

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

ITEM 1: 2018Z-010TX-001—BL2018-1416 TREE ORDINANCE

From: Karen R Brown [mailto:karenbrown21@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 6:18 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: BL2018-1416, Case No. 2018Z-010TX-001

PLEASE take this bill reforming how Nashville handles its tree canopy under serious consideration and recommend that Metro Council pass this bill.

This bill seeks to increase our tree density factor for commercial and multifamily land use property types. Currently Nashville has THE LOWEST tree density standards in the ENTIRE COUNTRY (for a city of our size and in a similar climate). The average tree density factor for our peer cities is 23, Franklin, TN is 26...Nashville's tree density factor is currently 14 and we allow builder to exempt their building footprint from that tree density factor. We deserve better treatment of our city's tree canopy!

Thank you -

Karen R Brown
5303A Kentucky Ave
Nashville, TN 37209
District 20

ITEM 3: 2019SP-006-001—3RD AVENUE NORTH SP

From: Mark Graziano [mailto:mark.graziano.13@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 6:02 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member)
Subject: Specific Plan 2019SP-006-001

All,

While I had planned to attend the eight previous meetings that were deferred, I am unfortunately unable to speak in person at this meeting tonight due to work conflicts. However, I wanted to reiterate my stance on the newly proposed plans.

· The proposed dwelling density is not aligned with the T4 Urban Neighborhood Maintenance policy. While the developer argues that the character of the neighborhood will be maintained, the only variable of neighborhood character they mention aligning with is the exterior design consideration. When the T4 NM was written, I suspect the Planning Department wanted developers to consider more than paint and trim when considering neighborhood "character". Based on current acreage (1.16 acres) the maximum dwellings that could be built is 9.097. The developer proposes a 140% increase to 22 units. It is

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

impossible to argue that such a substantial increase dwelling density is aligned with the character of any residences within this lot's vicinity.

· In this new design, the developer still does not provide any justifications for the need for such a dramatic increase in dwelling density. What benefits will the neighborhood see if this developer is permitted to build 22 units as opposed to nine? The only benefit I can see is not for the neighborhood, but for the developer's bottom line.

Nine dwellings is a substantial number of homes to sit on 1.16 acres. I am requesting that this current proposal should be rejected by the Metro Planning Commission.

I would also like to note that the zoning hearing signs on the lots were not updated and I was not provided with any updated literature to inform me of the new hearing date, time and details.

-Mark Graziano

ITEM 5: 2019S-043-001—HIGHLAND VIEW

From: Kathy Cloninger [mailto:kathy.cloninger@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 2:25 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Highland View, Case #2019S-043-001, widen Watts Lane

TO: Planning Commissioners

FROM: Mike Williams, resident at 6457 Fleetwood Drive

SUBJECT: Widen Watts Lane

DATE: June 6, 2019

Planning Staff's Condition #1, to approve Highland View subdivision, is that the developer must widen Watts Lane to 20 feet.

But two loopholes gut that requirement. One loophole may allow the developer to leave 700 feet of Watts Lane just 17 feet wide. The other loophole may result in abandoning the north access and building the 2017 single-access version of Highland View.

The Commissioners can cure the first loophole by revising Condition #1 to say that no minor modification can lessen the 20 foot width. Thus a developer can't beg Public Works – after the Commission has approved the concept plan – “20 foot width is so complicated and expensive, it'll sink the whole project. Grant me a 'minor modification' to let 700 feet of the street stay just 17 feet wide.”

The Commissioners can cure the second loophole by deleting “or bond” from Condition #1. Here's why. When you compare the 2019 and 2017 Highland View concept plans, you see that the 2019 plan

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

offers developers no new income but does require two big new profit-slashing expenses: widen Watts Lane AND build a new 400' north extension road to connect to Watts Lane. Now, suppose the developer posts a bond to widen Watts Lane, but then he looks at the dual costs of widening Watts AND building the new north extension road . . . and he decides, "The two new improvements will cost way more than the bond. I can make best profit by sacrificing the bond and *I'll improve neither road and just build the 2017 single-access plan. I won't need a variance for long turnarounds: the Commission has already approved Highland View.*"

There's one more worry. Even if you revise Condition #1 to force the developer to widen Watts Lane to 20 feet, he may first bring equipment in from Knob Road and start grading and blasting Knob Hill. At some point – maybe when he realizes Watts Lane is too difficult, or that it's hard to cut a 10 percent street up a 15 percent slope – he may abandon the subdivision and leave Knob Hill irrevocably torn up. That is a disaster the Commission can avoid by insisting that the developer widen all of Watts Lane *before sticking a shovel into the soil of Highland View*. That makes sense: if connectivity is the aim, get both accesses ready for heavy equipment before you start grading and blasting on Knob Hill.

We ask the Commissioners to revise Condition #1 to make the developer widen Watts Lane to 20 feet and do it first.

From: Rob Cheplicki <rob.cheplicki@gmail.com>
Date: May 31, 2019 at 3:22:42 PM CDT
To: "Rickoff, Abbie (Planning)" <Abbie.Rickoff@nashville.gov>
Cc: "Kempf, Lucy (Planning)" <Lucy.Kempf@nashville.gov>
Subject: 2019S-043-001: Robert Stammer / Expert Engineer Report

Good afternoon Abbie,

Our attorney Don O'Donniley had mentioned that we would be bringing in experts to address some of the issues and concerns we had regarding the Highland View project. To that point, Don has reached out to Robert Stammer, a registered Professional Engineer in the States of Tennessee and Alabama.

Mr. Stammer has done numerous engineering studies and teaches both undergraduate and graduate transportation engineering courses for the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department of Vanderbilt University's School of Engineering.

I am including a copy of Mr. Stammer's report for you and your department to review prior to the scheduled meeting with the Planning Commission on June 13th.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any other information regarding Mr. Stammer's report.

Best,
- Rob

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

Rob Cheplicki

Neighbors for Knob Hill

www.facebook.com/neighborsforknobhill

knobroadcommunity@gmail.com

Cell: 615.400.6272

SEE ATTACHMENT ON FOLLOWING PAGE

Robert E. Stammer, Jr., Ph.D., P.E.

212 Derby Glen Lane

Brentwood, TN 37027-4865

(615) 504-4691

REVIEW FINDINGS AND OPINIONS

**TO: Don O'Donniley, Esq.
The Metro Nashville-Davidson County Planning Commission**

FR: Robert E. Stammer, Jr., Ph.D., P.E.

RE: Review of Current Concept Plan for Highland View (A Cluster Lot Subdivision)

REPORT DATE: May 21, 2019

The following report documents my qualifications, actions, findings and opinions relating to my review of this concept plan.

Qualifications

1. I am a transportation engineer with a Bachelors Degree in Civil Engineering from Vanderbilt University, a Masters Degree in Civil Engineering (Transportation) and approximately 75% of the graduate courses for the Master of Planning degree from Georgia Institute of Technology and a Doctor of Philosophy Degree from the University of Tennessee in Civil Engineering (Transportation). I am a Registered Professional Engineer in the States of Tennessee and Alabama. I teach both undergraduate and graduate transportation engineering courses for the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department of Vanderbilt University's School of Engineering. I first taught a transportation course at Vanderbilt as an adjunct professor in 1978 while being employed full-time by the TN Department of Transportation. I taught the same introductory course a second time in 1979. I left TDOT to attend the University of Tennessee in 1979 to pursue a Ph.D. in Civil Engineering (Transportation). After completing my Ph.D. work, I was employed by Vanderbilt University as a full-time, tenure-track, transportation engineering professor in the fall of 1981 and have been continuously employed by Vanderbilt University's Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering since 1981. I am currently a Professor Emeritus and have held administrative appointments as Assistant Dean and Associate Dean for the School of Engineering and as an Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs in Athletics during my Vanderbilt career.

2. My professional transportation engineering career from 1972 to the present year of 2019 represents 47 years of professional experience. My professional experience spans employment in academia, in government (Tennessee Department of Transportation), and with three private consulting practices. The first consulting job was with a Nashville consulting firm, John Coleman Hays and Associates, in Nashville in the summer of 1972. The second firm was an Atlanta transportation consulting firm, Traffic Planning Associates in 1974, while finishing my graduate studies at Ga. Tech, and the third has been as President of my own firm, Stammer Transportation Engineering, Inc., since the firm's founding in 1987.

Actions

1. The five-page Concept Plan prepared by Dale and Associates provided on the Metro Planning Department's "Development Tracker" website was reviewed.
2. A personal site visit was performed and the existing roads surrounding the proposed development were driven. In addition to roads being driven and features such as lane width, shoulder conditions and near road hazards being observed, the current, very steep terrain of the proposed development was also duly noted.

Findings

My findings, and subsequent opinions, are based upon my 1) May 15 , 2019 site visit, 2) 47 years of transportation engineering and civil engineering experience, 3) education and training, 4) review of all the additional materials stated earlier, and 6) accepted fundamental engineering principles. The findings are grouped into six categories as follows:

1. Road Travel Lane Widths and Conditions
2. Eminent Traffic Calming Actions
3. Road Shoulders and Clear Zones
4. Vertical Slope Challenges for Roads, Lots and Driveways
5. Cul-de-sac Length
6. Drainage Issues

1. Road Travel Lane Widths and Conditions

The adjacent, existing roads that would serve traffic from this proposed development are very narrow (typically 9 feet in width) with winding horizontal alignments and multiple vertical curves. The proposed roads or travel lanes are expected to be of similar width and will face both horizontal and vertical challenges. Typical lane widths on most highways are 12 feet wide, and a lane width less than 10 feet is very narrow and more dangerous. Edge of pavement (EOP) or fog lines were generally not noted on the current existing roads.

A road's actual design speed is calculated considering a number of factors such as horizontal and vertical alignment, lane widths, shoulders, clear zones and other design factors. Although design plans or more extensive calculations are needed to calculate exactly the expected design speeds for both the existing adjacent roads and the proposed new development roads, my experience and site visit observations indicate that drivers are already driving faster than the current road design speeds in this area. Thus, motorists already are driving faster on adjacent roads than the recommended design speeds for roads having this type of topography. More roads would then likely add more speeding vehicles on the new rolling roads and further reduce the safety of everyone living or traveling in the area.

Other critical road design issues in the proposed Highland View development must address how emergency vehicles, such as a Fire Department's Ladder Truck, would be able to negotiate 9 feet narrow lanes and complete turning movements at new intersections. Turning radii have not been checked, but are important safety considerations that must be addressed.

2. Eminent Traffic Calming Actions

Knob Road is already posted as a "Traffic Calming Neighborhood" by virtue of an existing sign. But signs alone do not stop "cut through" traffic. Looking at the connectivity of the proposed new roads in the reviewed Highland View Concept Plan clearly indicates that similar "cut through" opportunities will exist with the currently proposed Highland View roads. Thus, the currently proposed Highland View roads would likely require significant additional traffic calming measures to slow motorists and improve both motorist and resident safety. Addressing this safety potential initially to prevent later remediation is advised.

3. Road Shoulders and Clear Zones

Shoulders and Clear Zones provide valuable safety features for motorists. Shoulders provide structural support to travel lanes and furnish a "pull over" area to improve motorist safety. Similarly, the clear zone concept further addresses the need to remove or protect motorists against any obstacles posing hazards to an errant vehicle. If the proposed development roads are not built to a higher standard of care, but are similar to the current adjacent roads with 1) little to no shoulders, and 2) nearby hazards (e.g., trees, steep drop-offs, etc.) that pose safety hazards, motorist safety is compromised immediately. Safety in road design is always critical.

Safe highway practices dictate that clear zones of varying widths be present to increase the safety of motorists should a vehicle leave the roadway for any reason. Another way of stating this is that a safe roadside recovery area clear of obstructions and dangerous hazards increases motorist safety. A safe roadside recovery area is typically composed of a paved or gravel shoulder and/or an additional "non steep" foreslope where both shoulder and any additional foreslope are hazard free.

AASHTO “Roadside Design Guide” guidelines appear to not be met for the existing roads and questions remain whether the proposed roads will meet the AASHTO guidelines.

Another finding from my earlier site visit is that there is already evidence of erosion of soil and even shoulders in the immediate area due to swift runoff occurring over steep terrain. Hydrology issues will be addressed more directly in Finding 6 that follows.

4. Vertical Slope Challenges for Roads, Lots and Driveways

Because of the extreme topography and ground slopes in this location, massive earthwork will be needed to avoid exceeding maximum allowable vertical slopes for roads, lots, and driveways. Meeting all mandated Metro maximum road, lot, and driveway slope requirements will be challenging. But even if maximum, allowable Metro slopes are not exceeded, the massive earthwork that will be required is going to have a profound effect on the existing vegetation and ground cover.

5. Cul-de-sac Length

Although the available scale makes accurate measurements challenging, the cul-de-sac on Court “B” appears to be slightly longer than Metro’s mandated 700 feet maximum.

6. Drainage Issues

As mentioned earlier, there was observed evidence of considerable soil erosion already in this area. Because of the severe terrain differences, steep roads and lots, the potential removable of existing vegetation and trees that would slow both runoff volumes and flow speeds, hydraulic considerations must be considered very carefully.

Opinions

My opinions, to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty, are as follows:

1. Narrow travel lanes (i.e., 9 feet), few adequate shoulders, and hazards in areas that need to be safe “clear zones” are problematic and present serious safety concerns in the Concept Plan.
2. Consider requiring extensive use of white edge-of-pavement (EOP) lines on any new roads to better delineate the existence narrow roads and to improve driver safety.

3. Remove all roadside hazards in clear zones or add guardrails to protect motorists.
4. Adequately addressing concerns regarding intersection turning radii and overall safety of larger emergency vehicles (e.g., a Fire Ladder Truck) operating on narrow and steep roads must be addressed. When rainy and icy conditions are considered, this raises more critical concerns.
5. The rather straight and direct connection of the proposed major subdivision road will attract additional cut-through traffic volumes and likely will require remedial traffic calming devices. Consider re-alignment of the proposed roads.
6. The steep topography presents major safety and development challenges for multiple features such as roads, lots, and driveways. As mentioned earlier in Opinion 4, these safety concerns become even greater with steep terrain when roads and driveways are not dry, but wet or icy.
7. Extensive required earthwork will negatively impact existing trees and ground cover and thus have adverse impacts on aesthetics, and can produce silt and surface runoff problems.
8. Court “B” cul-de-sac length may be greater than the allowable 700 feet maximum and should be re-examined.
9. Observed soil erosion in the area “already” raises additional concerns that this problem will occur again. Thus, special attention needs to address the sizing of drainage ditches, culverts, and the requirements for runoff retention areas.
10. Finally, open spaces are desirable and can be pleasant natural areas. However, they can also be a maintenance and safety nuisance. Who will maintain these if this subdivision is built? This issue should be addressed initially before a problem occurs.

Summary

There are many concerns and issues, as listed earlier in this review, concerning the approval of this subdivision. Until all are resolved, approval is not advised.

Property owners obviously want to develop fully their parcels with as many lots as possible to maximize sales and profit, but not all parcels lend themselves to being developed. Neighbors and others are obviously concerned about all types of problems that can arise from new developments. The many challenges of developing this parcel further increase these concerns. From my reviewed thus far, approval of the design offered in the reviewed Highland View Concept Plan should be denied.

I reserve the right to review any additional plans, data and facts that may become available, and then amend, update, and revise statements and opinions in this review. I will be glad to clarify and answer any questions regarding the engineering opinions offered.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items

Received through June 7, 2019

ITEMS 9a: 2019CP-003-002—BORDEAUX-WHITES CREEK-HAYNES TRINITY COMMUNITY PLAN and 9b: 2019SP-040-001—GATEWAY COMMERCE CENTER SP

From: Linda Jarrett [mailto:roseheadjjj@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2019 9:10 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Subject: SP-040-001

Recent discussions about the Gateway Commerce SP-040-001 have been misleading and slanted.

Some facts are being ignored which causes a lay person like me to feel manipulated and/or intimidated.

After seeing the chart of permitted uses, I believe an honest, fully vetted study of this project shows its potential.

I feel, if all sides worked together and respected each others views, this plan can work for all persons. I would like to see this process continue.

Thanks for working on this for our community.

Linda T. Jarrett
4300 Whites Creek Pike
Whites Creek, Tn. 37189

From: virginia [mailto:singervirginia@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 25, 2019 1:23 PM
To: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Cc: Planning Commissioners; Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: Whites Creek/Briley Project.

I am writing to FULLY endorse the Whites Creek/Briley Parkway project proposed by Fifth Generation properties. Having grown up in this area I am fully aware of the need for retail and convenience facilities. The location of this project-directly off Briley/Whites Creek exit is the perfect local; convenient to traffic flow but not in the middle of homes. It is not suitable as a green space due to rocky terrain and flood plain issues, trees on this property are mostly cedars with minimal good woods. Fifth Gen has done everything the community has asked in keeping this development low key and attractive to the area. There is already development in this section with UPS, FedX, Fontanelle and Richards. This

Business/retail would allow for the additional economic growth for the area, while providing an attractive entrance to the community. Thank You

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

Virginia Singer

From: eleanor baltz [mailto:elcbaltz@att.net]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 8:10 PM
To: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Planning Commissioners; Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: Proposed Gateway Commerce Center Development at Whites Creek Pike/ Briley Pkwy

My family has farmed on Whites Creek Pike since 1903. We have witnessed the addition of both UPS & FedEx Companies and feel they have provided much needed economic development to this area.

We have NO OBJECTION with the Gateway Commerce Center commercial /retail proposed site at the Briley Pkwy and Whites Creek Pike interchange. This land site is undeveloped privately owned property and is not considered "Green Space". Due to the topography and location to Briley Pkwy, it would be best suited for commercial & much needed retail development than residential.

We understand people are concerned but we feel the developers have taken great care to address, via feedback & revisions, the community and environmental issues. The developers have proposed low buildings that will be hidden from the road view with attractive retail stores in front. Also Green Space and Buffer areas will border the property. The traffic concerns will be handled by turn lane additions and electronic signal lights on Whites Creek Pk.

We have been to several meetings about this proposed project and only heard a few concerns from people who are new to this area and represent only a small minority of residents.. We feel this project would be a good fit and provide much needed retail and commercial space for this area.

Thank you for your time and consideration in viewing my email.

Eleanor Baltz
3300 Whites Creek Pike
Nashville, Tn. 37207

From: Mary Baltz [mailto:creekinc@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 7:12 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: Thank You!

Thank you for your time and attention to the Gateway Commerce Center Proposal on Whites Creek Pike and Briley Parkway.

Ever since Briley Parkway divided our family farm we have had many suggestions and monetary offers for the use of our orphaned 14 acres.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

We would take great pride in the opportunity to join the 2 adjacent properties and provide Metro Nashville with this specific plan. Not only will it provide esthetic value to the area but more importantly it would be the answer to market demand for small business square footage and 20 plus acres of much valued greenway space on the western side of the project.

Stephen and Mary Baltz
3210 Whites Creek Pike
Nashville, Tennessee 37207

From: Glenn [mailto:k4ava@att.net]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 5:27 PM
To: "Brenda.Haywood@nashville.gov"@hobvmisav06.nashville.gov;
"Planning.commissioners@nashville.gov"@hobvmisav06.nashville.gov;
"Anna.Grider@nashville.gov"@hobvmisav06.nashville.gov;
"Abbie.Rickoff@nashville.gov"@hobvmisav06.nashville.gov; Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: White's Creek Project

To whom it may concern-regarding the Greenway Development on Whites Creek,

Hearing of a possible retail development coming to the Whites Creek area excites me.

I grew up in the area area and still live close by. I think this is an idea worthy of a growing community.

There has never been any convenient excess to small retail options.

The idea of a possible restaurant ,grocery ,drug store or even a day care center would be I feel would be a welcome addition to the current community already present.

This area would be a perfect place with easy excess from the interstate as well as the local community.

From the local chatter I understand that the interested potential developers have listened to the concerns of the community and have even revised their plans to accommodate the concerns of the people such as traffic and cosmetic features of the area.

I encourage you to allow the necessary zoning changes to make this improvement for to this much needed community growth.

From: momasinger@netzero.com [mailto:momasinger@netzero.com]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 6:46 PM
To: BrendaHaywood@nashville.gov; Planning.commissioners@nashville.gov; Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: Whites Creek Project
To Whom It May Concern:

My family and I have cherished this land and property for many many years.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

I do not wish any more small homes to be built near it. It would be fine with me if a nice commercial company were to settle and improve this area. It would employ many workers, improve the economy, and would also be quick access to Briley Parkway. It would be a convenience to all.

Sincerely,

Angela Baltz Singer

1650 Ridge Circle
Joelton, Tennessee 37080
(615) 746-8579

From: Barbara Wehby [mailto:barbarawehby@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 11:45 PM
To: Brenda.Haywood@nashville.gov; Planning.commission@nashville.gov; Grider, Anna (Planning); Rickoff, Abbie (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning)
Subject: White's Creek Projectcrimi

I have lived in this area for many years and love it! However many times there was a need to have quicker aid and access to a drug store, car gas, food, clinic and even a daycare. Commercial zoning is needed and benefit the community. More housing will create more traffic and criminal activity. Thank You!

From: Stephani McCallum [mailto:harmonyfromchaos@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 9:59 AM
To: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Planning Commissioners
Subject: Proposed amendment to Community character policy in Whites Creek area

I would urge to please reconsider the impact this change would obviously have on this region of the county. We are the only mostly rural area left within county limits, and we provide an experience for the residents of Davidson County that will completely disappear if you allow an industrial element into this space. There are plenty of spaces already zoned for industrial use that are being under-utilized in other parts of the county. Please find a way to direct new growth toward those areas. I implore you, please use your position to help us protect our neighborhood in its current state, so that our children and our children's children can enjoy the green open space, a community garden, a pristine river alongside walking trails and neighbors still working together to feed each other from their own small farms. Thank you for your consideration.

Most sincerely,
Stephani McCallum
615-631-3202

From: amyrose wendell [mailto:pinkcoiffant@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 10:17 AM

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

To: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Planning Commissioners
Subject: Whites creek & Briley parkway "proposal"

Greetings,

I will be unable to attend this evenings meeting to discuss the proposal of changing the "Community use plan", " the zoning", or whatever the first steps it takes in moving away from its current Rural T2. I wanted to make my opposition known.

This community just went through this 3 years and as a community fought for and won to zone this parcel T2.

Nashville has so little green spaces and its current growth "boom" does have a ceiling and when it hits this has the potential one more abandoned warehouse meking up an otherwise beautiful area.

The world is moving towards sustainability, Nashville needs to get on board. That starts with recognizing the importance of our green spaces farming communities etc...A better use for this space will present itself but only if we preserve it.

Please let the voices of the people who live here and fought for this space, for its current zoning, stand.

Thank you.

AmyRose Wendell

Hocus Pocus Beauty Boutique
5424 Clarksville Pike 37189
828-582-3013

From: Nick Baker [mailto:NBaker@olesouth.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 12:52 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Subject: 2019CP-040-001 Community Plan Amendment 2019CP-003-002- Re-Zoning

We are reaching out regarding the following:

2019CP-040-001-community plan amendment

2019CP-003-002- Re-Zoning

Our community Vista at Whites Creek has met with the developer several times to discuss the planned development across the street.

We have been unable to persuade them in going another direction besides building out warehouses and further industrializing Whites Creek.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

While several people are reaching out individually we want to make our voices heard and documented that we are 100% against the proposed Re-zoning and Community plan amendment in our neighborhood for this project.

Simply stated we can do better and deserve better from a development standpoint at the gateway to Whites Creek.

Brenda, we ask that you act as a voice for our community and stand up to a bad vision for our neighborhood at the coming meetings.

Thank you for your time,

Residents of Vista at Whites Creek

From: Sayre Henley [mailto:shenley2009@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 2:39 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: 2019CP-040-001-community plan amendment 2019CP-003-002- Re-Zoning

> We are reaching out regarding the following:

> 2019CP-040-001-community plan amendment

> 2019CP-003-002- Re-Zoning

> Our community Vista at Whites Creek has met with the developer several times to discuss the planned development across the street.

> We have been unable to persuade them in going another direction besides building out warehouses and further industrializing Whites Creek.

> While several people are reaching out individually we want to make our voices heard and documented that we are 100% against the proposed Re-zoning and Community plan amendment in our neighborhood for this project.

> Simply stated we can do better and deserve better from a development standpoint at the gateway to Whites Creek.

> Brenda, we ask that you act as a voice for our community and stand up to a bad vision for our neighborhood at the coming meetings.

> Thank you for your time,

> Residents of Vista at Whites Creek

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

From: Spear, Harry [mailto:Harry.Spear@dell.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:29 PM
To: Haywood, Brenda (Council Member); Planning Commissioners
Cc: Krc0381@gmail.com; rob.ppaterson@gmail.com; jenna.e.hokanson@gmail.com; dhokjr@gmail.com; Jamison225@hotmail.com; Kuztom84@yahoo.com; Mandymariemorgan@gmail.com; mattsipf@gmail.com; tobystandefer@uslumber.com; nfillmore@bartdurham.net; shenley2009@gmail.com; joebryant21@gmail.com; nbaker@olesouth.com; smith2me@me.com; jenarusin21@gmail.com; Courtney Ball; nakeisha1978@gmail.com; rhonda.f.hunt@gmail.com; Alexis.k.hightower@gmail.com; bwinston06@gmail.com
Subject: Industrial/Commercial development in Whites Creek (Residents of Vista at Whites Creek)

Planning Commissioners & Brenda,

We are reaching out regarding the following:

2019CP-040-001-community plan amendment

2019CP-003-002- Re-Zoning

Our community Vista at Whites Creek has met with the developer several times to discuss the planned development across the street from Vista.

We have been unable to persuade them in going another direction besides building out warehouses and further industrializing Whites Creek.

While several people are reaching out individually we want to make our voices heard and documented that we are **100% against** the proposed Re-zoning and Community plan amendment in our neighborhood for this project.

Simply stated we can do better and deserve better from a development standpoint at the gateway to Whites Creek.

Brenda, we ask that you act as a voice for our community and stand up to a bad vision for our neighborhood at the coming meetings.

Thank you for your time,
Residents of Vista at Whites Creek (endorsed and copied on email)

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

From: Jenna Hokanson [mailto:jenna.e.hokanson@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 8:41 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2019CP-040-001 YMCA Meeting Follow Up

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Thank you so much for hosting the Whites Creek Community at the YMCA last night to discuss 2019CP-040-001. As a follow up, I wanted to write to you to briefly express my concerns with this amendment to the Community Plan. I'm sure you're hearing a lot of the specific reasons why myself and my neighbors **100% oppose** this change to the community plan (home value depletion, increased traffic, increased noise, potential for no commercial space to develop, etc.) so I wanted to share a more personal story.

I've been a resident of Nashville for two years. I moved here from New York City (Manhattan) and I've never regretted my decision. More specifically, I've been incredibly fond of my decision to reside in the Whites Creek neighborhood. The lure of living in a rural community in such close proximity to one of America's fastest growing cities is unparalleled. I love going to work in downtown and enjoying all of the restaurants and amenities that come with urban areas, but more importantly I love coming home to the quiet, clean, friendly Whites Creek community. If I wanted to live near fast food, I would have done that. If I wanted to live near an area with potential for further commercial development, I easily could have done that in a different Nashville neighborhood. When I moved to Whites Creek, I loved, and still love, that Fontanel felt like the only true establishment in town. I love that the local post office has one lady working every day and she's been the same employee there for decades. This, among many other reasons, is what truly makes Whites Creek special. By altering the Community Plan now and permitting potential industrial development up Whites Creek Pike, we risk ruining what makes Whites Creek so special - the feel of a local, rural community. I hope you will and the entire planning Commission will agree.

I'd like to end this email with a quote that I read in a recent [Tennessean article](#) about why Millennials love Nashville: *"Interestingly, as much as millennials are into urban living and cultural pursuits, Nashville may also hold a long-term appeal in its suburbs and surrounding community. According to Morley Winograd, co-author of the book "Millennial Momentum: How a New Generation is Remaking America," surveys show that more than 40 percent of millennials believe that suburbs are still the best environment to raise children. That means as millennials age, they could opt to move away from the city center for a more family-centric environment."* You and I both know that people, Millennials specifically, are flooding to Nashville each day from all corners of the world. What current and future Nashvillians want and truly need is suburbs that are easy to call home - suburbs like Whites Creek as it exists today.

Thank you so much for your consideration and please don't hesitate to contact me personally if you'd like to discuss my thoughts more.

Sincerely,

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

Jenna Hokanson
6245 Del Sol Drive
Whites Creek, TN 37189

From: Lisa Proctor [mailto:ljproctor@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 9:28 PM
To: Grider, Anna (Planning); Planning Commissioners; Haywood, Brenda (Council Member)
Subject: Proposed commercial warehouse/commercial development in Whites Creek at Briley Parkway

Dear Ms. Grider, Planning Commissioners, and Ms. Haywood:

I am a resident of Whites Creek and I adamantly oppose the applicant developer's request for changes to the existing community plan, and oppose rezoning the subject tracts located at Whites Creek Pike and Briley Parkway to allow for 6 huge warehouses.

If anything should be built there, low density appropriate housing with some light commercial neighborhood service companies might be acceptable.

We are a small but strong community and will stand against inappropriate massive warehouses at the "gateway" to the beautiful scenic views afforded here. Light pollution, noise, congestion, runoff, and removal of the entire tree canopy does nothing to enhance our community, and especially adversely affects the neighbors in the immediate vicinity.

In addition, at the public meeting held May 28, planning staff stated that the need for signalization "already exists" at Whites Creek Pike ramps off Briley Parkway when residents raised questions about additional traffic concerns. I couldn't agree more. The traffic is very congested during peak times. Why haven't you installed signals if it is already an admitted need, prior to any future development in that area?

Please take my comments into consideration and make them a part of the record at the June 13 planning commission meeting. The future of our historic rural community depends on it.

Thank you for your time and service.

Best regards,
Lisa Proctor
4129 Dry Fork Rd.
Whites Creek, TN
615-812-5841

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

From: Gerard Callghan [mailto:g_callaghan@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 10:47 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Gerard Callghan
Subject: Whites Creek at Green Lane Commercial Development

I wanted to share my thoughts on the proposed development on Whites Creek Pike at Green Lane.

When I purchased my home in Parmley Cove 4 years ago, I researched the area and the Nashville Next Plan.

I fully expect the land at Greens Lane to be developed. In meeting with the developer I have come to the conclusion that this development does not meet any aspect of the neighborhood development plan calling for community services and residential development within a rural neighborhood.

The zone changes required under this SP development are too far off from the plan adopted with community input for Nashville Next. The expected commercial uses within the proposed warehouses is in direct conflict of the existing zoning and the community plan.

As a realtor I believe a property owner has the right to use their land within acceptable community guidelines. This proposed commercial development does not meet these guidelines.

A combined mixed use development along Whites Creek with shopping and services, condo or townhomes for workforce living with single family residential homes behind is a much better use of this land.

Gerard Callaghan
Bradford Real Estate
615-975-0285

ITEMS 13a: 2019CP-012-001—SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PLAN and 13b 2019-050-001 TUSCULUM HILLS

From: Jeff and Donna Sexton [mailto:djsexton@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 7:50 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to Case Number 2019CP-012-001

Please review attached opposition letter from Jeff and Donna Sexton, 5003 Crosby Lane.
Thank you

SEE ATTACHMENT ON FOLLOWING PAGE

May 30, 2019

Metropolitan Planning Commissioners:

Greg Adkins, Chairman

Jessica Farr, Vice Chairman

Lillian Blackshear

Jeff Haynes

Brian Tibbs

Ron Gobbell

Dr. Pearl Sims

Daveisha Moore

Councilman Fabian Bedne

Roe Oscar Elam, IV

RE: Case Number 2019CP-012-001

Commissioners, Councilman Bedne, Mr. Elam,

We live in the Fairlane Park Community at 5003 Crosby Lane, we own our home and have been in the community for almost 25 years. We are contacting you regarding the proposed development at 5009 Raywood Lane and a portion of 4930 Nolensville Pike.

Tuesday, May 28, we attended the community meeting at Tusculum Hills Baptist Church, a rendering of the development was made public. This development is massive in size, will require a zoning change and a change to the current community plan. No studies have been conducted to indicate what this development will have on the community regarding property values, infrastructure, traffic and the overall quality of life for residents.

Fairlane Park is currently zoned Single Family, changing the current zoning to SP will open the door to other commercial development, which would destroy our community. Tusculum Hills Baptist Church has purchased approximately 6 to 8 homes on Raywood Lane over the years for personal benefit. These single family, affordable homes were removed from the community. Approximately 6 years ago, the neighborhood association requested a traffic study from Collier Engineering and the outcome was approximately 1500 cars travel daily on Fairlane Drive and Strasser Drive. These two streets have become cut through street and are in the center of our community, and will only worsen with a development of this size. At the community meeting, representatives indicated commercial vehicles will travel on these roads. Many roads in the Fairlane Park community are in dire need of paving, I was told we were on a paving list, that was 24 years ago.

Allowing a zoning change to develop a 180 apartment units, four stories tall in the middle of a resident community is not the proper location for a development this size. We are a community of single family, affordable homes and we must maintain the current zoning and community plan for our community to thrive and be viable. We encourage homeownership and many young families have bought homes here, they walk, ride bikes with their children, they feel safe. Should the zoning change and this development be allowed, we are terribly afraid many homeowners will look for another place to call home.

Most of the residents in Fairlane Park are unaware of the proposed development and Tusculum Hills Baptist Church has not reached out to the community to discuss their concerns outside the public meeting, which was scheduled the day after a holiday. We personally spoke with Pastor Gunn and requested the church to do a mailing to the entire community. The question was asked in the meeting if they reached out to the residents, the response was, residents were notified by the Planning Commissions and a small portion of the community received notices in accordance with the guidelines established by the Commission to notify residents within a certain boundary.

We respectfully ask that you deny approval of this massive development to ensure the residents of Fairlane Park will not suffer a tremendous impact to their properties and the community as a whole.

With regards,
Jeff Sexton
Donna Sexton

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

From: Hilda Mathis [mailto:mhilda62@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:20 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Senior Living Development in Raywood

MPC Case #2019CP-012-001
May 30, 2019

Hilda Ann Mathis
310 Melpar Dr
Nashville TN 37211

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am a resident of Fairlane Park Neighborhood.

I'm writing to oppose the building of 180 unit Senior Living Center 4 story apartment complexes in my neighborhood. Allowing this to be built will only increase the congestion at Nolensville Rd, Fairlane onto Raywood..

Our neighborhood is looking to you for help in preventing this to happen.

This is my neighborhood and we don't need the traffic.

There are other properties on Nolensville Rd that would suffice instead of destroying homes in our residential area that could be used for affordable housing.

The proposed development is not sympathetic to this surrounding neighborhood and will devalue residential property values in the Fairlane Park Neighborhood. This development will have a huge impact on those who live here!

I ask that you please deny this variance for the sake of Fairlane Park Neighborhood and its residents

Thanks!
Hilda Ann Mathis

From: Jeannie [mailto:jeanniebracken@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:37 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Rezoning of Fairlane Park

Dear Commissioner and councilmen,

Greg Adkins - Chairman
Jessica Farr - Vice Chairman
Lillian Blackshear

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

Jeff Haynes
Brian Tibbs
Ron Gobbell
Dr. Pearl Sims
Daveisha Moore
Councilman Fabian Bedne
Roe Oscar Elam IV, Mayor's Representative

Regarding # 2019CP-012-001.

Please consider voting against rezoning the Fairlane Park Neighborhood. I'm concerned about how it adversely will go affect our neighborhood. More information and communication about this proposal should be given to the neighborhood in its entirety. Based on the little information I have, I'm concerned about the increase in traffic and decreasing property values. I do not see this as an improvement to our community.

Sincerely,
Jeannie Bracken

From: Collins, Shirley K [mailto:Shirley.Collins@mnps.org]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2019CP-012-001

To the Planning Commissioners:

Greg Adkins, Chairman; Jessica Farr, Vice Chairman; Lillian Blackshear; Jeff Haynes; Brian Tibbs; Ron Gobbell; Dr. Pearl Sims; Daveisha Moore; Councilman Fabian Bedne; Roe Oscar Elam IV, Mayor's Representative

Hello, my name is Shirley Collins. I'm a resident of Fairlane Park Neighborhood, having lived at 348 Melpar Drive for the past 36 years, raised my two children here, and sent them to Tusculum, McMurray, and Overton. When I moved here in November 1982, my house was 950 sq. ft. After remodeling and renovations, it is now 1676 sq. ft. with central hear/air; an additional bathroom, dishwasher, deck, flooring, new roofs, all new windows and doors; custom built kitchen cabinets, glass tile backsplash, quartz countertops, shiplap, flood lights, paint-inside/out, fenced back yard, and landscaping. Many other neighbors have, also, added square footage, upgrades, etc., all to improve the functionality, values, and appearances of our homes.

I'm asking you to please vote against #2019CP-012-001. Tusculum Baptist Church wants to build a 4 story 180 unit complex opening onto Raywood Lane which would require rezoning Fairlane Park Neighborhood from a single residence to SP. This would devalue our properties and trigger many families to sell their affordable homes which would likely become rental properties, increase traffic on

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

roads that are overdue to be repaved, ending the community of longevity which has built our Neighborhood Community. The kind that has been the backbone of Nashville.

Please vote, NO, to #2019CP-012-001. Thank you.

Shirley Collins
348 Melpar Drive
Nashville, TN 37211
7shirleycollins@gmail.com

ITEM 15: 2019SP-041-001—HAWKINS STREET

From: JOSH WHITMORE [<mailto:windeagleman@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2019 9:35 AM
To: Planning Staff
Subject: case 2019SP-041-001

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to you to ask.....no BEG.....you NOT to approve the plans this case 2019SP-041-001 proposes!

As a resident of 4810 Kentucky Ave, a mere block away from this proposed construction, I can assure you that this build would cause massive traffic congestion, and further deteriorate this neighborhood. PLEASE do not approve this abominable project!

Sincerely,

Joshua David Whitmore
4810 Kentucky Ave
37209

ITEM 22: 2019SP-053-001—SR RESIDENTIAL - ACKLEN PARK

From: Nathan DeWitt [<mailto:nathanpdewitt@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 6:27 PM
To: Planning Staff
Subject: Re: 106 Acklen Park Drive

Attention: This email originated from a source external to Metro Government. Please exercise caution when opening any attachments or links from external sources.

Please stop allowing these developers to ruin our city. I beg of you.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

Nathan DeWitt
Native Nashvillian

ITEM 34: 2019Z-100PR-001—3128 Elm Hill Pike and Elm Hill Pike (unnumbered)

From: Mary Cook [mailto:maryhaub@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 2:45 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Please Reject Rezone 2019Z-100PR-001

Dear Planning Commission,

Moments ago, I received a notice in the mail that there is a request to rezone a piece of single-family residential property to commercial. This piece of land is at 3128 Elm Hill Pike, and I have already contacted you all when a different rezoning request was made. I am writing to make sure you know the neighborhood does NOT support rezoning. We look forward to the day when someone sees the value of our neighborhood and can work within the current zoning. The case number is 2019Z-100PR-001. Please do what you can to represent us in this bid to change the character of our neighborhood.

Thanks!

Kindly,

Mary F. Cook
Cedar Ridge Road, 37214

From: Sullivan, Deborah (Planning)
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 12:34 PM
To: Swaggart, Jason (Planning); Planning Commissioners
Subject: case 2019Z-100PR-001

Good Afternoon,

A customer (did not leave her name or number) called on 5/20/19 to state her strong opposition for case 2019Z-100PR-001. She stated traffic is already bad in the area and they do not need commercial business added to the mix, especially since it is mainly residential.

This case is scheduled for the 6/13/19 MPC meeting.

Sincerely,

Deborah Sullivan, Planner II
Metro Planning Department
800 2nd Avenue South/PO Box 196300

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

Nashville, TN 37219-6300

planningstaff@nashville.gov

615-862-7190

From: Don Gillette [mailto:don@dongillette.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 1, 2019 1:35 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Mendes, Bob (Council Member); Huezo, Holly (Council Member)
Subject: Case No. 2019Z-100PR-001

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the case noted in the subject line above.

You have received a request to re-zone 3128 Elm Hill Pike and (unnumbered) Elm Hill Pike from Single Family Residential zoning to a Commercial Service zoning.

Elm Hill Pike cannot possibly handle any more traffic than it currently has. Beginning at Bell Road, Elm Hill Pike is 4-lanes. From there, it narrows into 2-lanes crossing I-40 and then goes to 3-lanes as it approaches Donelson Pike. Every morning and afternoon, traffic is bottle-necked at the I-40 overpass and backed up in both directions by at least 2 miles. It is so bad that residents cannot even get out of their subdivisions.

Council District 13 is currently being over-built to such a degree that infrastructure will never catch up and re-zoning this land, intended for single family homes, to allow for a commercial service is going to make Elm Hill Pike even more of a nightmare and will result in ruining the quality of life for every voter who lives in the area.

Regards,

Donald W. Gillette

3449 White Pine Drive

Nashville, TN 37214

<http://www.dongillette.com>

From: Sharon Melman [mailto:sharon.melman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 3:06 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Case No. 2019Z-100PR-001

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the case noted in the subject line above.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through June 7, 2019

You have received a request to re-zone 3128 Elm Hill Pike and (unnumbered) Elm Hill Pike from Single Family Residential zoning to a Commercial Service zoning.

Elm Hill Pike cannot possibly handle any more traffic than it currently has. Beginning at Bell Road, Elm Hill Pike is 4-lanes. From there, it narrows into 2-lanes crossing I-40 and then goes to 3-lanes as it approaches Donelson Pike. Every morning and afternoon, traffic is bottle-necked at the I-40 overpass and backed up in both directions by at least 2 miles. It is so bad that residents cannot even get out of their subdivisions.

Council District 13 is currently being over-built to such a degree that infrastructure will never catch up and re-zoning this land, intended for single family homes, to allow for a commercial service is going to make Elm Hill Pike even more of a nightmare and will result in ruining the quality of life for every voter who lives in the area.

From: Russ Bradford [mailto:j.russell.bradford@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 11:08 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Vote No on Case #2019Z-100ER-001 at 0 Elm Hill Pike 37214

I am emailing today to ask that you vote no on Case #2019Z-100ER-001. This property was zoned RS10 and agreed upon by the community years ago. There have been no community meetings or involvement in this project to get neighborhood input. Our community is tired of being left out of the planning and zoning process. We value the character and integrity of our neighborhood and want developers to understand we do not like being ignored. By going through with this zoning change, the committee will be violating the agreement reached when this land was originally zoned to RS10.

We, as a community, ask that the Committee disapprove this request and advise the parties involved to come to talk to the community, as we will be the ones directly impacted.

Thank you,

James "Russ" Bradford
1328 Quail Valley Rd, 37214

From: Mary Cook [mailto:maryhaub@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 4:30 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Huezo, Holly (Council Member)
Subject: Case 2019Z-100PR-001 - PLEASE REJECT!

Hi planning commission and Councilwoman Huezo,

I am a resident in Ms. Huezo's district with two small children, and the thought of rezoning parcels 053, 337 from it's current residential zoning fills me with reservations. Elm Hill Pike is already busy and has become unsafe for young residents due to lack of sidewalks. The daycare currently adjoining the parcels

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items

Received through June 7, 2019

in question offers little safety for those children. Building commercial, rather than single family homes as current zoning permits, jeopardizes family safety further. We do not need more traffic on this road. We need the safety and quietness of this residential area preserved. Please REJECT all attempts at changing the current zoning on this property and put CURRENT RESIDENTS first. We are the reason Nashville is attractive to so many. Please help us keep it that way.

I would love to be at the planning commission meeting to make my voice heard in person, but the 4 pm time does not work for my small children. Please receive this email with all the vehemence and fervor I intend.

Kindly,

Mary F. Cook
Cedar Ridge Road
Nashville, 37214

From: Andrea Reynolds [mailto:redhead_girl98@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 5:36 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2019Z-100PR-001

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to oppose the request to change 3128 Elm Hill Pike & a second unnumbered lot to commercial zoning. With the exception of a daycare, the area surrounding these lots are residential, in a "neighborhood maintenance" area according to Nashville Next. Although the purported use for the property is a school for the carpenters' union, the application doesn't appear to preclude any other allowed commercial use. Furthermore, it appears that the sale has not been finalized yet. The seller could back out of the contract and sell it for any other commercial purpose if approved.

This area is adjacent to the bottleneck at the bottom of Elm Hill Pike at Patio Drive, which backs up in the morning due to:

- 1) narrowing from four lanes to two lanes;
- 2) a stoplight at McCrory Creek (which I can only describe as "overcontrolled" for the traffic that it lets out); and
- 3) school buses that stop traffic at Terrace Park Apartments and load/unload around 30 students at a time.

I live at the top of Elm Hill at White Pine, and the traffic can back up as far as the daycare, which causes shortcutting through the neighborhoods from Trails End to Timber Valley and difficulty with left hand turns from all side streets onto Elm Hill. In the afternoon from 4:30-6, traffic going toward Bell Rd is backed up and comes to a full stop somewhere between McCrory Creek & Donelson Pike.

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through June 7, 2019**

I am also concerned about the future of the defunct “Buchanan Pointe” at McCrory Creek, which was approved for a large office/shopping complex about 10 years ago. To the best of my understanding, it seems that work could begin at any time.

The method of approving applications and then trying to solve traffic problems with stoplights and all-way stops is irresponsible and inconsiderate to the people who already live here. Please do not recommend approval of this zoning change.

Sincerely,

Andrea K. Reynolds
3412 White Pine Drive
37214

From: lindanance0007@comcast.net [mailto:lindanance0007@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 1:41 PM

To: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); lee.jones@nashville.gov; Leeman, Bob (Planning); Planning Staff; Huezo, Holly (Council Member)

Subject: 2019Z-11PR-001 June 13 2019 4P Patio Drive L Nance official input & request to participate online

Importance: High

Attached and below. Also how may I participate online?

SEE ATTACHMENT ON FOLLOWING PAGE

Metro Planning

Yet again you are knowingly holding this meeting during normal working hours when you know a majority of owners will NOT be able to get off work to attend.

Consider my previous correspondence (confirmed as received) with one herein as my official input

regarding your forcing of 2019Z-11PR-001 & all subesequent atempts to force additional development in our area.

Linda Nance

**06-06-19 1:15 P
103 N Timber Dr 37214
Sole Owner
Primary Mortgage**

Same arguments. There is too much, unbearable traffic congestion as it is.

Why do you insist on putting more people on already severely congested roads?

You all must get a percentage, a bonus, kickbacks or something because you sure are relentlessly persistent.

Please stop (cease & desist) trying to force more building on Elm Hill, Donelson Pike, Stewarts Ferry, and etc.

All of those tiny tall homes have added to the traffic congestion and will be worthless when the market stabilizes again. Many will suffer the traffic congestion in the meantime.

Linda Nance BBA, RN 103 N Timber Dr. 37214

A request to rezone from RS10 to CS zoning for properties located at 3128 Elm Hill Pike and Elm Hill Pike (unnumbered), approximately 730 feet east of Patio Drive (6.21 acres), requested by Midsouth Carpenters Regional Council Training Trust, applicant; Gregg and Susan Eatherly, owners.

RS10 Zoning: Low-medium density residential, requiring a minimum of 10,000 square foot lot and intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 3.7 dwelling units per acre.

CS Zoning: Commercial service is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, office, new auto sales, self-storage, light manufacturing and small warehouse uses.

Metro Planning Commission Public Hearing:

The Metro Planning Commission will hold a **public hearing** on the case identified below on **June 13, 2019**, at 4:00 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter at the Sonny West Conference Center (First Floor), 700 2nd Ave S. Interested persons may speak at this hearing to give reason or show cause why the change should or should not be made.

Case 2019Z-100PR-001

Map 108, Parcel(s) 053, 337
Subarea 14, Donelson - Hermitage - Old Hickory (2004)
Council District 13 (Holly Huevo)



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT
OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY
Planning Department, Metro Office Building
800 Second Avenue South
P.O. Box 196300
Nashville, Tennessee 37219-6300
www.nashville.gov

METRO PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF A ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Comments on June 13, 2019 MPC Agenda Items
Received through June 7, 2019

ITEM 40: 2019Z-109PR-001—TREVOR STREET (UNNUMBERED)

From: Michael Fisher [mailto:fishermichaelp@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 5:52 PM

To: Rickoff, Abbie (Planning)

Subject: 2019Z-109PR-001 Zoning Change Request

Ms. Rickoff,

We received notice of this request for a zoning change from residential to commercial. My neighbors and I along 33rd Avenue North strongly oppose this change. All of the single family homes on our street were built with skyline views. The owner of the property appears to be requesting the zoning change in an attempt to increase the value of the property they are attempting to sell at the adjacent parcel 09209037800. There is no valid basis to convert this property from R6 to CS. Aside from the parcels along Charlotte Ave., this is meant to be a residential neighborhood. Please let me know the status of this request, the likelihood of success, and the process going forward. Thank you.

--

Michael P. Fisher, Esq.

408A 33rd Ave N, Nashville, TN 37209