

Comments on January 10 MPC agenda items, received through January 10

Item 5: 2018SP-069-001 – Ridgecrest at Vista

From: Vaughan Pritchett [mailto:mrmusiccity@att.net]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 8:00 PM
To: Planning Staff; Vaughan Pritchett; Brenda Haywood; Rickoff, Abbie (Planning)
Subject: Fw: Planning Commission Meeting (1/10/2019)

January 7, 2019

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Vaughan Pritchett <mrmusiccity@att.net>
To: Planning Staff <planningstaff@nashville.gov>; Vaughan Pritchett <mrmusiccity@att.net>; Brenda Haywood <brendahaywood@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, January 7, 2019, 10:39:59 AM CST
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Meeting (1/10/2019)

January 5, 2018:

RE: **Planning Commission Meeting**

on: January 10, 2019 (Thursday)

TO: ***Commissioners and Staff***

RE: **Ridge Crest@Vista Proposal**

2018 SP - 069 - 001

FM: Vaughan Pritchett

[nearby neighbor]

I have recently *visited* the proposed site

for Ridge Crest Vista :

2018 SP - 069- 001

I live nearby, in *Bellshire Estates*. I believe

this proposed development will be a **positive**

addition to our Northern part of Davidson County.

I give it a *thumbs-up*. I have lived nearby in Bellshire

Estates since since 1978 and am a member of the

Bellshire Neighbors Group.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Vaughan Pritchett
1211 Westchester Dr.
Nashville, TN 37207
mrmusiccity@att.net
Tel. 615-868-3923
1 / 7 / 2019 - vp

From: Zachary Dier [mailto:zdier@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 8:46 AM
To: Planning Commissioners; Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Subject: 2018SP-069-001 - RIDGECREST AT VISTA

Planning Commissioners and Planning staff,

Good morning! I want to express my (and my Knight Drive/Brick Church Lane neighbors') concerns regarding this SP, up for review tonight. I also want to note that since October 25th, there have been NO community meetings to discuss. In addition, the signs still have the October meeting date and have not been updated since. This makes it VERY difficult to know when things are happening:

1. Development too dense - This pattern of development is inconsistent with current and future developments and the rural nature of Whites Creek. As usual, developers are trying to cram as much in (aka make as much money), without any concern for neighbors. In addition, we aren't a "gated community" kind of place. Especially since the reason this development is gated is to separate new buyers from the affordable housing (re: African American owners) on Tisdall. Is there really another reason why a small house on a small lot would need to be gated?
2. No Entrance/Exit on Knight Drive - A major concern we have is that the developers will try to relieve the traffic pressure by opening up an entrance on Knight Drive. This would be a deal breaker for my neighbors and I. Any additional entrance should connect to Green Lane, instead.
3. Grease Plant Development - This land is very close to the approved Grease Plant (Represented by Tom White and Roy Dale). My assumption is that people will be paying for a gated community without knowledge of the potential environmental disaster being developed in parallel.

You are our community's only hope for a strategic view of development in our area. Please consider these points and side with Planning on "Disapproval" of this SP.

Thank you for your time!

Zach Dier
681 Brick Church Lane
Whites Creek, TN 37189
615.423.5823

From: Randy Dowell [mailto:RDowell@KIPPNNashville.org]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 5:16 PM

To: Planning Staff

Subject: support for #2018SP-069-001

To whom it may concern,

Six years ago KIPP Nashville founded a college-prep public charter school in the Ewing Park building on the corner of Green Lane and Knight Drive in the Whites Creek community. Since then we have grown our program while making improvements to our facility in an effort to put more students on the path to and through college. KIPP Nashville is dedicated to the Whites Creek community and we are generally supportive of investments in the Whites Creek community, especially those that increase affordable housing options.

Recently, I heard of plans for the Ridgecrest Vista neighborhood (#2018SP-069-001), which would be adjacent to our school in Whites Creek. I am familiar with the builder's involvement in the community and am also familiar with the project and supportive of what they're presenting.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Randy Dowell
Executive Director
KIPP Nashville

Item 9: 2017Z-037PR-001 – 1804 and 1806 Lischey Avenue

From: Davis, Ashonti [mailto:DavisA17@aetna.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 4:24 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Birkeland, Latisha (Planning); Ashonti Davis
Subject: RE: Item 9 on 1/10 Planning Commission Agenda (2017Z-037PR-001)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Planning Staff's recommendation to disapprove the request to rezone to RM20 for 1804 and 1806 Lischey Avenue. In this case, the Planning Staff thoughtfully lays out the reasons why this zoning petition is inappropriate. As the Staff Report rightly observes, this type of intense zoning at this particular site is incongruent with the neighborhood policy, and this type of petition does not account for serious infrastructure concerns like alley right-of way.

I wholeheartedly support the Staff's recommendation and respectfully ask that you support Staff's recommendation and disapprove this request to rezone.

Respectfully,

Ashonti Davis

From: Yasin kokoye [mailto:kokoyeys82@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 8:36 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001

Attention Planning Commissioners,

I purchased 1804 Lischey Ave last May 2017 and 1806 Lischey Ave this past November with the goal to have the opportunity to rezone the 2.3 acres to RM20 and develop nice affordable homes for the community along side of 1801 Meridian's approved SP development which carries the same density as being requested today. I have been working closely with Councilman Davis with his full support behind the project. I understand certain order has to be in place to assure positive growth for Highland Heights which was diligently done through the 5 month Highland Heights Charrette study this past year which the planning department did an excellent job conducting. The majority of the community came out to support the new plan which states that the North West corner (Lischey, Edith and Meridian) to be reserved for higher density and that an RM20a would be appropriate for the larger parcels. The request is within character policy as well as states the building requirements which helps developers understand what can and can not be built. The codes, permits and fire departments are examples of the checks and balance system in place to approve plans who only meet the criteria. The request to rezone 1804 and 1806 Lischey Ave is well within the plan and feel it is an appropriate request.

Please follow up with any questions.

Thank You for your time and service,

Yasin

Yasin Kokoye, DVM, MPH
Chief Executive Officer
American Dream Developers, Inc.
4201 Barnes Cove Drive
Antioch, TN 37013
Cell: (615) 414-9759
kokoyeys82@gmail.com

From: Kempf, Lucy (Planning)
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 7:22 AM
To: Daniel Pratt; McCaig, Anita D. (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: Re: Metro Planning Commission Public Hearing 1/10

Daniel- thank you for sharing your views. Lisa- can you share with the review officer? And, Anita with the Commission? Thanks!

On Jan 9, 2019, at 11:48 PM, Daniel Pratt <danprattdrums@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Executive Director Kempf,

I hope this finds you well. I wanted to reach out prior to the 1/10 public zoning hearing to voice some concerns about item 9 under *Items to be Considered*: **A request to rezone from RS5 to RM20 zoning on properties located at 1804 and 1806 Lischey Avenue.** I hope I've sent this message to the proper email address.

My family and I own and have resided at 342 Edith Ave., one of the bordering properties directly south of 1804 and 1806 Lischey Avenue.

I would like to formally submit the following statement for the record:

I have lived at 342 Edith Ave. Nashville, TN 37207 since my family purchased it in March 2016. As I approach my 3 year anniversary of living there, I reflect on the reasons we bought the house. I moved to Nashville to pursue my career as a musician, and I found East Nashville's community to be one rich with diversity, inclusivity, and camaraderie. It was those reasons, in addition to the quiet and suburban feel (despite the beautiful view of downtown from my front doorstep) that I chose to move into the Highland Heights neighborhood.

Upon hearing about the Highland Heights Neighbor meetings, I began attending monthly when my work schedule permitted. I am fortunate to have a such a caring, supportive group of neighbors. It is because of what I have noted above and because of my wonderful neighborhood, that I oppose the rezoning of 1804 and 1806 Lischey Ave.

I am concerned that the rezoning and development of these two properties will undermine the single-family home character of the neighborhood, inevitably creating more foot traffic, noise, and congestion. I am specifically concerned because the northern wall of my house is only several feet away from the property line shared with 1804 Lischey Ave. This means that any development at 1804 Lischey would negatively affect my quality of living and comfort in my own home. During and after rainy weather, my yard regularly accumulates measurable water run-off from 1804 Lischey, and I'm afraid that this would only get worse if the land directly behind my yard, which is currently an open field, be rezoned and developed.

I greatly urge the Metro Planning Commission to disapprove of this rezoning. I ask that Councilmember Scott Davis consider the wishes of taxpaying residents and homeowners of Nashville Council District 5 over those of investors and big developers who do not call Highland Heights home.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel Pratt
342 Edith Ave. Nashville, TN

From: David Scales [mailto:davidscales730@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 10:06 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is David Scales and I am the son of Mary Ann Scales who owned 1806 Lischey Ave since June of 1995 until her passing. She passed early last year and shortly after my family had been waiting to officially sell our mothers home which sits on 1.13 acres of land directly next door to the 160 unit development 1801 Meridian and slightly across the street from Marshal Crossing Development. We started the process of rezoning nearly 2 years ago as apart of 1804 Lischey ave which together total 2.3 acres. After being deferred over 8 times, the recommendation from the planning commission was to have the Highland Heights Charette.

I have been very involved in the process by making sure I attend all of the neighborhood meetings, hearing and any event which will help me to understand the process. My neighborhood is changing and although I was moving on from Highland Heights I would like the ones who come behind me to enjoy a wonderful community at its highest and best use of land and I would like the homeowners currently living there to have the best shot of selling if in the future they are also ready to transition. We successfully completed this process this past June of 2018 with the community supporting the character policy which states an RM20a is an appropriate zoning request.

After the character policy was updated I was happy to see my direct area of focus on 1806 Lischey had been included to have higher density and that the RM20A zoning we had been requested for the past 2 years would finally have its day to be approved. It is disheartening to see staff gives it a disapproval. I am asking you to highly consider 1806 and 1804 Lischey ave to be appropriate for an RM20A rezone.

I look forward to the outcome and thank you for taking time to read my honest thoughts. Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank You,

David Scales
davidscales730@yahoo.com
615-870-4963

From: <stacy@easeuptravel.com>

Date: January 10, 2019 at 10:53:26 AM CST

To: <planning.commissioners@nashville.gov>

Cc: <lucy.kempf@nashville.gov>, "Jones, Lee (Planning)" <Lee.Jones@nashville.gov>, <Latisha.Birkeland@nashville.gov>

Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001 - 1804 & 1806 Lischey Ave

As a resident of Highland Heights (1826 Joy Circle), I have several concerns about this case and would like to voice my support for the Staff's recommendation for disapproval.

My concerns are as follows –

1. Density – this is an ongoing concern within our neighborhood, and I believe my stance on density that pushes the max limits is well understood. Should the intent of the developers change and unit count be reduced to a reasonable number, this concern could be minimized.
2. Driveway/Alley/Street – RM-20 doesn't provide for a plan to accommodate traffic into and out of this project. The size and shape of the lots in question would demand units built deep into the property. How would traffic turn into and leave the development? RM-20 does not require any specific plan or right-of-way. How will delivery or emergency vehicles be accommodated? Where will this access connect to Lischey? How will this access impact the traffic traveling on Lischey especially at the Joy Avenue intersection?
3. STRP – RM-20 will allow for some if not all of the units to qualify for STRP permits. One of the loudest and most vociferous arguments for density of this level is to provide housing opportunities for the growing Nashville population. To see this reason used to justify greater density then those projects' units be sold under the premise of investment/Short Term Rentals is counter to the argument used to originally justify the project. There is no legal way to restrict that usage under RM-20 that would be binding should the ownership of the property change hands before development.
- 4.

I have met with and discussed the option for SP-R, but the developers have not considered that as an economical or viable option for them. The RM-20 option does not provide any binding plan to be presented, reviewed, or discussed.

I urge and respectfully request the Commission take Staff's recommendation for disapproval.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS

Your Personal Travel Professional

Ease-Up! Travel Services

(615) JET-SAND (538-7263)

From: jami anderson [mailto:jamidesign@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 10:47 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: please disapprove to rezone Item 9 on 1/10 Planning Commission Agenda (2017Z-037PR-001)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

Please disapprove the request to rezone to RM20 for 1804 and [1806 Lischey Avenue](#). This is mere blocks way from our home so it is of particular concern to us. It is not consistent with neighborhood policy which was thoughtfully planned to protect this area from inappropriate development. There are also infrastructure concerns which become big problems when exceptions are made and a project gets passed in spite of future and often costly consequences.

I support the Staff's report that echoes the reasons above and respectfully ask that you support this recommendation and disapprove this request to rezone.

Thank you,

Jami Anderson on Stainback
615.480.5347

From: Austin Jackson [mailto:ausijackson@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 11:07 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001

Attention Planning Commissioners,

As a senior student at Fisk University, I have had the pleasure to take part in the opportunity to create affordable housing. I am originally from San Fransisco and have lived in Nashville over the past 3 years. I recently purchased my first home and would love for many of my peers to be able to have the opportunity to do the same. Especially after graduating and receiving jobs in their field of study. Unfortunately with the cost of living it has forced me to buy almost 30 mins away from my university and although I am happy to be a homeowner it would have been great to be able to be apart of a local walkable safe Nashville community. I have really come to love the Highland Heights community and had the opportunity to be very involved in the Charrette study. I just want to take a moment to simply state my overwhelming support for an RM20A on 1804 and 1806 Lischey. I have had the pleasure to be a part of many community meetings and feel that the projects would be a great addition to the community.

Thank you,

Austin Jackson
ausijackson@gmail.com
Fisk University Student

From: Anita Lorraine [mailto:anita.lorraine67@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 11:55 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001

Greetings Planning Commissioners,

I am an East Nashville resident that neighbors the Highland Heights neighborhood, because of which I have attended several community meetings to ensure the growth and development of East Nashville is unified and makes sense to the culture of East Nashville. After attending several community meetings and understanding what purposed policies are for different developments, I feel like the character policy supports the zoning request for this project. I think because of it's location and near by developments this a great property to have an RM20 rezone in place. This development gives new breath to the community by tying in different housing choices but staying true to the flavor of a growing East Nashville.

After having many conversations take place over the last 2 years of this development's process, I see why they are so passionate about making sure this development maximizes and makes sense for the neighborhood. Since all the hard work was done with the charret process to establish a new Character Policy Plan the applicants shouldn't have to continually go through an SP process to revert back to community because the community worked hard to come up with a character policy that fits and this zoning request falls into the policy. It causes a lot of stress on the community when the process goes back and forth. The community was in better support of the this project when the new charter policy was amended but when staff made a disapproval recommendation then it changes opinions.

Respectfully,

Anita Garrison-Crews

From: Jessica Williams [mailto:jesso3577@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 12:10 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2017Z-037PR-001

Good Morning Planning Commissioners,

My address is 2115 Yeaman Pl and as a resident, property and business owner in district 5, I am excited that Highland Heights is in an evolving policy allowing for growth opportunities. I have been in the process of wanting to develop 1804 and 1806 Lischey Ave which totals 2.3 acres for the past 2 years into a beautiful start growth affordable community. I have made sure I invested time working with and understanding the community, planning department and Councilman Davis. I fully support the rezone request to RM20A as I have had the awesome opportunity to serve on the steering committee as well experience people to come together with the planning department and members of the steering community to hear different view points and ideas for the growth of Highland Heights. I took time to diligently read through the Highland Heights Character Policy while taking into consideration the comments and prospectives of the other members on the steering committee as well as feelings and comments I received through the time working on this project form neighbors and stakeholders. One of the end conclusion of the Charette process is that higher density would be supported in the North West corner and that RM20A would be appropriate. After looking at this project from all angles, an RM20A is what best fits the needs. This would be consistent with the density supported in the approved SP directly adjacent to the site and would create the proper transition to the lower intensity policies to the south and east.

Thank your for your time and consideration,

PS. I had a bounce back email from sending it before noon but just saw that it didnt go through.

Thank you,

Jessica G. Williams
InvestSmartToday, LLC

Loving to Inspire Making Great Moves in Real Estate!

Item 15: 2018Z-010TX-001 – Zoning Code Text Amendment regarding tree density

From: Kim Hawkins [mailto:k.hawkins@hawkinspartners.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2019 6:18 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Leeman, Bob (Planning); Henderson, Angie (Council Member); Davis, Anthony (Council Member); Sledge, Colby (Council Member)

Subject: Bill BL 1416 Tree Ordinance Comments

Commissioners and Planning Staff:

I appreciate the interest in council for encouraging the adoption of more stringent tree ordinance codes. As a landscape architect and lifetime promoter of trees and author of Nashville first tree ordinance under Mayor Bredesen, we are on the same team.

I have the following comments that I believe should be addressed prior to final passage of this bill (whether at Planning or at Metro Council public hearing) that are technical issues which, I believe, may result in unintended consequences of this well-meaning ordinance.

I thank Councilwoman Angie Henderson for her time in speaking with me and her commitment to reviewing and addressing these technical revisions that I have noted here prior to final adoption, though I think it critical that the feedback and comments be voiced to you as Commissioners and to Metro Councilpersons.

My comments below:

1. **Generally agree with requiring additional TDU per acre (from 14 to 20) and with the purpose and intent.** There MAY be a consideration for adjusting the credit for protected trees higher if the idea is to truly incentivize keeping them, but overall the higher TDU seems, generally, doable. *There will be issues with meeting this density in urban areas where higher FAR and impervious surface ratio are high.* We suggest that specific real world applications be reviewed to understand the affect prior to adoption.
2. **Please offer strong consideration to incorporate the Street Tree credit that was proposed in WalknBIke Master Plan released in April 2017.** This is a big help in urban sites with little space and in all locations with sidewalks to provide the shade onto the pedestrian areas, which creates comfortable pedestrian experience and is really a prime intent for Metro. This inclusion may soften the blow for the development community of the 43% increase in the TDU requirement and reinforce the purpose and intent.
3. **Big concern overall is the disallowance of the area of a building unless it meets Metro "sustainable design protocols" per 16.36.050 - I believe this portion of the code should be removed at this time.**
 - a. As written, redevelopment of an existing building, an inherently sustainable practice, would be penalized if that adaptive reuse did not further receive certification through LEED (per 16.36.050). LEED is not the sole certification method for building. There are a number of other sustainability measures utilized in today's market (including Green Globes, Living Building Challenge, New Zero Building, Calgreen, SITES, etc).
 - b. Many in the development community build to a more sustainable standard, but don't go through expense for the certification process. LEED discriminates against more suburban locations through its point system and provides an advantage for urban locations. Several project types are far more difficult to achieve LEED, such as industrial, some housing types, education and others.

4. **There are several revised figures in the Staff Report that were not indicated as changes to the ordinance, but which are:** the first is Figure 17.24.150-1 which has (as an addition) the planting of evergreen shrubs along side property line where adjacent to parking. My opinion, there may be instances where this is good and instances where this is not necessary (adjacent to an adjacent wall or building, existing trees or open space, etc. Also, the B5 buffer changed (and a few of the diagrams for buffers are not consistent with the buffer as depicted).

Until this ordinance can be evaluated more thoroughly on a site specific basis, it is difficult to fully evaluate and approve the ordinance proposal as written. I would respectfully recommend providing more time for full consideration prior to adoption.

As always, thanks for your interest and service

Best-

-

Kim Hartley Hawkins, ASLA
HAWKINS PARTNERS, INC.
Landscape Architects
110 South 10th Street, 2nd Floor
Nashville, TN 37206

p: 615.255.5218 / f: 615.254.1424

www.hawkinspartners.com

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#)

From: Noni Nielsen [mailto:n_n_nielsen@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 9:51 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Henderson, Angie (Council Member); Nashville Tree Foundation

Subject: Support for BL2018-1416, Tree Bill, Item #15, Text Amendment 2018Z-010TX-001

To Planning Commissioners:

As president of the Nashville Tree Foundation board, I enthusiastically support BL2018-1416, Tree Bill, Item #15, Text Amendment 2018Z-010TX-001.

Nashville's tree canopy is under intense pressure from development, disease and natural aging. Anything we can do to encourage the protection and restoration of this vital resource will serve our community well.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this legislation.

Respectfully,

Noni Nielsen
Board President
Nashville Tree Foundation

From: Susannah Scott-Barnes [mailto:susannah@ashblue.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 6:27 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: BL2018-1416

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I support BL2018-1416 and ask you approve this bill to help enhance Nashville by protecting and improving our tree canopy.

Thank you,

Susannah
Susannah Scott-Barnes
700 Crescent Road
Nashville TN 37205

From: Jim Gregory [mailto:jim@nashvilletreetaskforce.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 9:31 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Please Support Tree BL2018-1416

Planning Commissioners,

Happy New Year to you all! I am writing to you all to ask for you to recommend approval for BL2018-1416, a tree bill focused on mostly increasing TDU (tree density units) for commercial and multi-family zoned properties.

A few reasons why I ask you to support this bill are the following:

-During Nashville's fantastic growth over the last several years, the city has also experienced an tremendous loss in urban tree canopy. Through comparative analysis with other cities our size who have recently had tree canopy studies, I have derived that Nashville is losing over 50,000 trees every year during our unprecedented period of growth. This generational canopy loss degrades our community's livability on so many different levels... from the most obvious loss of clean air and clean water quality, to the less obvious socioeconomic and psychological effects urban canopy has on our city's citizens, our city really needs help replenishing the urban canopy we are losing. We are out of balance compared to other cities.

-Nashville's urban tree canopy standards are below average compared to peer southern cities. Our TDU requirements are miniscule to Atlanta, Charleston, even Mobile... the list goes on and on... On Page 150 of this report on cities in Georgia, you'll find a list of 120 different cities and how they regulate trees on private property. This list should help you do an easy comparison:

<http://www.gufc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Georgias-Tree-Ordinances-Report.pdf>

-More trees in commercial districts are good for business. Here is a quick read from a peer reviewed research from University of Washington saying that shoppers spend 9-12% more at commercial properties with more trees (landscaping):

https://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/Thm_Economics.html By requiring more trees in commercial areas we generate more tax revenue for the city

There are numerous other items that could be listed, but I do want to be respectful of your time as I know you are quite busy. I hope that you'll be in favor of supporting this bill and the others that come before you which seek to balance our cities economic growth with our city's urban tree canopy growth. I challenge you to think about visiting other cities and remember the trees you saw walking around the cities streets. It's not hard to notice that Nashville is currently behind on its tree planting standards and with a city that is as hot as Nashville is in the summer, we should be trying to find as many ways to give us a break from our summer sun.

Thank you for all that you do to help steer our city's growth in a responsible and prosperous manner.

Very respectfully,

Jim Gregory

Nashville Tree Conservation Corp.

From: Nashville Tree Foundation [mailto:carolyn@nashvilletreefoundation.org]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 9:38 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Henderson, Angie (Council Member)

Subject: Support for BL2018-1416, Tree Bill, Item #15, Text Amendment 2018Z-010TX-001

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As Executive Director of the Nashville Tree Foundation, I would like to give my full support for BL2018-1416, Tree Bill, Item #15, Text Amendment 2018Z-010TX-001.

Our organization and supporters are seeing increasing threats to the vital tree canopy that makes Nashville a healthy, beautiful place to live, including rapid progress, an aging tree infrastructure, and imminent threats of the Emerald Ash Borer.

Thank you for your consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

Carolyn W. Sorenson
Executive Director
Nashville Tree Foundation
615-292-5175 cell

From: Carol Ashworth [mailto:carol@ashworthenvironmental.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 10:08 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Henderson, Angie (Council Member)
Subject: Support for BL2018-1416 Landscape, Buffering, and Tree Replacement update

Dear Metro Planning Commissioners,

I wish to express my support for BL2018-1416, the update of the Metro Nashville Zoning Code – Chapter 17.24 Landscape, Buffering, and Tree Replacement.

As Nashville continues to grow at an accelerating rate, the need to protect, restore, and maintain its tree canopy becomes increasingly important and time sensitive. Trees provide many proven beneficial ecosystem services such as cleaner air and water and reduced temperatures as well as psychological, health, and aesthetic benefits to people.

Our Landscape Ordinances, written in 1997, are in need of updating to reflect the needs of our growing city. The 2016 Metropolitan Nashville Urban Forestry and Landscape Master Plan makes recommends to strengthen the codes and suggests a review of the Landscape Ordinances every five-years. Previous studies, and reports that support the needs to strengthen our ordinances to protect the Urban Forest are:

- Street Standards and Specifications for Metro Nashville- 2018
- Green and Complete Streets Program- 2016
- Nashville Next- General Plan for Nashville- 2015
- Metro Nashville Code of Ordinance review- 2014
- Street Tree Inventory of Nashville's Inner Loop- July 2013
- Nashville Next- Natural Resources and Green Spaces- March 2013
- Nashville Landscape Guidelines and Best Management Practices - March 2013
- Nashville Open Space Plan- March 2011
- Metro Nashville Tree Canopy Assessment Project- 2010
- Nashville Green Infrastructure Master Plan- November 2009

I have been a member of Metro Tree Advisory Committee for over a decade, I am a founding member of Nashville Tree Task Force, I wrote several of the above mentioned documents and have dedicated my life to Urban Forestry issues through my work, advocacy and volunteered time. I am very grateful to Councilmembers Henderson, Davis, Sledge, and others for bringing forth this bill and I ask you to support their efforts so we can have a greener, healthier city!

Respectfully-

Carol Ashworth RLA, ASLA
Ashworth Environmental Design, LLC
919 Caruthers Avenue
Nashville, TN
615-477-9469-cell
www.ashworthenvironmental.com

From: Worrall, William E CIV USARMY CELRN (USA) [mailto:William.E.Worrall@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 11:10 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Henderson, Angie (Council Member); Withers, Brett (Council Member); Jim Gregory; Will Worrall
Subject: Please Support BL2018-1416 - Tree Bill - Item #15, Text 2018Z-010TX-001 (UNCLASSIFIED)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I urge your support for the subject bill to update portions of Nashville's tree ordinance.

As co-founder of the Nashville Tree Task Force and member of the Metro Tree Advisory Committee, we have worked hard for several years to advocate for updating our tree ordinance. The current tree ordinance is outdated, currently has many weaknesses and loopholes, and is no longer sufficient for a fast growing and world class city such as Nashville. Other nearby suburbs and such as Murfreesboro and Franklin currently have much stronger tree ordinances, as do most other cities across the south. Let's work to, at a minimum, bring our code in line with other peer southern cities.

Nashville residents are weary of mature trees being recklessly removed within our city, many of these for no legitimate reasons besides convenience or lack of foresight. Residents continue to voice concerns regarding the lack of mature tree protections in Nashville. We are tired of seeing new developments with only a couple small understory trees planted as replacement for huge trees removed. CM Henderson's current proposed update, is a first step in improving our tree ordinance. We recognize that this proposed ordinance is a first step, and additional ordinance updates will be needed to better protect our mature trees and grow Nashville's urban tree canopy for the future. Please support our urban tree canopy.

Thanks to CM Henderson for her hard work on these efforts. Thank you for supporting this important effort.

Respectfully,
William Worrall
1000 Glenview Drive
Nashville Tree Task Force
Metro Tree Advisory Committee

From: Patricia Miller [mailto:plantatree@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 11:34 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Regarding: BL2018-1416/ A. Henderson, A. Davis, Tree Ordinance

2018Z-010TX-001
Regarding: BL2018-1416/ A. Henderson, A. Davis

Dear Planning Commission,

Being the "It" city has taken a toll on Nashville's tree canopy. In addition to development, trees are being lost due to old age, unusual wind storms and soon, the Emerald Ash Borer epidemic. Ash trees account for approximately 10% of our urban tree canopy.

The Metro Tree Advisory Committee (MTAC), composed of 29 Members and 11 Friends, consider ourselves to be the official cheerleaders for and watchdogs of Nashville's trees. Composition of our group is about one-fourth Metro Departments, then non-profit organizations, professional arborists, landscape designers, citizen foresters, and volunteers. We represent a broad base of the community. All of these people care deeply about the city's trees and work to have an influence over the welfare of our trees.

MTAC members have planted trees and hosted community tree plantings and tree sales. We have presented numerous outreach programs to citizen groups. And this past fall, Nashville kicked off the Root Nashville Campaign whose goal is to plant a half million trees by 2050!

This Campaign is just part of the equation. To support our Committee's efforts and fulfill the Campaign goals, a strong tree ordinance is needed. This means an updated tree ordinance which preserves existing trees and requires more tree plantings related to development. This will have a lasting impact on the quality of life in Nashville. We have been involved with the rewrite of the ordinance and with much anticipation, feel this is the right direction for our city.

As our members interact with the community, we hear an increasing number of comments from average citizens who are tired of seeing the loss of our trees. They are seeking a solution, often pleading, for something they care about deeply. And then, they learn that our current tree ordinance is no longer adequate to serve our growing community.

It is only when trees are about five years old that they start to make air quality and stormwater management improvements and homes for wildlife so the preservation of our existing trees is imperative. Having a healthy urban forest is the best way to combat climate change.

Thank you for your consideration in approving a stronger tree ordinance to better serve Nashville's citizens *and* our trees!

Sincerely,
Patricia Miller, Chair
Metro Tree Advisory Committee

"People who will not sustain trees will soon live in a world which cannot sustain people." Bryce Nelson

Item 18a: 2018CP-005-003 – East Nashville Community Plan Amendment and Item 18b: 2018Z-123PR-001 – 1111 McGavock Pike

From: Davis, Anthony (Council Member)
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 11:14 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Grider, Anna (Planning); Swaggart, Jason (Planning)
Subject: FW: Support for Plan Amendment and rezoning

Good morning Commissioners,

I wanted to express my support for an East Nashville Community Plan Amendment (2018CP-005-003) and a Rezoning (2018Z-123PR-001) on your agenda today in District 7.

The plan amendment is for three parcels on McGavock Pike, and the rezoning for one parcel from RS to OR-20 zoning. The intention of the applicant is office use.

We held our required community meeting with a relative few in attendance, and planning staff communicated the change. Many questions were asked and answered and my thought is neighbors were fine. In general, I think this area could probably use more amendments and changes, but this was a place to start. It's a stretch of McGavock Pike just off Gallatin Road that maybe could use some more development based on how our neighborhood is evolving.

Please support moving the plan amendment and the zone change forward.

Sincerely,

Anthony Davis
Nashville Metro Council, District 7
anthony.davis@nashville.gov
615-775-8746

Item 32: 2019Z-001PR-001 – 327 Gatewood Avenue

From: Martha Carroll [mailto:marthacarroll15@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 10:07 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: We oppose 2019Z - 001PR - 001; Number 32 on MPC Agenda, 1/10/19

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are writing with regard to the property at 327 Gatewood Avenue. We live next door to that property. We agree with the Staff Recommendation to disapprove changing the zoning from RS5 to R6.

This is a narrow lot on a narrow street without sidewalks. The Charette held this past Spring in Highland Heights resulted in the decision, agreed to by both developers and neighborhood residents, to build larger units on the corridors and/or on corners, but not within many of the neighborhoods such as ours.

We are not against progress. We are against these attempts to change the zoning agreed on by requesting zoning changes in bits and pieces. Mr. Kendig has talked with our neighborhood association and with me personally, and it is my understanding that he doesn't want to change the character of the neighborhood. I appreciate that sentiment; however, if he and Mr. Lazarus and Ms. Frizzell sell the property, which I understand they probably will do, I can't see how he can make any guarantees.

Furthermore, a driveway entrance from the back of that property will be difficult, given the narrowness of the alley and the fact that fences border the properties across from the back of the lot in question. We know this because we attempted to do the same when we bought our lot next door, added a fence with a double gate, and hoped to be able to park in back. We couldn't do it. Maybe it can be done next door, but it is an issue to consider before any zoning changes are made.

Sincerely,

Martha Carroll and Sandra Stratton

325 Gatewood Ave.

Nashville, TN 37207

574.229.7754