6 zoning to RM20. Currently the applicant can build six units on the property. This would be consistent with the infill directly across from these lots on the west side of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave South. The applicant reports that he has plans in hand for 6 individual units.

His request for RM20 zoning would allow the applicant to build up to 12 units. The front of this structure would by code have 60% of the façade fronting 12<sup>th</sup> Ave S within 15 ft of the road. This shorter setback is a departure from existing structures on either side of lots.

The applicant cannot be more specific as to his actual building plans because he has none. He provided a single page diagram with the incorrect setback. He is unwilling to apply for a Specific Plan.

The neighborhood is concerned on several points. First, we do not believe up zoning is a right. We think of it as a process that involves the community earlier rather than later. Asking for an exception because this is the first development you have attempted and/or citing the Councilperson has providing you with inaccurate information does not exempt the applicant from due process with the community.

Secondly, as density increases in the urban core, the SP is one of the few tools that the neighborhoods have to provide input in to how their communities develop. For the developer to refuse that as an option is problematic.

Thirdly, if the applicant had construction plans to present to us regarding the layout, the correct setbacks, the construction materials, etc. we could validate his verbal intentions. The applicant reports he has engaged no professionals for such documents. With a zone change to RM 20, the applicant's property becomes more valuable on the open market. For his cited need to speed the process up for financial reasons, plans generally take 4-6 months to create and submit to planning for approval before construction.

Without an SP and without plans, we believe if this passes it will set a precedent for other developers to bypass the community's input for economic gain at the communities expense. We acknowledge his right to build 6 units as currently zoned. As such we respectfully request that you disapprove this request.

Sincerely,

Janet Shands

1001 14<sup>th</sup> Ave South

## Item 7, Donelson Transit-Oriented Redevelopment Plan

**From:** Judith Mikesell [<mailto:judith.mikesell@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 9:34 AM

**To:** Leeman, Bob (Planning)

**Subject:** Donelson TOD

I will be out of town this Thursday and unable to attend the meeting. This email is sent to place my vote in favor of the Donelson TOD. Thank you for your assistance. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Judy Mikesell

**From:** Phillip Mikesell [<mailto:pmikesell@comcast.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:50 AM

**To:** Leeman, Bob (Planning)

**Subject:** vote-Donelson TOD

Bob,

My wife, Judy, said we can vote via email to you since we will be out of town. She has already sent you an email to vote YES(-in favor of the DonelsonTOD). I vote the same.

Thanks for your help

Phil Mikesell

Surge Suppression of TN, LLC

...Mfg reps for SSI, an ILSCO Company

2842 Lebanon Pike

Nashville, TN 37214

Office/mobile 615-289-9081

[pmikesell@comcast.net](mailto:pmikesell@comcast.net)

[www.surgesuppression.com](http://www.surgesuppression.com)

## Item 9, Whitland Realty Company Revision One

**From:** Lisa Butlak [mailto:[lisabutlak@gmail.com](mailto:lisabutlak@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 9:20 AM

**Cc:** Planning Commissioners; [kathleen@murphyformetro.com](mailto:kathleen@murphyformetro.com)

**Subject:** Re: 3700 and 0 Woodlawn a.k.a. The Pennington Property 2018S-046-001

To Whom It May Concern:

Recently, I purchased and closed on my home at 3701 Brighton Road. I wasn't aware at the time of the pending hearing for an approval of multi lot housing development, otherwise I would not have purchased the home. These homes and the run off they create will directly impact my property lot. Already there is water intrusion evidenced by the moss and moisture at the back of my property (it stays wet at all times). There is a culvert that has been created to take in water to left of my property but it clearly doesn't adequately drain now, much less with the addition of 5 additional large homes that will increase run off with less land to absorb the water shed.

Every time an expansion of back terrace or a pool is added with one of these homes this will directly impact those of us below, yet we have no say or ability to insist on a cure before it's implemented, yet we are the owners directly impacted. I strongly request the committee to vote against this proposal by the Pennington's, and request they go back to requiring a minimum of one-acre lots with no more than 14%

hardscape coverage of property (to include the home, pool, tennis courts, guest house) and require architectural/engineer approved drainage plans developed and stamped before a home is built. Should a home be modified or added to going forward the homeowner at their expense would have to secure an architecturally approved drainage plan that ties into the culvert currently created.

Respectfully,

LISA BUTLAK

3701 BRIGHTON ROAD

**From:** Brad Karro [<mailto:bradkarro@mac.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 7:07 PM

**To:** Planning Staff

**Subject:** Case Number 2018S-046-001

Could you please provide the following email to the Planning Committee in advance of there meeting this coming Thursday. Unfortunately, I am not able to make the meeting in person but wanted to provide this statement for the record.

Thank you.

---

Metropolitan Nashville Planning Commission

[planning.commissioners@nashville.gov](mailto:planning.commissioners@nashville.gov)

RE: Project Location 3700 Woodlawn Drive

Applicant: Michael H Charette

Case Number: 2018S-046-001

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity to express concern about the proposal involving the Pennington property at [3700 Woodlawn Drive](#). My wife, Harriet, and I own and reside at [3800 Woodlawn Drive](#), immediately next to the property in question.

When we moved to Nashville in 2003, we were attracted to the large lots, mature trees, and older homes in the Woodlawn area and were pleased to purchase the approximately three-acre property on which our 105 year old home, "Hillcote," sits. We were further pleased that, in the years that followed, our neighbors galvanized under the initial leadership of Bell Newton and Jennifer Pennington to help protect the character of our neighborhood. At a time when so many areas are being overtaken by large-scale developments where land is clear-cut to make way for multiple townhomes or oversized single family homes with zero lot lines, our neighborhood has managed to retain its character chiefly because so many of our neighbors - including the late Guv and Phyllis Pennington, and their daughter, Jennifer - invested the time and energy necessary to promote the preservation of those aspects of our neighborhood that make it special.

In their report to the Commission, the Metro Planning Department staff stated that, if allowed, "This pattern of development would change the character of this section of Woodlawn Drive." We concur, as do our neighbors – a fact that was made clear two years ago when, as a result of neighbors working together with our councilwoman, downzoning was approved for our area.



Harriet and I encourage the applicant to pursue development of the property within the current zoning guidelines and we urge the Commission to support the staff recommendation and the wishes of existing homeowners by voting to **DISAPPROVE this applicant's request.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bradley S. Karro

3800 Woodlawn Drive

[Nashville, TN 37215](#)

[bradkarro@aol.com](mailto:bradkarro@aol.com)

615-300-0353

**From:** Dianne [<mailto:craigevan@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 8:06 PM

**To:** Bell Newton

**Cc:** Planning Commissioners; Murphy, Kathleen (Council Member); John Cooper

**Subject:** Re: 3700 and 0 Woodlawn a.k.a. The Pennington Property 2018S-046-001 (4/12/2018) Item # 9

Dear Commissioners,

We too share the concerns and opposition voiced by Bell Newton and Rob Stein.

We bought our home at 3615 Woodlawn Drive in April of 1983.

We think it is most unfortunate for the city that developers and builders seem to feel the need to maximize the number of houses on beautiful tree lined lots.

We need to preserve the neighborhood we have so that our land doesn't lose its charm and integrity.

We too must respectfully ask you to oppose the Pennington property proposal to have 5 homes on this site.

Sincerely,

Dianne and Craig Sussman

3615 Woodlawn Drive

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 9, 2018, at 12:49 PM, Bell Newton <[bella.bella@comcast.net](mailto:bella.bella@comcast.net)> wrote:

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed development of the Pennington property, 3700 Woodlawn Dr., 37215. I have lived at 3950 Woodlawn since 1984 and am a founder and a current leader of the Woodlawn Neighborhood Association.

Many years ago, I chose to settle, make my living, and raise my family in Nashville. I chose to buy my home on Woodlawn for several reasons, one of the most important being the beautiful "estate" lots upon which the homes are built. In addition to wonderful, caring, involved neighbors, the goal of all to maintain the fabric, character, charm and integrity of this area remains unsurpassed in trying to keep these large lots intact.

Woodlawn neighbors went to great lengths two years ago and with the help of our councilwoman, Kathleen Murphy, we were successful in downzoning to make sure the above stated goal was met. It then, should come as no surprise to anyone in the Pennington family that we think "less is best." We do not want small yards with houses grouped on top of one another that seems to be the current theme going on in the "It City." Had we wanted this character make-up, we would've purchased homes somewhere other than the Woodlawn "estate' neighborhood.

Please vote in opposition to the request for a subdivision and the current development plans. A subdivision of this nature on Woodlawn is not what this lovely neighborhood is about.

I hope the Pennington family will reconsider the wishes of the neighbors and agree to as few as homes as possible on their property. We want nothing but the best for *all* concerned.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and also for your public service.

Respectfully,

Bell Newton

3950 Woodlawn Drive

Nashville, TN. 37205

(615) 429-7545

**From:** Covington, Paula A [mailto:paula.covington@Vanderbilt.Edu]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 4:40 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** FW: [Woodlawn] ~~OBJECTS~~ Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 4/12/18 Item #9 Pennington Property Staff Report

This would definitely change the face and character of an historic and special neighborhood. Please concur with the staff recommendation that it would not be compatible with the neighborhood. It is a special street that needs protecting against these “skinnies” and other low-quality buildings that are taking over our “infill” areas. I came here from California and have loved the dogwoods and flowering trees in the spring and lush lawns, etc. of that part of Woodlawn whenever I go by it. We need to preserve the beauty of Nashville where we can.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paula Covington

907 Estes.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**Staff recommends disapproval as the proposed subdivision does not meet the compatibility criteria for infill subdivisions as required by the Subdivision Regulations and not all agencies have recommended approval.**

Project No.: **Concept Plan 2018S-046-001**

Project Name: **Whitland Realty Company Revision One**

Council District: 24-Murphy

School District: 8-Pierce

Requested by: Smith Gee Studio, LLC, applicant; Phyllis and Thomas Guv Pennington, Et Ux, owners.

Staff Reviewer: Rickoff

**Staff**

**Recommendation:** **DISAPPROVE**

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Request for concept plan approval to create five lots.

**Concept Plan**

A request for concept plan approval to create up to five lots on properties located at 3700 Woodlawn Drive and Woodlawn Drive (unnumbered), north of the terminus of Lynnbrook Road, zoned Single-Family Residential (RS20) (3.56 acres).

**Existing Zoning**

Single-Family Residential (RS20) requires a minimum 20,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 1.85 dwelling units per acre.

**GREEN HILLS-MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN**

T3 Suburban Neighborhood Maintenance (T3 NM) is intended to preserve the general character of developed suburban residential neighborhoods. T3 NM areas will experience some change over time, primarily when buildings are expanded or replaced. When this occurs, efforts should be made to retain the existing character of the neighborhood. T3 NM areas have an established development pattern consisting of low to moderate density residential development and institutional land uses. Enhancements may be made to improve pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connectivity.

**PLAN DETAILS**

This request is for concept plan approval to create five lots on two existing parcels located on the north side of Woodlawn Drive, mid-block between Wilson Boulevard (west) and Bowling Avenue (east). The larger parcel contains an existing residence, which is indicated to be retained and included on one of the lots proposed for subdivision. The smaller parcel, located to the west, is vacant. The proposed plat would create 5 lots as follows:

- Lot 1: 31,333 SF (0.719 acres) and 153.5 feet of frontage
- Lot 2: 28,550 SF (0.655 acres) and 43.34 feet of frontage
- Lot 3: 20,698 SF (0.475 acres) and 52.61 feet of frontage

- Lot 4: 24,632 SF (0.566 acres) and 58.56 feet of frontage
- Lot 5: 29,261 SF (0.674 acres) and 164 feet of frontage

### **Proposed Subdivision:**

**All lots would be accessed from a new public street, Lynnbrook Road, which would align with the existing Lynnbrook Road located south of Woodlawn Drive.**

### **ANALYSIS**

Section 3-5.2 of the Subdivision Regulations establishes criteria for reviewing infill subdivisions and for determining their compatibility in Neighborhood Maintenance policies.

#### **Zoning Code**

**The proposed lots meet the minimum lot size requirements of the RS20 zoning district. However, the applicant has not confirmed if the existing structure on proposed Lot 5, which will be retained, complies with the minimum rear setback requirement of the RS20 zoning district. Therefore, staff is unable to make a determination on compliance with the minimum rear setback for Lot 5.**

#### **Street Frontage**

All proposed lots have frontage on a public street.

#### **Community Character**

Section 3-5.2.d of the Subdivision Regulations requires that newly created lots in areas that are previously subdivided and predominately developed must be comparable to the surrounding lots in regards to frontage, area, setback, and orientation. For the purposes of this analysis, “surrounding parcels” is defined by the Subdivision Regulations as the five R, RS, AR2A, or AG parcels oriented to the same block face on either side of the parcel proposed for subdivision, or to the end of the same blockface, whichever is less.

In this instance, proposed Lots 1 and 5 are located along an existing street, Woodlawn Drive, and Lots 2, 3, and 4 are located along a new public street, Lynnbrook Road. **Therefore, only Lots 1 and 5 are reviewed against the compatibility criteria for infill subdivisions.**

1. Lot frontage analysis: The proposed lots must have frontage 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.

Along Woodlawn Drive, Lot 1 must have frontage at least equal to approximately 112.10 feet and Lot 5 must have frontage at least equal to approximately 123.69 feet. Proposed Lot 1 has 153.5 feet of frontage and proposed Lot 5 has 164 feet of frontage. Both of the proposed lots meet compatibility requirements for frontage.

2. Lot area analysis: The proposed lots must have a total area either equal to or greater than 70% of the average area of surrounding parcels or equal to or greater than the surrounding lot with the least amount of area, whichever is greater.

---

Lot 1 Frontage	
Proposed Frontage	153.5 feet
Minimum Frontage	84.65 feet
70% Average	112.10 feet

---

Lot 5 Frontage	
Proposed Frontage	164 feet
Minimum Frontage	115 feet
70% Average	123.69 feet

---

Along Woodlawn Drive, Lot 1 must be equal to or greater than approximately 35,980 square feet (0.826 acres) and Lot 5 must be equal to or greater than approximately 37,301 square feet (0.856 acres). Proposed Lot 1 is approximately 31,333 square feet (0.719 acres), and proposed Lot 5 is 29,261 square feet (0.674 acres). **Neither of the proposed lots meets compatibility requirements for area.**

3. Street setbacks: 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.

Identifying front setbacks on concept plans is required in certain situations when the required street setback of the Metro Zoning Code is less than the front setback required by the Metro Subdivision Regulations. In this instance, the minimum required street setback per Zoning for Lot 1 is 120 feet. The average street setback of abutting parcels is approximately 133.7 feet, which is greater than 120 feet. Therefore, Lot 1 must include a minimum building setback line of approximately 133.7 feet.

**The proposed plat does not include a building setback line on Lot 1. Therefore, staff is unable to make a determination on consistency with the average setback of adjacent parcels.**

A minimum building setback line is not required to be platted for Lot 5 since the existing structure and existing setback will be retained. However, future structures would have to comply with setbacks as established by Metro Zoning Code.

4. Lot orientation: Orientation of the proposed lots shall be consistent with the surrounding parcels. Lots 1 and 5 front Woodlawn Drive and are consistent with the surrounding parcels.

**Analysis**

Based on the Subdivision Regulation’s definition of surrounding parcels, Lots 1 and 5 do not meet the area requirements of the surrounding lots. Lot 1 is approximately 4,647 square feet less than the required size based on surrounding parcels, and Lot 5 is approximately 8,039 square feet less than the required size based on surrounding parcels. In addition, the Lot 1 front setback has not been identified on the plan, inconsistent with the Subdivision Regulations and despite staff’s request to provide this information with the plan revisions. It is also unclear whether the existing structure on Lot 5 complies with the minimum rear setback requirement of the Metro Zoning Code. This information was also requested with the plan revisions.

Lot 1 Size	
Proposed Size	31,333 SF
Minimum Size	19,602 SF
70% Average	35,980 SF
Lot 5 Size	
Proposed Size	29,261 SF
Minimum Size	25,264 SF
70% Average	37,300 SF
Lot 1 Street Setback	
Proposed Street Setback	Not provided
Minimum Street Setback	120 feet
Adjacent Average	133.7

The applicant requests approval under Section 3-5.2 of the Subdivision Regulations, which states that if a proposed subdivision fails to meet the compatibility criteria, the Planning Commission may grant an exception to the compatibility requirement by considering whether the subdivision can provide for the harmonious development of the community. The applicant has proposed to meet the harmonious development provision by limiting vehicular access to a maximum of 16 foot wide driveway located between the primary structure and the street.

**Staff does not find the proposed subdivision to be harmonious with surrounding development pattern. The Woodlawn Drive block face is unique in that it contains predominantly larger lots that have generally remained intact, as compared to surrounding blocks that have developed with smaller lots. This pattern of development would change the character of this section of Woodlawn Drive.**

The Planning Commission may grant an exception to the compatibility criteria by considering a larger area to evaluate general compatibility, if they find it appropriate.

FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION Approve with conditions

- Fire Code issues will be addressed in the permit phase.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Return for corrections

- Provide Water Quality Concept.
- Label all Storm Water features (Include Water quality units, bio-retention and detention ponds

Etc.)

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION Approve

TRAFFIC AND PARKING RECOMMENDATION Approve

WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION Approve with conditions

- Approved as a Concept Plan only. Public water and sewer construction plans must be submitted and approved prior to Final Site/Development Plan approval. These approved construction plans must match the Final Site/Development Plans. The required capacity fees must also be paid prior to Final Site/Development Plan approval. (FYI - Please update availability study before Final Site/Development Plan stage, so the lot count matches - latest study proposes 7 lots, this Concept Plan proposes 5 lots.)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

**Staff recommends disapproval as the proposed subdivision does not meet the compatibility criteria for infill subdivisions as required by the Subdivision Regulations and not all agencies have recommended approval.**



--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Woodlawn Area Neighborhood Association" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to [woodlawn+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com](mailto:woodlawn+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com).

To post to this group, send email to [woodlawn@googlegroups.com](mailto:woodlawn@googlegroups.com).

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/woodlawn>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>

**From:** Lewis Pennock [mailto:[lewis@lewis.net](mailto:lewis@lewis.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 1:37 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners; Murphy, Kathleen (Council Member)

**Subject:** Re: 3700 and 0 Woodlawn a.k.a. The Pennington Property 2018S-046-001 (4/12/2018) Item # 9

Dear Comissioners,

I live at 715 Lynnbrook Rd. with my wife and two young daughters, and I too would like to echo my neighbor Bell's comments below. I have lived in the Woodlawn neighborhood since 1998 and my family and I are very much against this plan which drastically changes the character of the houses along Woodlawn Dr. by inserting a subdivision style development in what are currently low density tree filled "estate" lots with deep set back houses.

Please do not approve this request for a subdivision.

Regards,

-Lewis

—  
Lewis Pennock

715 Lynnbrook Rd.

Nashville, TN 37215

**From:** Bell Newton [mailto:[bella.bella@comcast.net](mailto:bella.bella@comcast.net)]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 12:49 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Cc:** Murphy, Kathleen (Council Member); John Cooper

**Subject:** 3700 and 0 Woodlawn a.k.a. The Pennington Property 2018S-046-001 (4/12/2018) Item # 9

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed development of the Pennington property, 3700 Woodlawn Dr., 37215. I have lived at 3950 Woodlawn since 1984 and am a founder and a current leader of the Woodlawn Neighborhood Association.

Many years ago, I chose to settle, make my living, and raise my family in Nashville. I chose to buy my home on Woodlawn for several reasons, one of the most important being the beautiful "estate" lots upon which the homes are built. In addition to wonderful, caring, involved neighbors, the goal of all to maintain the fabric, character, charm and integrity of this area remains unsurpassed in trying to keep these large lots intact.

Woodlawn neighbors went to great lengths two years ago and with the help of our councilwoman, Kathleen Murphy, we were successful in downzoning to make sure the above stated goal was met. It then, should come as no surprise to anyone in the Pennington family that we think "less is best." We do not want small yards with houses grouped on top of one another that seems to be the current theme going on in the "It City." Had we wanted this character make-up, we would've purchased homes somewhere other than the Woodlawn "estate' neighborhood.

Please vote in opposition to the request for a subdivision and the current development plans. A subdivision of this nature on Woodlawn is not what this lovely neighborhood is about.

I hope the Pennington family will reconsider the wishes of the neighbors and agree to as few as homes as possible on their property. We want nothing but the best for *all* concerned.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and also for your public service.

Respectfully,

Bell Newton

3950 Woodlawn Drive

Nashville, TN. 37205

(615) 429-7545

**From:** Brad Karro [mailto:bradkarro@mac.com]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 7:20 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Meeting on April 12, 2018

Metropolitan Nashville Planning Commission

[planning.commissioners@nashville.gov](mailto:planning.commissioners@nashville.gov)

RE: Project Location 3700 Woodlawn Drive

Applicant: Michael H Charette

Case Number: 2018S-046-001

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity to express concern about the proposal involving the Pennington property at [3700 Woodlawn Drive](#). My wife, Harriet, and I own and reside at [3800 Woodlawn Drive](#), immediately next to the property in question.

When we moved to Nashville in 2003, we were attracted the large lots, mature trees, and older homes in the Woodlawn area and were pleased to purchase the approximately three-acre property on which our 105 year old home, "Hillcote," sits. We were further pleased that, in the years that followed, our

neighbors galvanized under the initial leadership of Bell Newton and Jennifer Pennington to help protect the character of our neighborhood. At a time when so many areas are being overtaken by large-scale developments where land is clear-cut to make way for multiple townhomes or oversized single family homes with zero lot lines, our neighborhood has managed to retain its character chiefly because so many of our neighbors - including the late Guv and Phyllis Pennington, and their daughter, Jennifer - invested the time and energy necessary to promote the preservation of those aspects of our neighborhood that make it special.

In their report to the Commission, the Metro Planning Department staff stated that, if allowed, "This pattern of development would change the character of this section of Woodlawn Drive." We concur, as do our neighbors – a fact that was made clear two years ago when, as a result of neighbors working together with our councilwoman, downzoning was approved for our area.

Harriet and I encourage the applicant to pursue development of the property within the current zoning guidelines and we urge the Commission to support the staff recommendation and the wishes of existing homeowners by voting to **DISAPPROVE this applicant's request.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bradley S. Karro

3800 Woodlawn Drive

[Nashville, TN 37215](#)

[bradkarro@aol.com](mailto:bradkarro@aol.com)

615-300-0353

## Item 10, W.L.B. Lawrence Plan of Lots Resub of Part of Lot 12

**From:** Clare Eng [mailto:clare.eng@belmont.edu]

**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 11:18 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Cc:** Planning Staff

**Subject:** Case 2018S-047-001

Dear Sir or Madam:

I write to express objection to case number 2018S-047-001, the application to subdivide the lot 2020 10th Ave South. Because of my work schedule, I am unable to attend the public hearing on this matter that is scheduled for 10 April. My family and I live near this lot, which is why we received notice of this application and the public hearing. Over the last 5 years, our neighborhood has seen a lot of construction by commercial developers. The vast majority of such developments have resulted in two homes being built on existing lots (since lots were zoned for duplexes before the historical overlay was added), and due to our proximity to both the 12<sup>th</sup> South commercial strip and Belmont University, many of the new homes are either tenanted by too many students in violation of city codes, or being run as illegal AirBnBs. Even for homes that are not violating city laws, the dramatic increase in home density in our neighborhood in the last 5 years brings with it many accompanying stresses, such as greater difficulty to find parking near one's home for homes without off-street parking facilities, and more noise from residents, pets and guests in general. Allowing lot subdivision in case 2018S-047-001 would simply add to neighborhood problems brought about by overcrowding. Therefore, I ask you not to approve of lot division for case 2018S-047-001.

Sincerely,

Clare Sher Ling Eng, Ph.D., LLB (Hons)  
Associate Professor of Music Theory  
College of Visual & Performing Arts  
School of Music  
Telephone: 615-460-6267

Email: [clare.eng@belmont.edu](mailto:clare.eng@belmont.edu)



1900 Belmont Boulevard | Nashville, TN 37212

Visit us: [belmont.edu](http://belmont.edu)