

Comments on March 14 MPC agenda items, received through March 13

Item 11: 2018Z-119PR-001 – 412 Brewer Drive

From: Ken Harding [mailto:kharding@newhavenrecords.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 11:12 AM
To: Planning Staff; Planning Commissioners
Subject: Case 2018Z-119PR-001 412 Brewer Drive

Dear Planning Commissioners and Planning Staff,

Let me first thank you for your time and service to our wonderful city. I grew up on the corner of Hasty Dr. and Tusculum Rd(around the corner from this property). After school, I have worked in the music industry, first for the Oak Ridge Boys' studio and then moved to Texas to work for Word Records (the largest Christian label at the time and home of Amy Grant, Al Green, Glen Campbell, Shirley Caesar and many others). When I moved back to Nashville I purchased 419 Brewer Dr. (almost across the street from the rezoning request) in my old neighborhood. I'm mentioning my background to let you know I am not use to these types of battles but we are getting a quick education.

My neighbors and I spoke at your Dec. 13th meeting when our councilperson Davette Blalock presented this property and 414 Brewer Dr. (further intruding into the neighborhood) for your consideration for rezoning. At that time you voted against rezoning these properties by 6 to 0. It was stated that it would go against the T3 Neighborhood Maintenance Policy(I think I am saying it correctly). My neighbors and I were overjoyed hoping that would be the end but our council person pushed ahead to the Metro council.

We could not understand her determination to push this through despite overwhelming opposition from the neighbors. We never had a meeting with the developer (our understanding is they are from California and build cell towers and are going to buy the property when and if it is rezoned). Just before the Metro council public hearing one of our neighbors discovered our council person was the listing agent on the 414 Brewer property (something I guess should have been disclosed) and Steve Glover was brought in to co-sponsor.

As I stated earlier, I don't understand all the in and outs of the politics of Metro but what I do understand is that the Planning Staff and the Planning Commissioners seem to be fair, helpful and honest. But we are dealing with people that have said they "met with us" and "will continue working with the neighbors" when she(the developer) had never met with us (this is recorded at the Metro council public hearing on February 5). After many request of our council person to have a meeting we finally got notice Monday of a meeting tonight. I'm sure that this will be so they can legitimately say "they have met with the neighbors".

Sorry if I got down in the weeds on this but we are passionate about stopping this type of rezoning into our neighborhood. I ask you all to please vote no to their request. And a special thanks to the wonderful and helpful Planning staff!

With much respect,

Ken
Ken Harding
New Haven Records, President
741 Cool Springs Blvd.
Franklin, TN 37067

p: 615-327-3300

f: 615-327-3367

Item 21: 2019SP-015-001 – 538 Rosedale Avenue SP

From: merihoward1 [mailto:merihoward1@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 5:17 PM

To: Planning Staff

Subject: 538 Rosedale Ave

I was just made aware of a rezoning that was requested for the above address. Case 2019SP-015-001. My husband and I reside at 2769 Rosedale Place and have lived here for 19 years. I wish to oppose this. Traffic going down Rosedale is already at a maximum, plus I fear that our home value will diminish with the congestion in this area. 1 or 2 homes on this piece of property may be alright, but not 10! I would appreciate it if this consideration would be carried forward to any other person who wishes to do the same in this area. I understand that I am not the only resident in this area who feels this way.

Item 30: 2019Z-032PR-001 – 329 Edwin Street

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

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 10:17 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Please vote No on the zoning change 329 Edwin Street (Item 2019Z-032PR-001)

Please do not allow individual exceptions to our neighborhood's stated plan which was carefully thought out and developed with much precision and foresight. Doing so also allows a foot in the door or precedent to be made for more and more egregious mis-use of the neighborhood for the profit and gains of others who have no stake in the well-being of the residents. Please stand up for the people who live here and consider the following:

- All of the 300 block of Edwin Street is currently single-family homes, and the zoning of 329 Edwin Street should not be changed to permit housing types that are incompatible with the existing footprint. With the density allowed under the requested zoning change, a very narrow street (with drainage ditches) will suffer irreparable harm to the existing character and cause additional strain on waning infrastructure.
- The infrastructure is inadequate to support additional units. Specifically, Edwin is narrow street without street parking, severe storm water issues, strapped electrical grid, and sewage are all issues for this specific street.
- This zoning change would set a bad precedent for the Highland Heights area. Maintaining the character of our single-family footprint was one of the goals of the Planning Study, and this zoning change is inconsistent with our stated goals as a neighborhood. This neighborhood is an established neighborhood, and it is one that should grow while maintaining its single-family footprint. Allowing this type of zone change in the infill of the neighborhood is simply wrong.

Please vote no! I live on Stainback just a few blocks from this address and strongly oppose this zoning change.

thank you,

Jami Anderson

From: Nate Paulk [mailto:paulknate@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 8:11 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 329 Edwin Street - Item 30 on 3/14 MPC Agenda - 2019Z-032PR-001

Dear Planning Commission,

Please accept this letter of opposition for rezoning at 329 Edwin Street. I believe this rezoning does not fit well with the existing character of the street and surrounding community.

Furthermore, I believe, if rezoned, it would create a precedent for increasing density in the infill of our neighborhood instead of on the corridors.

I am writing as a someone who leads a non-profit in the Highland Heights community and have witnessed how this type of development has impacted the surrounding community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nate Paulk
Executive Director
Trinity Community Commons
204 East Trinity Lane
Nashville, TN 37207

From: n.sovereign@comcast.net [mailto:n.sovereign@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 10:02 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 329 Edwin Street

Dear Members of the Commission,

I am writing to express my concerns on the proposed zoning change for the property at 329 Edwin Street.

This property is well within the boundaries that were agreed upon in the community charrette. The infrastructure does not support this increase in density and was to remain single family homes.

Placing trust in the agreement that the neighbors, planning, and other stakeholders committed to upholding is now under review.

I can appreciate that the Councilmember Davis, is forging ahead with bypassing agreements the Highland Heights Neighborhood Association he made to bring requests through our subcommittee on zoning. In fact, Scott is bypassing the planning process and taking zoning issues directly to Council. His zeal in working with small developers to build in the 5th ward, while commendable, as a termed out councilperson, his contributions over the years with feelings of betrayal of our trust.

Please consider my request to deny a zoning change for this property, and all property within the zoning area that is requested.

Thank you for your service,

Rae Sovereign
1602 Lischey Ave
574 904-3799

From: stacy@easeuptravel.com [mailto:stacy@easeuptravel.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 11:36 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Napier, Patrick (Planning)
Subject: 2019Z-032PR-001 - 329 Edwin St - Item 30 on March 14 agenda

Good morning,

I am writing to voice my concerns about this application. As I've mentioned in a previous email, this property sits within the contested 'northwest corner' of our neighborhood. Also at the March 14 meeting, there is a hearing about a request to amend the Highland Heights Study that impacts this portion of that street.

Specifically, the R6-A zoning would allow a density and design that substantially impact the infrastructure that desperately needs attention in this area. One existing unit could become four and put additional strain on the utilities that serve the other residences. There has already been documented issues of problems with sewer service resulting from current use. Adding additional service demands may lead to additional problems that reach beyond the responsibilities of the developer/builder for the proposed units. Such concerns were a primary point of contention during the Highland Heights Study and are a continued discussion neighbors hope to have should the request for a corrective amendment be heard.

Consider one scenario that is often overlooked when considering the impact of a jump density such as this. In the Highland Heights Study, the need for an alley extending from Lischey to Meridian Streets was identified as necessary for the development to higher density. As R6-A requires alley access for this district yet no alley exists, services such as trash and recycling collection would be relegated to the street as it happens currently. As each residential unit may have up to two trash and two recycle bins, such density might result in between eight and sixteen bins sitting on the street on collection days. Each bin requires spacing of 3 feet between the bin and any other object such as a mailbox or other bin. Should Public Works enforce this requirement and all 16 of the possible bins be present at one time, the space required would exceed the total street frontage for this property. Even if bins were allowed placement immediately beside each other, all 16 would occupy nearly half the frontage of this lot. The likelihood of this scenario is debatable, but as it is possible, it should be considered in the planning for this as well as any moderate to high-density development.

Edwin Street just isn't adequately designed to support additional density of this type on a per-lot basis. Multiple parcels – such as case 2019Z-018PR-001 heard on February 28 – are more appropriate for this zoning district.

Please consider these conditions as you discuss this case. I respectfully request to vote disapproval.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS
Your Personal Travel Professional
Ease-Up! Travel Services
(615) JET-SAND (538-7263)

Memo related to Item G – Highland Heights

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

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 1:02 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); 'Ashonti Davis'; 'Courtney Williams'

Subject: Agenda Item G - Hearing Regarding Highland Heights Amendment Request - March 14, 2019

Good afternoon.

I wish to express my disagreement with the recommendation to deny hearing our request for a corrective amendment to the Highland Heights Study. The recommendation to postpone this request to December 2020 will create a situation that exacerbates the conditions that prompted the most recently passed amendment.

I encourage you all to revisit the recording of the June 14, 2018, Commission meeting. To support our position and reasoning for requesting this amendment so soon after the adoption in June, here are a few key points of that meeting –

1. In his report, Marty Sewell states that Staff always prefers consensus, but “that didn’t happen exactly in this case”. There were conflicting viewpoints on certain minor parts of the overall study. The area of most contention was commonly referred to as the ‘northwest corner’ or the 300 block of Edwin Street.
2. During the public hearing, there were 16 people who spoke in favor. Of those, 7 specifically called out the northwest corner as an area that should be reconsidered.
3. At the start of the commission’s discussion, Vice-chair Farr and Commissioner Haynes expressed concerns about the areas mentioned during the public comments. Mr. Sewell admitted that there was a disagreement amongst the Steering Committee and staff about these areas.
4. Vice-chair Farr specifically asked about the process concerning revisions to these contested areas and was advised by Director Kempf that those areas of concern could be revisited as this amendment’s resulting plan is a ‘living document’. She also pointed out that there were decisions made under the then-existing plan that set a precedent difficult to correct. For example, the large SP zoning at 1801 Meridian allows much higher density than both Edwin and Edith Streets currently enjoy. The justification for having much more dense building regulating areas along those two streets was based on that SP.
5. Commissioner Tibbs agreed with the concerns expressed by Vice-chair Farr. He did comment that this amendment should be allowed to ‘cook for a while’, but no specific timeframe was proffered.
6. After the motion to accept was made and seconded, Vice-chair Farr made an additional comment that the northwest corner should be revisited in the future. Again no specific timeframe was proffered. Chairman Adkins agreed that as it was a single possible amendment to correct this portion of the plan, there was cause to warrant a review of the contested areas.

My neighbors that served on the Advisory Committee with me donated our time and efforts to make this plan amendment happen, and we are extremely grateful and appreciative of the work and efforts by the staff to achieve this result. During our discussions, many concessions were made to achieve the balance this plan represents. However, the contentions centered on this northwest corner as well as two other very small areas (represented in our request for revision), were threatening to extend the timeline devoted to this study. In the interest of adoption of the final draft of the plan without further delay, we ceded our objections with the understanding that these small areas could be revised with an additional minor amendment. This option was presented by the staff to earn our agreement with the final draft, and we willingly ceded our concerns under this belief.

On October 10, 2018, we had a meeting with Director Kempf and several members of the staff to discuss the revision to the approved amendment. Surprisingly, we met with resistance, were told that the timeframe was too soon after adoption, and were dissuaded from pursuing the revision further. We had to remind those present that comments made by the Commission led us to believe that these small revisions were quite possible.

To highlight the reason why we acted within months of the most recent amendment, there are two rezoning applications currently pending for the 300 block of Edwin Street. One is being heard at the same meeting as this hearing on March 14. The other is scheduled to be heard on March 28. If this revision isn't addressed soon, we could see even more erosion of the single-family footprint for these areas of contention. If we wait until December 2020 before re-visiting this question, these areas of the neighborhood could look starkly different than today. The pressure to push the density envelope has not waned, and if this revision is delayed, it could become a moot point.

I understand that the Planning Department devoted substantial resources to the Highland Heights Study, but personally, I feel like the work isn't quite done. Under other circumstances, I can understand why a moratorium would be more appropriate. It has been explained that there are only three ways an amendment like this can be heard – at the behest of the Commission, at the behest of the Councilmember, or at the behest of the owner(s) of the lots in question.

For this reason, I respectfully request that the Commission charge the staff with revisiting this request for these minor changes.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS
Your Personal Travel Professional
Ease-Up! Travel Services
(615) JET-SAND (538-7263)