

**Comments on February 28 MPC agenda items, received through
February 28**

Item 12: 2018S-204-001 – Hunters Run

Please see attachment on the following page.



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

One Public Square, Suite 204
Nashville, Tennessee 37201
Office: (615) 862-6780
Fax: (615) 862-6784

4101 Brick Church Pike
Whites Creek, Tennessee 37189
Cell: (615) 473-8339
email: brenda.haywood@nashville.gov

BRENDA HARRIS HAYWOOD

Councilwoman, District 3

February 27, 2019

Mr. Greg Adkins, Chair and Members
of the Metro Planning Commission
Howard Office Building
Sonny West Conference Center, First Floor
700 Second Avenue, South
Nashville, TN 37201

RE: Hunters Run Concept Proposal 2018S-204-001

Dear Chairman Adkins and Members:

After several community meetings with my District 3 Constituents, it is unequivocally clear that they are opposed to the Hunters Run Concept Proposal. I serve as the collective voice of my community. It would be difficult to over emphasize or amplify the degree to which they have demonstrated objection to this development.

It is imperative that I articulate that Goodall Homes has put forth a sincere attempt to hear, digest and address our concerns! However, their attempt has not met community expectations.

Primary concerns include yet not limited to the following:

1. Potential flooding and stormwater issues;
2. Increased traffic and safety issues;
3. Building standards not constant or contrary to the existing neighborhood character;
4. Potential decrease in neighborhood property values;
5. Bellavista Boulevard, Marydale Drive and Celina Drive as connector streets; and
6. Failure of the Planning Staff to comply with Nashville Next.

In addition, we are most appreciative of the time, attention and dedication given to this project by Goodall Homes. They have been extremely pleasant, cooperative and professional!

In conclusion, I, Brenda Harris Haywood Councilwoman for District 3, join my constituents by lending my voice in opposition to the Hunters Run proposal.

Thank you Planning Commissioners for your time and attention to this matter and above all for your service!

Sincerely,

Brenda Haywood
Councilwoman, District 3

From: Elise Hudson [mailto:elise@elisehudson.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 1:00 AM
To: Planning Commissioners; Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Subject: Hunters Run BL 2018S-204-001 Does Not Meet Cluster Lot Option Zoning Code 17.12.090

The proposed subdivision at Hunter's Run (BL2018S-204-001) does not meet the Nashville Metro Cluster Lot Code Requirements as laid out in Metro Ord. 17.12.090 since:

1. The code requires that "any...developer of a subdivision utilizing the cluster lot option shall install and/or construct recreational facilities on a portion of the common open space...recreational facilities mean active play facilities (including but not limited to tennis courts, basketball courts, swimming pools, playgrounds, baseball/softball diamonds, or volleyball courts." (Section G) **No recreational facilities are noted in the staff report.**

2. It also states that "2. Recreational facilities...shall not be constructed in the following areas:...b. Within the floodplain.) **Yet, the vast majority of open space in this development is around the small creeks which are indeed in the floodplain as seen on the metro maps website despite the regulations against this.**

Please oppose this development until this is corrected.

Thank you,

Elise Hudson
4601 Whites Creek Pike

From: Chuck [mailto:chuckfglass@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 9:50 PM
To: Rickoff, Abbie (Planning)
Subject: Opposition to Hunters Run

A.R., as a working single father I cannot make the 4pm meeting. I am vehemently opposed to this project and the negative impact and horrendous congestion it will bring to our wonderful neighborhood. If it is indeed in violation of zoning codes please do not approve this on that fact alone.

Recent activity on and near that proposed sight leads us to believe this ill advised jam packed subdivision could already be a done deal. That would be an interesting situation for anyone to explain who may have had prior knowledge of this. Hopefully this upcoming meeting is not just a placating formality. This subdivision is obviously a poorly thought out plan for anyone with any common sense but a great idea for the short sighted profiteering builders who will no doubt not live anywhere near this soon to be fiasco. Sincerely, Charles F. Glass 1338 Dalemere Dr. 615 415 6496

Common sense ain't so common anymore. P.S. (how convenient for the developers to get a meeting time that almost no responsible working person can make without disregarding school age child obligations or leaving their job early and losing money that day) *Refer to previous common sense quote. CFG

From: George Ewing [mailto:georgeofnashville@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 12:32 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: MPC Draft Agenda Item #12 - 2018S-204-001 HUNTERS RUN - OPPOSED

Dear Commissioners,

I respectfully disagree with the staff report and ask that the commissioners vote to disapprove Agenda Item #12 - 2018S-204-001 HUNTERS RUN. The Hunters Run proposal is not consistent with T2 RM policy nor complies with the requisite Rural Subdivision Guidelines. The proposal includes lots as small as 10,006 square feet as a cluster proposal in R20 zoning. The staff report summarizes T2 RM policy saying, “new development in T2 RM areas should be through the use of a Conservation Subdivision at a maximum gross density of 1 dwelling unit/2 acres with individual lots no smaller than the existing zoning and a significant amount of permanently preserved open space.” Proposed gross density of 237 lots on 149.45 acres is non-compliant at 1 dwelling unit/0.63 acres, and the smallest proposed lot is non-compliant as it is nearly half the lot size allowed by base zoning.

Additionally, Chapter 4 of the Rural Subdivision Regulations “regulates the subdivision of land in T2 Rural Neighborhood policies, with the intent of ensuring that new development is in harmony with the established rural character of these areas.” Despite acknowledging that much of the the proposed internal street network consists of not new roads, but extending existing roads from established neighborhoods (see Bellavista Blvd, Celina Dr, and Marydale Dr), the report offers no analysis of lot size, lot depth, or set back from these neighboring patterns so they can be quantified and considered against the proposal as set forth in the Countryside Character Open Alternative.

The average lot size of all 25 immediately adjacent suburban homes to the west and south in the Dalemere and Grand Ville subdivisions (this does not included the larger parcels along the northern side) is 1.13 acres or 49,222 square feet. There was no more than a quarter-acre of average deviation among those 25 adjacent homes with the smallest lot being 0.73 acres or 31,798 square feet. The application proposes 237 lots on a development footprint of 76.69 acres, in other words 3 dwelling units per developed acre, or 14,520 square feet lots. At an average lot size of 14,250 square feet, the proposal offers lots that are 1/3 of the average lot size of its neighbors, and an average lot that is half the size of even its smallest adjacent lot. So the proposal does not comply with the T2 RM policy which require the proposal 1. have lots no smaller than the existing zoning and 2. have a maximum gross density of 1 dwelling/2 acres, and the proposal also does not comply with the T2 Rural Subdivision Guidelines - Countryside Character Open Alternative requirements that “the minimum lot size is either equal to or greater than 70% of the lot size of the average size of the surrounding parcels or equal to or larger than the smallest of the surrounding parcels, whichever is greater.”

Lastly, the proposal leaves a jigsaw of cul de sacs, wetlands, floodway, floodplain, flood buffers, and stormwater management areas that are presented as open space without regard for meaningful preservation gains or meeting the emphasized preservation intent of T2 Rural policy. Much of the proposed undeveloped area is unbuildable, regardless of policy and doesn't receive any particular grace by this proposal. In other words, the community is receiving no recognizable deference from the staff report, or the developer, as to whether this proposal is in T2, T3, T4, NE, or RM.

Commissioners are charged with the responsibility to ensure that new development in T2 Rural is in harmony with the established character and they are bound to disapprove proposals like this that are not only opposed overwhelmingly by the community and opposed by the councilperson, but not compliant with policy and not compliant with Subdivision Regulations. I ask that they disapprove.

With gratitude for your service,

George Ewing
4601 Whites Creek Pike
Whites Creek, TN 37189

Item 17: 2018Z-127PR-001 – 1218 Montgomery Avenue

From: stacy@easeuptravel.com [mailto:stacy@easeuptravel.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 2:35 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); Swaggart, Jason (Planning)

Subject: Feb 28 Agenda Item 17 - 2018Z-127PR-001

Good morning.

I am writing to express deep concern over the return of this bill/application to the Planning Commission. At the January 24 meeting of the Commission, this item was discussed, and it was the decision of the Commission to disapprove. I revisited the recording of the meeting to ensure I understood your concerns. They were listed as –

1. RM15-A would allow usage of the units on that property as non-owner occupied Short Term Rentals.
2. Dimensions of the lot would present challenges to fitting three total units.
3. Concerns over applying a multi-family zoning district to one singular lot.

This discussion led to a 5-4 vote to disapprove the application.

In reviewing that video, there seemed to be some confusion over placement of the units. The gentleman who spoke on behalf of the owners mentioned their intentions to build two additional units that face Douglas. If you look at the parcel's aerial view, the existing home occupies nearly half the lot. By accommodating the existing structure, the two additional units would have to sit on the remaining western half of the lot on about 45x75 ft (less than 0.078 acre). If those two units were detached, each would occupy roughly 32.5 feet of street frontage with a depth of 45 feet. Each unit would have roughly 1,500 square feet of actual land that will need to incorporate setbacks and parking along with a physical house.

One question that doesn't appear to have been considered or addressed – how and when will this lot be subdivided to allow the current structure to remain while selling the two potential lots to two different owners? Would each of the resulting lots be zoned RM15-A?

The challenges associated with constructing dwellings that fit within that space may lead to buildings that look out of place in the neighborhood and along the street. As was noted in that same meeting, my neighbor, Ashonti Davis, referenced the SP just down the street at 330-336 Douglas. That development had similar challenges trying to fit 4 units on a 0.14 acre lot, and a year later, it still remains an unfinished shell.

The potential result would be two micro/tiny homes that sit amidst other homes seemingly palatial in comparison. Such structures neither fit the character of the street nor of the neighborhood.

I respectfully petition that you maintain the disapproval decision and/or encourage the owner to revise their plans to construct a single house instead of two.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS

Your Personal Travel Professional

Ease-Up! Travel Services

(615) JET-SAND (538-7263)

Item 24: 2018NHL-003-002 – 819 and 901 Russell Street

From: matthew charette [mailto:mdcharette@hotmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 1:56 PM

To: Withers, Brett (Council Member)

Cc: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 819 Russell st.

Dear Councilperson Withers

Thank you so much for all of your hard work and all you do for East Nashville, our city and of course for me and my businesses!

I am so excited to see the progress and restoration of the old church at 819 Russell and I am all for them adding the rooms to incorporate the historic attic into the project. At a time when so much of our city and East Nashville's History and identity is being demolished or ignored and run down, it is great to see some of the developers actually Valuing the History and Craftsmanship of the past and being willing to restore it and in doing so add tremendous value to our homes and businesses. Sure it would have been amazing for someone to be able to restore it and use it as the beautiful structure of its original intent. Unfortunately, these are not the times that we live in.

I understand the concerns of such a project and even expanding its capacity, and also expanding its value. Not only in financial and property value but also in the business and taxes it will generate from the folks who visit our town, spend money at our shops and restaurants and Uber around to experience it.

Brett, you have done such a great job of helping our community grow while respecting our neighborhoods and I do believe that this project will be in keeping with those values we both share. Please support the addition of the 5 rooms to the project at 819 Russell st.

Sincerely,

Matt Charette
2445 Eastland Ave
Nashville TN. 37206

Matthew Charette
Owner
615-948-6393
MDC Group, LLC
Unique East Nashville Restaurants & Bars with "something for everyone"
Beyond the Edge Neighborhood Sports Bar www.beyondtheedge.net
Batter'd & Fried- Boston Seafood, Sushi & Oyster Restaurant www.batteredandfried.com
Drifters Tennessee Barbecue (BBQ) Joint www.driftersnashville.com

From: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 2:32 PM
To: steve oloughlin; planning.staff@nashville.gov
Cc: Planning Commissioners
Subject: RE: Reference Case 2018NHL-003-002

Steve: Thanks so much for writing and sharing your thoughts on this case with the Planning Commissioners and me. I am copying the Planning Commissioners to ensure that they have your letter in their packet as they consider this case on Thursday evening.

The request to add five rooms in the attic space of this building should not change parking in the neighborhood since the existing parking lot contains more than the required spaces for this boutique hotel even with these rooms added. There are no porches or decks on the exterior of this historic church building, and so there are not appurtenances that would tend to encourage noisy outdoor gatherings. The original conditions remain in place, which means that there is to be no bar or restaurant area inside the building, and food and beverage service is prohibited. The lobby is designed in such a manner as to allow seating for individuals or small groups for coffee but not large gatherings. Therefore, there are no easy opportunities for five or a maximum of ten additional guests to create noise in the neighborhood other than walking from the parking lot across 9th Street to the hotel or walking up 9th Street away from the hotel to or from Five Points.

As I discussed in last week's community meeting, I am continuing to work with the Public Works staff to conduct an assessment of parking volume for a potential residential permit parking application for Russell Street and assuming that enough neighbors on Russell support that application, the Traffic and Parking Commission would be the body to approve or disapprove that request. The applicant for this case has already stated on the record at the original Planning Commission public hearing that he supports residential permit parking for Russell as the hotel guests would not need to use on-street parking.

Please let me know if you have any further questions that I can research for your or that I should consider as I listen to testimony in tomorrow's public hearing. Thank you for your advocacy for the Historic Edgefield neighborhood.

Brett A. Withers

Metro Council, District 6

Mobile (615) 427-5946 | [facebook.com/Brett A. Withers](https://www.facebook.com/Brett.A.Withers) | [twitter.com @brettawithers](https://twitter.com/brettawithers)

From: steve oloughlin [soloughlin152@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 11:58 AM
To: planning.staff@nashville.gov; Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: Reference Case 2018NHL-003-002

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Steve O'Loughlin. I live at 818 Fatherland Street.

It has become very apparent that the traffic from We Works has impacted our neighborhood in ways that have overshadowed the Historic Edgefield flow.

When the Hotel on Russel Street was approved, it was obvious that it would become a compounded factor that will add to the traffic, noise and parking that does not only effect Russell Street but will impact the entire neighborhood and surrounding areas.

I am writing to request the extra found rooms not be approved as to minimize the greater influx of traffic, noise and congestion that will have a negative effect to our community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Steve O'Loughlin
818 Fatherland Street

From: Melanie Barnett [mailto:melanie.barnett@roomintheinn.org]

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 8:59 AM

To: Planning Commissioners; Withers, Brett (Council Member)

Cc: Micah Lacher; Rachel Hester

Subject: For Tonight's Planning Council Meeting

Dear Councilman Withers and Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you for your ongoing service to our great city. I am writing you on behalf of Micah Lacher and his team at Anchor Investments. As you know they are currently requesting approval for 5 additional rooms on the 3rd floor of their project at 819 Russell Street, Nashville, TN 37206.

When Anchor Investments opened their property, 506 Lofts, in the spring of 2016 they also launched their "Rooms for Rooms" program. For every overnight stay, they donate a portion of their revenues to this program. This program has significantly impacted Room In The Inn by providing support for our programs and services for the past three years. We are so grateful for their generosity and commitment to bettering our community.

Additionally, Micah and his team have visited the Room In The Inn campus on numerous occasions to learn more about the services and programs we offer. They support our work financially, but they also support us by educating themselves and their guests on the circumstances that impact our most vulnerable neighbors and how our community is impacted by the changing face of Nashville.

The Anchor Investments team has not forgotten that the rapid growth and change our city is experiencing impacts the homeless just as much as everyone else. We appreciate their thoughtfulness and inclusion as they continue to grow as well.

Thank you again for all you do.

Best regards,

Melanie

Melanie Barnett

Community Development Director

Room In The Inn

705 Drexel St., Nashville, TN 37203

615.251.9791 ext. 125

RoomInTheInn.org

From: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 8:28 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: FW: Case 2018NHL-003-002 Russell Street Hotel Church.

Planning Commissioners: I wanted to ensure that you saw this letter from the next-door neighbor to the 819 Russell Street NLOD property which has a site plan revision application coming before you this afternoon. Thank you.

Brett A. Withers

Metro Council, District 6

Mobile (615) 427-5946 | [facebook.com/Brett A. Withers](https://www.facebook.com/Brett.A.Withers) | [twitter.com @brettawithers](https://twitter.com/@brettawithers)
* * * *

From: <lois.layne@wku.edu>
Date: February 27, 2019 at 6:42:15 PM CST
To: <planning.staff@nashville.gov>
Subject: Case 2018NHL-003-002 Russell Street Hotel Church.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My husband, Clint and I live at 817 Russell Street next door to the church. We are happy to see an adaptive reuse of the church. There are not many good options for a large, historic church in a residential neighborhood. We are cautiously optimistic that the Church Hotel will be an asset to the neighborhood.

We understand it could be possible to find an attic and space for 5 rooms after beginning renovations. We added a room in a huge attic space we discovered under our rafters. The space could only be reached by a trap door in a bathroom ceiling. We have been happy to see the quality of the work being done on the church next door. It will be nice not to live next to a ruin. I am happy not to see broken and rotted windows, boarded up windows, glass hanging like a guillotine, and plants growing out of the brick walls of the church.

Clint is fine with the extra five rooms, as are three of the other neighbors who live around the church. I'm still concerned about congestion and possible unintentional consequences, but with all the staff conditions attached to the plan, we are cautiously optimist.

We think it is in the neighborhood's best interest for Hotel Church to be a financial success. A successful owner is less likely to sell the property, and more likely to maintain the property and perhaps do more restoration.

We have found Mr.Lacher to be a good neighbor during the construction and we hope there will be a good relationship between Historic Edgefield Neighbors and the Hotel.

There are valid concerns about increases in parking, noise, and traffic from more hotel guests. We are already dealing with the impact from the commercial development on nearby Woodland Street and Main Street that has turned Russell St. into a parking lot.

Thank you for your service and consideration.
Lois and Clint Layne
817 Russell Street

From: Francesca Maas [mailto:francesca.maas@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 9:28 AM
To: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: 819 Russell Street - Bouquet Hotel Commissioner Meeting

Dear Councilman Withers and Members of the Planning Commission,

Firstly, I would like to thank you for your service to our great city.

I am writing to express my full support for the additional 5 new rooms on the 3rd floor of the boutique hotel project at 819 Russell Street which will be voted on today by the planning commission. I live in the Five Points area of East Nashville. I commend the developers of this project for diligently working to preserve this architectural gem of a building that adds to the character and charm of the neighborhood. Historical preservation can only happen successfully when it is economically viable to do so. I imagine, being able to incorporate another 5 guest rooms into the design of this bouquet hotel will go a long way in offsetting the substantial costs associated with the restoration of this church into a boutique hotel. Historic preservation is an asset to the neighborhood, and something I want local government to encourage. This hotel will be a great addition to our neighborhood. I look forward to seeing it approved at today's meeting.

Sincerely,

Francesca Maas

From: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 10:35 AM
To: Randall Gilberd; planning.staff@nashville.gov
Cc: Planning Commissioners
Subject: RE: Planning Commission (2018NHL-003-002)

Thanks for sharing your thoughts, Randall. Despite the residential base zoning, this property has never been used as a residence and would not be suitable as a residence even if it were in good condition, which it clearly is not. In fact, the already approved NLOD site plan brings this property closer to residential use by incorporating and requiring an on-site manager apartment.

The Historic Edgefield Neighborhood Association has worked for decades to preserve historic buildings and indeed such local historic zoning protections already exist on this property that prevent its demolition. Furthermore, the Historic Edgefield Neighborhood Association presumably supported the application of the Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District on this property nearly 20 years ago when Council Member Eileen Beehan represented District 6 on the Metro Council, and that Overlay application specifically allowed for alternative uses for properties to which the NLOD is applied in the interest of making the preservation of those structures economically viable. The possibility of commercial uses for this property has been in place since long before you purchased your home. The question has always been what commercial use would be approved for this site. I have received and discouraged quite a few applications for much more intense uses for this property. I thank this particular applicant and many of your neighbors for working together to provide constructive feedback about how to build in controls for this NLOD site plan to minimize disruptions to the neighbors while providing for an economically viable renovation and preservation project.

As you know, with the passage of Bill -608 each of your houses on Russell Street remains eligible for Type-1 STR permits and furthermore, Bill -608 specifically categorized Residential Medium Density Zoning (RM) as being eligible for non-owner-occupied STR permits. There are four parcels on the 900 block of Russell that bear RM zoning. Therefore, in the spectrum of the number of potential tourists that could visit Russell Street at any time if any number of houses or apartment buildings on your street applied for STR permits, adding five small guest rooms to attic space in this building for a maximum of 10 guests is less than the number of guests that could be approved to stay at your house, which features a third-floor ballroom, were you or a different owner to apply for a Type I STR permit.

For at least the last 100 years Edgefield has never been a residential-only neighborhood but it has always been one that featured large, neighborhood landmark church buildings. Those that survived the 1916 fire, the 1933 tornado and the 1998 tornado are in various states of repair or disrepair, and this particular one is almost past the point of salvaging. Having a vacant and deteriorating building on your street does no one any good and in fact creates a drag on property values and attracts crime. Finding a suitable adaptive reuse within the already-existing NLOD zoning is in the best interest of your neighborhood. There is the delicate matter of finding a solution that is reasonable. I look forward to hearing the public comment and the deliberations of the Planning Commissioners at this afternoon's public hearing. Thank you again for sharing your thoughts with me and the Planning Commissioners.

Brett A. Withers

Metro Council, District 6

Mobile (615) 427-5946 | [facebook.com/Brett A. Withers](https://www.facebook.com/Brett.A.Withers) | [twitter.com @brettawithers](https://twitter.com/brettawithers)

From: Randall Gilbert [rg@washtopia.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 4:55 PM

To: planning.staff@nashville.gov

Cc: Withers, Brett (Council Member)

Subject: Planning Commission (2018NHL-003-002)

To the Planning Commission:

I am writing to ask you to deny the revised plan for another 5 rooms.

18 rooms at double occupancy means 36 people. Another 5 rooms will be 46 people. With the additional rooms, we will have twice as many transient, commercial visitors on our block than we have residents. How can we even call this a residential neighborhood if we are overrun with hotel guests?

What's the difference? For one, non-residents will be on vacation. Many will be celebrating and partying. I work hard every day and come home to the peace and quiet of our home. Our daughter goes to bed by 8pm. Her bedroom overlooks the hotel.

Whatever disruptions we would have with 18 rooms, gets nearly 30% more frequent with 23 rooms. More scooters blocking the sidewalk, more late-night disturbances, more double-parked Ubers etc.

I have heard 5 more rooms is a reasonable request. What is reasonable about 30% more inconveniences suffered by existing residents? All of the benefit accrues to the sole business on the block and all the cost is born by us.

I don't know what guides your decisions, but I urge you to consider the cost to us. How reasonable would the request be if they were next door to you? It's just another 10 people per night, most nights.

Think also of the precedent you set. If a nearly 50-person AirBnB is allowed there, how much longer before we sell to the next enterprising business person. Our 6,000 square foot home, built in 1893, could house another 40 people. Pretty soon, the long-standing residents that have fought to preserve the quality of life here leave. By then, residential property prices plummet and the neighborhood is swallowed up by commercial interests.

Please remember that every "reasonable" commercial concession erodes our quality of life. What's reasonable about that?

Thank you,

Randall Gilbert

816 Russell Street

Nashville, TN 37206

615 768-9274

Item 27: 2019Z-026PR-001 – 4409 JJ Watson Ave./4415 Nolensville Pk.

From: Sarah Lefebvre Krieger [mailto:slefebv@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 10:51 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Case 2019Z-026PR-001

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing this notice in regards to case 2019Z-026PR-001.

As homeowners on J J Watson Avenue we would be directly affected by this rezoning.

In response to this notice, my husband and I have concerns which are outlined in brief below:

1. The zone change is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan for the areas of J J Watson Avenue and Providence Heights, that are composed of single family homes.
2. The current road infrastructure of the area would not support a growth in traffic density as it is already difficult to navigate exiting onto Nolensville Pike.
3. The creek that runs across J J Watson Avenue and the impact of new housing (which is not displayed on zoning maps).
4. Medium-high density residential, multi-family dwellings would have a direct impact on our property assessment and by extension house value.
5. Historical elements of the surrounding areas.

We ask that you oppose this concept plan.

Thank you,

Dr. Sarah Lefebvre and Mr. Andrew Krieger

4417 J J Watson Avenue

Nashville, TN 37211

Written without prejudice.

Item 30: 2019Z-018PR-001 – Edwin Street

From: Davis, Ashonti [mailto:DavisA17@aetna.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 1:17 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Napier, Patrick (Planning)

Subject: RE: Item 30 on 2/28 Planning Commission Agenda - 2019Z-018PR-001

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing in support of Staff's recommendation for the rezoning petition, reflected in 2018Z-018PR-001, which are properties located at 342, 345, and 347 Edwin Street. Due to the severely limited infrastructure of the area surrounding the properties at issue and the single-family footprint of the area, the request to change the zoning for these properties to RM-15 is unreasonable. In addition to the debilitated infrastructure and surrounding context, there are several other compelling reasons to support Staff's recommendation and disapprove the zoning request as submitted. First, the northwest corner of the Highland Heights study area was hotly contested during the recent charrette. Many neighbors and stakeholders in the Highland Heights charette expressed concerns about the supplemental policy and corresponding density assigned to this very area as it is incompatible with the single-family footprint of this established neighborhood. In fact, under separate cover, I will submit photos of the immediate area surrounding these properties – they are all single-family homes along with a head start at the immediate north of the properties at issue. With the exception of the small convenience store facing Trinity Lane to the south of the properties, the entire 300 and 400 blocks of Edwin Street are single-family homes. Second, the sub-district on the 400 block of Edwin Street is R3, and that supplemental policy for a R3 subdistrict only permits single-family homes and detached-dwelling units. To maintain the integrity of the supplemental policy for the block that is immediately adjacent to the properties at issue requires a zoning classification that compliments not only the existing homes, but future development envisioned by the R3 subdistrict. Lastly, Staff's recommendation for R6-A is a dramatic increase in density for this area, but it, at least, strikes a compromise of increasing density in the area and accounting for the limited infrastructure and surrounding single-family character.

In light of the reasons outlined above, please vote in support of Planning Staff's recommendation and disapprove the zoning petition as submitted. I sincerely appreciate your consideration of these comments.

Kindest Regards,

Ashonti Davis

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

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 10:32 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Napier, Patrick (Planning)

Subject: Item 30 on 2/28 Planning Commission Agenda - 2019Z-018PR-001 - please disapprove this rezoning request

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

I would like to state that 2018Z-018PR-001, the request to rezone the properties located at 342, 345, and 347 Edwin Street to RM-15 is unreasonable - please disapprove per your recommendation. Infrastructure which is already strained in this area won't support it and the area context is single-family homes. As a nearby home owner, I support Staff's recommendation and disapprove the zoning request as submitted. Density assigned to this area is incompatible with the single-family footprint of this established neighborhood. Also, the sub-district on the 400 block of Edwin Street is R3, and that supplemental policy for

a R3 subdistrict only permits single-family homes and detached-dwelling units. To maintain the integrity of the supplemental policy for the block that is immediately adjacent to the properties at issue requires a zoning classification that compliments not only the existing homes, but future development envisioned by the R3 subdistrict. Staff's recommendation for R6-A is a dramatic increase in density for this area, but it, at least, strikes a compromise of increasing density in the area and accounting for the limited infrastructure and surrounding single-family character.

In light of the reasons outlined above, please vote in support of Planning Staff's recommendation and disapprove the zoning petition as submitted.

Thank you,

Jami Anderson
Stainback Ave

From: stacy@easeuptravel.com [mailto:stacy@easeuptravel.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 3:18 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); Napier, Patrick (Planning)
Subject: Feb 28 Agenda - Item 30 - 2019Z-018PR-001

Good morning.

I am writing to voice my opposition to this application requesting the rezoning to RM-15 for the three properties located at 343-347 Edwin St. My reasons are –

1. This street is predominantly single-family homes. The property directly across from these three lots is roughly the same size with one house. Adjacent to these lots across Lischey St sit single family homes that currently RS-5 and fall within the R3 sub-district building regulating plan allowing up to R6-A. Behind these lots sits a convenience store/gas station. Diagonally across the intersection of Edwin and Lischey is Tom Joy Head Start. Rezoning to RM15-A with the potential for these lots to allow 13 residences is inappropriate for this intersection.
2. This portion of Edwin St (the 300 block) was a contentious section of the neighborhood when we were working on the amendment to our neighborhood plan. At the presentation of the amendment to the Commission last summer, most all of the statements during the public hearing expressed support of the amendment with the exception of the northwest corner (specifically Edwin St). Even Vice-Chair Farr made a point to encourage neighbors to seek further revision of the plan to address those concerns.
3. There are significant concerns with existing infrastructure in and around that street. The current neighborhood plan calls for the installation of an alley to run parallel with Edwin, yet as staff has noted in their report, there are no requirements under RM-15 (or even RM15-A) for the construction of the alley. In addition, other utilities and infrastructure are in dire need of attention to service the existing homes along the street. Adding more units without an investment to ensure adequate use of these utilities and related infrastructure will be a disservice to the existing homes along the street.

Several of the current owners of the properties did attend a meeting of the Highland Heights Neighborhood Association. Many of those in attendance voiced opposition to the proposed density that RM-15 zoning would bring to that corner. It was asked if a less-dense zoning would be possible, specifically R6-A. However, the owners were adamantly opposed to anything less than RM-15.

I respectfully request that you vote in accordance with your staff's recommendation to either disapprove the application or encourage the owners to agree to R6-A.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS
Your Personal Travel Professional
Ease-Up! Travel Services