

## Comments on November 8 MPC agenda items, received through November 7

### **Item 1a: 2008CP-006-002 – Bellevue Plan Amendment and Item 1b: Security Central Storage SP**

**From:** Autumn Hoyt [<mailto:autumnf1@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2018 3:08 PM

**To:** Birkeland, Latisha (Planning)

**Cc:** Autumn Hoyt

**Subject:** Community Plan Amendment Case No. 2018CP-006-002, Security Central Storage SP 2018SP-043-001

Dear Ms. Birkeland,

My name is Autumn Hoyt and I own 101 Bear Track, Nashville, TN 37221 in the Coronada condo community. I am writing to express my great concern of rezoning from commercial to residential development. I am THE one resident that is most visually affected by the upcoming development. I know from life experience that it's difficult to walk in another's shoes. Please carefully consider my/our concerns. Please consider the negative impact of rezoning by an owner's perspective.

Keeping zoning as a commercial or storage unit development with the plan of 100 trees being planted is a much better option in my option. Development of the lot will negatively impact the active wildlife in our area as we have deer and wild turkey traveling the ridge.

It is my understanding that a traffic study was conducted four years ago. Much has happened in the past four years as approximately 90 people move to Nashville per day according to many publications in the area. I am one of the many that chose to make Nashville my home over the past year. During the buying process, I was never made aware of the possibility of the woods being destroyed, increased housing, and noise pollution. As we all know, increased population in any given area increases the probability of increased crime.

Coronada has been referenced as a "hidden gem". Please consider the impact of buses, at least 2 cars per residence, noise, and possible crime on our community. Turning left out of Coronada can be a bear in the a.m. as it is. With increased adult as well as teenage drivers of 30 homes in such close proximity to the very busy intersection of Old Hickory Boulevard and Hwy 70 South, increased accidents/fatalities are imminent. As it is, Kroger/businesses have no shortage of traffic and crowded parking lots.

Coronada has a high percentage of single women owners. Safety is priority and a concern. Being a single woman, having to work to make ends meet, and no spouse to allow for plan B when things go askew, it is of utmost concern for all aspects of safety.

Please allow zoning to remain commercial. I am in opposition of rezoning to allow housing on our block.

Thank you for your time.

Autumn Hoyt

[autumnf1@hotmail.com](mailto:autumnf1@hotmail.com)

706-266-6550

## Item 2: 2008SP-025-005 – Park at Ewing Creek SP (Periodic Review)

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

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 07, 2018 9:20 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Park at Ewing Creek SP Review 2008SP-025

To The Commissioners:

When Haynes Manor residents appear at your meeting this week on the Park at Ewing Creek SP Review, it will be a reminder of the past.

On April 16, 1970, *The Tennessean* reported that 25 Haynes Manor residents at a Metro Planning Commission meeting opposed a developer's effort to build a mobile home park nearby. Speakers included a Meharry Medical College psychiatrist, a TSU faculty member, a member of the Metro Board of Education and a dentist.

The dentist said, "One of the social problems is that people hate to live in a Negro neighborhood because that neighborhood is so vulnerable ...

"When a man lives in a certain type of white neighborhood he has the assurance that most of the orderly forces in the community will direct their effort to preserving that neighborhood. Too frequently the Negro community does not enjoy that kind of protective effort."

I have attached a portion of that news article. It is a reminder of citizens' ongoing efforts to preserve Haynes Manor.

Peace,

Karen Dunlap

--

*Karen Brown Dunlap, Ph.D.*

[karebdunlap@gmail.com](mailto: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.*

# Zoning Head Presents Develop

APR 16 1970  
The chairman of the Nashville Board of Zoning Appeals presented the zoning application of a real estate developer yesterday to the Metro Plan-

ning Commission but claimed no interest conflict. Fred Hathcock, a real estate broker, who presented the B-1 residential zoning plan of Fred

W. Hahn for 160 prefab homes adjoining Hayes Manor, pointed out that he heads the appeals board hearing urban services district appeals.

er, for 50 acres of his 110 acres on White's Creek Pike, because of the lack of a quorum. Hahn's original petition for Residence "C" zoning that would have permitted a mobile home subdivision drew more than 25 residents of Hayes Manor to the commission's public hearing yesterday to voice their opposition.

But when his spokesman, Hathcock, announced that he planned to construct pre-fab homes costing from \$12,000 to \$15,000 under the B-1 permission, they renewed their opposition.

"THERE IS a completely separate board for appeals of Planning Commission decisions on property in the general services district," Hathcock said. "I would not even consider an appearance before the Planning Commission on a matter originating in the urban services district."

THE DEVELOPERS' decision earlier yesterday to withdraw his Residential "C" petition and ask only for "B-1" zoning caught the protesters by surprise.

Speaking for Hayes Manor residents were: Dr. Henry Tomas, psychiatrist at Meharry Medical College, Troy Jones, Tennessee State speech and drama faculty, Horace Buford, Metro Board of Education, and Dr. E. R. Richardson, a dentist.

"When a man lives in a certain type of white neighborhood he has the assurance that most of the orderly forces the community will direct their efforts to preserving that neighborhood. Too frequently the Negro community does not enjoy that kind of protection."

The Planning Commission could not act on the petition of Hahn, a mobile home dealer,

Most of those appearing

"ONE OF THE social prob-

lems is that people hate

TENNESSEE  
APR 16 1970  
Nash - Apts

**From:** Winnie Forrester [mailto:wgforrester1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 07, 2018 11:39 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Cc:** Winifred Forrester  
**Subject:** The Park at Ewing Creek SP Review-2008SP-025

All all Commissioners:

Why it's an INACTIVE SP:

We appreciate the Planning Staff and the long hours they put into their jobs. We do want to take issue with some of the information submitted to them that they used in their final Staff report. They included in their review the northern part of District C with the Eco-Park that already had a final site plan and the buffer zones on the west and south side. The final inspection by Metro Stormwater for the Eco-Park (Phase 1) occurred on 8/25/2017. Council Lady Sharon Hurt requested the SP review on 8/31/2018. This clearly should not have been included in the prior 12-month review. This allowed the owner to claim in excess of a million dollars spent that wasn't eligible for the review.

In addition, on October 26, we reviewed the file at Planning. We were looking for any documentation to support the claim on page 71 of the Planning staff recommendation, second paragraph, line 6, they state "Since August of 2017, the owners have completed ongoing floodplain and wetland restoration at the north end of the SP and have invested in planting trees.... at the south end of the SP", and we found nothing to support this claim. The Eco-Park passed its final inspection on 8/25/17. We believe the south end has not been touched since it borders the undeveloped parts- why would work be done on it prematurely before its even been sold? And indeed, we cannot find a permit showing this work has been done. This is important because Planning used this as one of their points to prove the SP is Active.

Finally, the Zoning Law doesn't address a minimum dollar amount to be considered when determining whether it's ACTIVE. This appears to be a subjective matter on how the Commission approaches this and allows for interpretation.

Thanks, Winnie Forrester

Haynes-Trinity Neighborhood Coalition Member

Website: [www.haynestrinitycoalition.com](http://www.haynestrinitycoalition.com)

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/haynestrinitycoalition/> (please like our page!)

Cell: 615-498-8671

## Item 4: 2018SP-050-001 – 6280 New Hope Road SP

**From:** Wayne Scharber [mailto:wayne.scharber2@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 03, 2018 12:05 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Cc:** Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); waynesch48@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Comments on Agenda item #4 on Nov. 8th Planning Commission Agenda

RE: Case 2018SP-050-001  
6280 NEW HOPE ROAD  
Map 087, Parcel(s) 011  
Subarea 14, Donelson-Hermitage (2004)  
Council District 12 (Steve Glover)

November 3, 2018

Mr. Chairman Adkins and Planning Commission members:

My wife and I live on five acres of land across New Hope Road from the proposed project. We built our house and have lived here for 38 years.

**We are opposed to the project, as proposed**, because it does not preserve the rural character and consistency of size of properties in the existing neighborhood and community. It also is not close to transit and jobs, as the nearest transit (train station and bus stop) and jobs are one and a half or two miles away and further there are no safe walking or biking areas to get to either. The **Nashville Next Plan** requires these factors to be considered in new developments.

The project does not provide a safe exit or entrance to or from North New Hope Road. One exit/entrance is proposed at the most historically dangerous curve on North New Hope Road and the second is about 40 to 60 feet south on the downward slope of a hill from the congested exit/entrance of Landings Way coming out of Cobblestone Subdivision.

**The project could be modified to accommodate these concerns** by making three lots instead of four lots in the four combinations (10,11,12,13); (14,15,16,17); (18,19,20,21); (22,23,24,25), which, individually, are approximately 2300 square feet each. The new sized lots, a minimum of 3000 square feet, will still be less than the 5000 square lots in the adjoining Chesney Glen S/D and the 9000 to 10,000 square foot lots in Cobblestone S/D and still less than the lots in Farmingham S/D, New Hope Meadows S/D, and New Hope Estates and certainly less than the five acre tracts and greater across the road. All these areas are adjoining or in the immediate neighborhood. In order to make a safe entrance/exit for this development, the proposed Private Drive (alley as noted in traffic report) and adjoining extra parking on the north end of the project should be made a Public Road and extended to the north end of project and aligned to connect New Hope Road at an intersection with Landings Way. A signal light should be installed at this intersection and the staff required left turn lane will thereby provide a safe entrance/exit for property owners from this new development and for those owners from Chesney Glen S/D, who will very likely use this new route to access New Hope Road, and those currently coming from Cobblestone S/D. Both connector public streets from Chesney Glen S/D should be opened, as designed in its S/D PUD, to connect to this new Public Road.

Sixteen lots would be combined and reduced to twelve. Four lots (1, 2, 3, 4) eliminated by the conversion of Private Drive (alley) and extension of the of Public Road, four lots ( 6, 7, 8, 9) can be enlarged, and one new 5000 square foot lot can be added next to lot 55. The two “stub streets (alleys)” would serve 6 or 7 lots each, as opposed, to 8 lots each and provide greater safety for emergency access. Glentree Drive public road extension to the dangerous curve would be eliminated. These suggested modifications to the project would reduce the number of lots from 54 to 47. The density will be 4.7 dwelling units per acre and within the range as noted by the staff report. Admittedly, the lot sizes may still be less in the development; however, the larger areas will allow for planting of trees or shrubbery as reflected in concept house drawings in the filed plan.

I share these details as I am concerned that the public may not be permitted to speak at the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Commission. While some Commission members have assured a community individual, the Public Hearing will be open, **the Draft agenda shows it to be Closed**. I would appreciate your advice and response that the **hearing will be Open** so that the Community public can be notified and may attend to share their concerns.

Sincerely,

Wayne K. Scharber  
6285 N. New Hope Rd.  
Hermitage, TN 37076  
Phone: 615-500-9731  
Email: [waynesch48@gmail.com](mailto:waynesch48@gmail.com)  
Date: 11.03.2018

**From:** John Sheets [mailto:serious2003@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2018 11:46 AM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Subject:** Issues with Traffic Study

Good morning,

I will not be able to attend this Thursday due to a conflict of a family planned event. I hope this email can be used in my stead.

A few issues with this study:

- 1) The study was completed when Wilson county was in the middle of their fall break (10/11). Would that not skew the data in favor of the Dale and Associates? At the original hearing the traffic study analyst proclaimed that most of the traffic came from Wilson county heading west. Would not at least half the traffic be compromised for parents taking their kids to different locations (alternate routes) or staying home?
- 2) The report stated that due to the construction not taking place line of site could not be estimated. Do they not have access to the property in question? One would think you do not have to be in a vehicle to establish a line of site. The line of site in particular would be the bend in the road where the new construction access point would be. At the original hearing the Dale and Associates agent did agree that was a difficult line of site. His suggestion was "widening" the road. To take that bend out the road widening would have to occur on the east side of the road which is not the property in question. Would they not have to contact that property owner for permission? I have been in contact with the property owner and she has stated that no one has approached her. She is concerned that no one has approached her and that they (the dale and associates thought process) will just use eminent domain and condemn her property. She said this has happened on a different property of hers back in 1990-1991 and forced her and her husband to move out in the country from near the airport. She does not want to give up her 15-20 matures trees to appease the straightening of new hope road. I think the mutual solution would be to widen the road on the west side of north new hope and add in a stop light (not stop sign). The problem is that none of this has been brought up and needs to be addressed.
- 3) Most of the Westbound traffic study is at an estimated LOS B for '2020' which is slightly over 10 minutes. What is the baseline for this projection? Is it based off traffic when Wilson County schools were on fall break? If I travel on a Sunday to the opposite side of metro nashville I can get to my place of employment in roughly 30 minutes. When I travel during the week during these "peak times" it takes me at least 45 minutes and sometimes up to hour. with the majority of this traffic on the east side of town/old Lebanon dirt road. There is a complete "bottleneck" at the intersection of Andrew Jackson Prky and Old Lebanon dirt road as well as Central Pike and Old Hickory. Adding more traffic to this area will only make it worse. Of

course there have been ‘occasional’ accidents on I40 where it has taken me well over an hour and one instance close to 2 hours for that travel. No way westbound projections are at a LOS B for ‘2020’ when I’m experiencing 15-30min of LOS already (without accidents). I believe the basis of this study is directly related to issue #1.

I feel the traffic report inaccurately describes the current traffic situation we are experiencing. ‘2020’ projections are even less than the current reality of the vehicle congestion.

Thank you,

John

**From:** Tim Weeks [mailto:timweeks@att.net]

**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2018 3:24 PM

**To:** Planning Commissioners

**Cc:** Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); waynesch48@gmail.com

**Subject:** Comments on Agenda item #4 on Nov. 8th Planning Commission Agenda

Commissioners:

In reference to the case below, a few points...

On September 13, this case was open to public comments and it was deferred due to the lack of information from a community meeting and a traffic study.

A community meeting has been held with Councilman Steve Glover present and now the traffic study is available, so I believe the public hearing should remain open for neighbors to comment on the new information that is before you.

I know that at least two commissioners agree but I hope a majority on the commission will permit the hearing to remain open.

The Donelson Hermitage Neighborhood Association (DHNA) remains opposed to this project because it is too dense for this area’s plan. It would be nice in East Nashville or other parts of the urban core, but it is out of place in a more rural setting designed for moderate density. The staff has stated that the plan for our area is “evolving,” which is code for subjective opinion...or a favor to a developer and former Councilman who has lots of business before the Planning Commission.

The fabric of neighborhoods in this area call for moderate density. This case, however, will create a precedent for higher density projects permitted in Hermitage. The residents of this area do not want developments like this. We ask that you not approve this one.

Regards

Tim Weeks

President DHNA

[DHNA – Donelson Hermitage Neighborhood Association](#)

**DHNA – Donelson Hermitage  
Neighborhood Association**  
Donelson Hermitage Neighborhood  
Association

6101 Hagars Grove Pass  
Hermitage TN 37076

RE: Case 2018SP-050-001  
6280 NEW HOPE ROAD  
Map 087, Parcel(s) 011  
Subarea 14, Donelson-Hermitage (2004)  
Council District 12 (Steve Glover)

From: Delores Dewitt [mailto:deedewitt@comcast.net]  
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2018 9:03 PM  
To: Planning Commissioners  
Subject: Hearing

I am asking you to re-open the hearing on the New Hope rd subject

Thanks. D DeWitt

**From:** Erin Evans [mailto:erinlucasevans@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 07, 2018 12:51 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** Case #: 2018SP-050-001 - Please re-open the public hearing

Dear Planning Commissioners:

RE: Case #: 2018SP-050-001 - N. New Hope

I am vice president of the Donelson Hermitage Neighborhood Association (DHNA).

On September 13th neighborhood representatives appeared before you to share their feedback on the proposed project and ask for a deferral due to lack of community engagement.

Since then, we had an officially scheduled meeting through the council office. At that meeting the developer's representatives stated that they wouldn't consider changing anything that Planning didn't request that they change.

We're in a position where the neighbors' concerns are being dismissed - especially around the question of density.

This case has been deferred a few times because the traffic study wasn't available. Considering it is now, **we respectfully request that you re-open the public hearing for this case** to permit residents to share their feedback about the study and the impact on the area.

In addition, we also request that you disapprove this project so the developer can come back with a more suitable plan.

Thank you,

Erin Evans  
DHNA  
5109 Vineyard Point  
Hermitage, TN 37076



## Item 19: 2018Z-112PR-001 – 1239 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North

**From:** Richard Audet [<mailto:richardaudet414@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 06, 2018 10:37 AM

**To:** Hill, Levi (Planning); To: Lesley Beeman; Birkeland, Latisha (Planning); Patrick, Kristy (Planning); O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member); Richard Knapp; [board@historicgermantown.org](mailto:board@historicgermantown.org)

**Subject:** Project Number 2018Z-112PR-001 Rezoning Request

November 6, 2018

The Historic Germantown Neighborhood Association (HGN) Board wishes to express its general opposition to MUL or MUL-A zoning within the boundaries of Germantown. MUN zoning, which is intended for a low intensity mixture of residential, retail, and office uses, provides the most appropriate zoning for retaining the character of this historic community.

Project Number 2018Z-112PR-001, which is before you, is a request to rezone property located at 1239 6th Avenue North from Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN) to Mixed Use Limited-Alternative (MUL-A). The mitigating circumstances detailed below provide the HGN Board's rationale for supporting this particular request:

- The site contains an important two-story historic property (that currently has a FAR of .6) which is protected by the Germantown Historic Overlay.
- The design of the proposed project has been submitted and approved by the MHZC.
- The FAR for the approved design is 0.83 which is less than the FAR of 1.0 allowed under MUL-A zoning.
- The .23 increase in the FAR is primarily intended to allow code-required building amenities such as egress stairs, lifts, and accessible restrooms to be added. It accomplishes this need while limiting the amount of invasive construction required for those services to be added in an existing historic building. This allows more of the building's historic interior to be protected.

HGN's positive response to this site-specific request should not be interpreted as indicating any precedent-setting support for additional MUL or MUL-A zoning requests within Germantown. This letter outlines why, in this particular case, the HGN Board is able to support rezoning of this property from MUN to MUL-A. It is unlikely that future MUL-A rezoning requests would receive similar support from this Association.

Best regards,

Richard Audet

HGN President