

Comments on June 14, 2018 Planning Commission agenda items, received June 11 -13

Item 1, East Nashville Community Plan Amendment

From: Ashonti Davis [mailto:ashontidavis@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 1:21 PM
To: ANITA CARTMELL
Cc: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Re: Item 1 East Nashville Policy Amendment

Thank you! I appreciate you so much!

On Wed, Jun 13, 2018, 12:28 PM ANITA CARTMELL <anitakr1@bellsouth.net> wrote:

Dear Planning Commission,

As someone who has lived on Edwin Street for 25 years, I am disappointed in the proposed update to Edwin St. and the surrounding area. Please make Edwin St. one consistent policy and change it to the policy for the block of Edwin across the street from the Tom Joy Head Start.

I live at 334 Edwin St., and my backyard touches the new development of 150 units in the former Meridian Mobile Home park. I am frustrated that project was approved because it does not reflect the single-family character of this established neighborhood. There are plenty of new homes being built in my immediate area and they are single-family homes.

I participated in one of the sessions during the study in March and I informed members of Planning of my concerns. We have a small neighborhood. The intense density is too great for such a small area.

I hope the update to the policy reflects what my neighbors want. From talking to my other neighbors on Edwin, it currently does not.

Thanks,

Anita Cartmell

Sent from my iPad

From: Christy Grace [mailto:christy.h.grace@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:07 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Highland Heights Study

Commissioners,

The proposed subdistricts allow for intense density that doesn't work for our neighborhood. Please lower the subdistricts on Meridian, Lischey, Edwin, and Edith. Please do not divide blocks. We seek the lower designation. Please keep in mind that this is, geographically a very small area. Diving blocks and putting in higher density subdistricts doesn't make a ton of sense here. Especially as you consider any decisions around Marshall Street, please keep in mind that this neighborhood considers the future Marshall Crossing development an example of inappropriate density. Indeed it just squeaked-by with it's approval before this charette process. Our vision statement called for reclaiming the character of our neighborhood-which is largely single family and residential. We support the intensity of development along Dickerson, but ask you to please understand that while Trinity can support some increased density for sure, it is currently largely single family and it's infrastructure supports that.

I love my neighborhood. I want to see it grow-- and preserve it's single-family charm as much as possible, particularly in areas with historical significance like Lischey Ave.

Thank you for your service,

Christy Grace (charette advisory committee)

From: Davis, Ashonti [mailto:DavisA17@aetna.com]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 12:36 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Sewell, Marty (Planning)
Subject: RE: Item 1 - East Nashville Community Plan Amendment 2018CP-005-002

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

The East Nashville Community Plan Amendment represents months of hard work by the Planning Staff and those engaged in the Highland Heights Study.

Overall, the precedent of the last policy change and approved developments should not be used as justification for greater intense developments that contravene the vision statement. That policy change was approved without public notice, and we, as neighbors, want to preserve the existing character and quality of our neighborhood. As the neighborhood continues to change and grow, we want to protect the single-family footprint of the neighborhood and the policy amendment to add additional density (where appropriate) while complementing the existing character.

Thus, I respectfully ask that you adopt the East Nashville Amendment, but with the following conditions:

- **Transitions** – Many of the transitions are problematic. Specifically, on Meridian, Lischey, and Edwin, previously approved developments are being used to justify higher transitions. The subdistricts R5 and R4 will not encourage and/or preserve the existing footprint and is wholly inappropriate for the infrastructure. We are a neighborhood of primarily residential homes with narrow roads and drainage ditches. Storm water and sewage are major issues in HH area. A piecemeal approach to infrastructure is not a workable solution, and we are amendable to the approach of permitting additional density as one of the avenues for improved infrastructure but not at the cost of losing our neighborhood's character. Thus, it would be more appropriate to classify Meridian Street and all of Edwin Street with subdistrict R3. These proposed designations would allow for additional density balanced against the existing development pattern of single family homes. My neighbors and I strongly oppose subdistricts that transition "up" our existing residential streets and instead of a transition "down."
- **Trinity Lane and Dickerson Road** – While the general existing consensus is that placing higher intense developments on the corridors like Trinity Lane and Dickerson Road is a good approach, Trinity Lane and Dickerson Road are not the same. In fact, Trinity Lane, as it touches our neighborhood, contains primarily residential single-family homes, with new homes being built, and is a two-land road resembling Douglas Avenue. The subdistricts for Trinity Lane do not

reflect or support the existing development pattern and Trinity Lane should have a classification of R5, which still allows for greater density than what currently exists today.

- **Divided Blocks** – The divided blocks are awkward and contradict existing and recent development patterns. For example, the divided blocks on Pullen and Gatewood seem unjustifiable in light of the new, single-family homes being built in that same area. There is an existing development pattern, and even the new homes being built are consistent and in harmony with the older homes in the area. Divided blocks contravene that pattern and frustrate the vision statement of maintaining our character. Reclassifying the eastern side of Meridian Street and Lischey Street from Edith Street to subdistrict R3, which is currently showing as R4. Since the cross streets are so close (Edith, Marshall, Pullen, Gatewood) it would seem more appropriate to apply the R3 building types as most of those lots are corner lots. R3 would allow up to 4 units. As R4 would allow more dense developments, we would potentially see these projects encroaching further into the neighborhood instead of using the street as a boundary to ease the transition.
- **Corner of Douglas and Lischey** – While we agree with the M1 classification at the corner of Douglas and Lischey, the M1 subsumes too much. A lot of that area includes residential homes, and we do not want to sacrifice that existing pattern. We think a good example of what we would like to see in this area is the Riverside Village area in Inglewood at the corner of Riverside Drive and McGavock. It is a commercial area that compliments the homes surrounding it. Only the new Douglas Market development should be included as M1, the rest of the single family homes should stay intact and the policy should reflect that. The rest of Lischey Avenue in that immediate vicinity is R1, and we think R1 should be the designation for more of the lots in the current M1 area.
- **Corner of Meridian and Trinity Lane** – I propose subdistricts M1 or M3 for that corner as that church is a historical building with a lot of character and is worth preserving. I attended the Planning Commission’s public hearing on May 24, 2018, and I listened to the comments about the historic church in Edgefield being converted to hotel, while maintaining its character and promoting unique commercial activity. The United Methodist church is an anchor in the community; it is an asset that should be preserved.
- **Neighborhood Infill** – The subdistricts R1 and R2 are appropriate in all of the areas currently labeled as such. To promote incremental density while respecting the existing context, the subdistricts like R3 and R2 in the north portion of the neighborhood going towards Trinity Lane and west towards Dickerson Road would also be more appropriate than subdistrict R5 and R4. Specifically, in that portion of the neighborhood, R3 and R2 would allow for greater density while also complimenting the existing single-family footprint and recent development pattern.
- **Marshall Street** – Marshall Street is an undeveloped right-of-way, and the Marshall Crossing SP is arguably inappropriate precedent. Please consider designating Marshall street as an alley/laneway. An alley/laneway is a fair compromise that balances the need for infrastructure and the existing context of the homes that touch this proposed “connector” street. There are a total of 9 properties that touch that right-of-way, and none of them face it. If it were to be

developed as a street, it would significantly impact those properties along the northern side of the street.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of my request to add the above conditions to East Nashville Amendment.

Kindest Regards,

Ashonti Davis

Edwin Street, 37207

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 2, 1225 Stainback Avenue (Amendment)

From: Woody Muckler [mailto:wmuckler13@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 12:06 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2015SP-049-003 Oppose

As the meeting keeps getting deferred, I am resending this to make sure that my voice is heard. I understand the Metro Planning Agenda meeting is now scheduled for tomorrow, 6/14/18.

I am sending this email to strongly oppose the request to change the zoning for the property at the Corner of Stainback Ave and Douglas

Ave to RM-40. My wife and I live at 1008 Stainback Ave. The purpose of this re-zoning request is to allow the units that are being built there to be used as non-owner occupied short term rentals. This is detrimental to the neighborhood and, I believe, to the entire city. It is most certainly detrimental to the immediate neighbors around this property. Mini-hotels that would house rotating groups of guests, the problems that that entails in regards to insufficient parking, excessive noise, and a lack of affordable housing for people who actually wish to reside in the neighborhood, residential areas that are being turned into businesses....these are just a few of the reasons for my opposition. Thank you.

Nathaniel & Nancy Muckler
1008 Stainback Avenue
Nashville Tn 37207