

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Item 7: 2019Z-017TX-001 – ZONING CODE AMENDMENT

From: Carol W. Williams [mailto:wachtel@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 2:33 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Withers, Brett (Council Member); Freddie.O'Connel@nashville.gov
Subject: Please vote no to 2019-7

Planning Commission;

Please no more STR variables until the system has the staff to force compliance to existing STRs under current laws. Let's get our act together before adding to this citywide problem. Please vote no on 2019-7.

Carol Williams
800 Russell Street
37206

From: Raphaela Keohane [mailto:raekeo@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 4:13 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Murphy, Kathleen (Council Member)
Subject: RE:BL2019-7

To all Planning Commission and Ms. Murphy

I am writing to ask you to oppose this zoning bill proposed by Councilman O'Connell.

Current ordinance: For duplexes, only ONE STR permit is available per lot.

CM O'Connell's proposed ordinance, BL-2019-7: TWO owner-occupied STR permits would be allowed (one for each homeowner), provided the respective owner **claims to reside** in the unit where the permit is issued. In essence, so long as the homeowner **purports** to reside on his "half" of the duplex, he can get a permit. There would be no more maximum of 1 STR permit per lot.

This would open the door for *even more short-term rentals in neighborhoods*. Enforcement of owner occupancy is already a huge challenge for the Codes Dept.

In addition it would continue to erode Nashville's housing stock in favor of vacation rentals. The Codes Dept. is already struggling with enforcement of owner-occupancy.

There are numerous reports of owner-occupied STR permits being issued to people who do not reside on the property. This bill would add to the many existing enforcement challenges.

Please do not permit this zoning change to pass and further destroy Nashville neighborhoods.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Thanks for your time and attention.

Raphaela (Rae) Keohane
117 30th Ave N Apt 402
Nashville TN 37203
615 964 7804

From: Logan Key [mailto:keylogan@icloud.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 8:17 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: OPPOSE BL2019-7

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I reside at 1411 Fatherland St. in Nashville on property zoned R6. This part of Nashville has one of the highest concentrations of vacation rentals in Nashville. BL2019-7, sponsored by CM O'Connell would directly impact the neighborhood in which I reside.

BL2019-7 constitutes the latest effort to expand the use of short-term rental properties in our residential zones. "Short-Term Rental Properties" are most often used by vacationers in lieu of traditional venues like hotels. This land-use provides no meaningful benefit to the residential community in Nashville and does not support the collective aspiration to expand our local housing stock.

BL2019-7 would increase the maximum number of vacation rental permits available on a duplex lot. Currently the cap is 1 permit per duplex lot. This bill would permit each side of a duplex to obtain a permit.

This is highly problematic as our Codes Department ALREADY struggles to adequately enforce the requirement for owner-occupancy of short-term rentals. Our current ordinance is much too lax with respect to proof of owner occupancy.

Any expansion of available STRP permits should be halted until the owner occupancy rule either 1) becomes better enforced, and/or 2) undergoes a revision to ensure the general welfare is protected by requiring the owner-occupant to be present on site when a room-night is sold.

The Planning Commission is entrusted with the duty to ensure our community planning goals are prioritized. This bill fails to promote conservation of residential housing and fails to provide a community benefit.

Please vote NO.

Sincerely,
Logan Key
1411 Fatherland St.
Nashville, TN 37206
PH. 615-290-0280

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

From: LeAnne Péters [mailto:leanne.peters55@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:24 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Please oppose BL2019-7

We need to preserve Nashville's neighborhoods.

LeAnne Péters
37215

From: Ann Roberts [mailto:avroberts210@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:35 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: NO, please, on BL-2019-7

Dear Commissioners,

Please vote no on this bill that would allow more than 1 STR permit on a property. We all know how difficult STRs are to enforce. We all know that many permits for owner-occupied STRs are in the hands of investors, not owners who live there. Please do not allow the draining of more affordable housing units.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Ann Roberts
District 23

From: Billy Nobel [mailto:billynobel@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 9:02 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE Zoning Bill BL2019-7

Dear council members,

Please OPPOSE Zoning Bill BL2019-7 because it would continue to erode Nashville's housing stock in favor of vacation rentals. The Codes Dept. is already struggling with enforcement of owner-occupancy. There are numerous reports of owner-occupied STR permits being issued to people who do not reside on the property. This bill would add to the many existing enforcement challenges.

Thank you

Billy Nobel
6528 Melinda Dr
West Meade

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

From: J Garr [mailto:jgarrett244@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member); Withers, Brett (Council Member)
Subject: please disapprove 2019-7 // duplex STR permits

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Duplex housing is often offered as a way to increase the supply of housing and respond to needs for having more affordable housing. That this could more easily be allowed for STR permits is a little alarming. There are a number of gaps still existing and well identified in current STR legislation delineating good faith usage and it would seem prudent to fix those prior to opening further options.

I'd suggest that if this is opened further, especially in the prevalence of owner-occupied permits not really being enforced or verifiable as it enters the legal domain, that **you'll see owners of the other half of duplexes rapidly leaving the property, selling, and now an investor will be buying a second duplex half**, permitting this through the broken system as it exists, and now a full duplexed house will be unavailable during our housing crisis.

Planning should provide more details on numerous data points relevant to the consideration of increasing STR allowances :

- 1 - the backlog of enforcement; which is documented to be as long as 4 months and of course single complaints are no longer legitimate at that time; thus complaints can't exist.
- 2 - the prevalence of Owner Occupied permits and the degree to which they are both non-fake and also being used in good faith of the generous current allotment. There are no legal show-Cause conditions currently allowing for inspection.
- 3 - equity issues that result in devaluing a property by buying half and converting it into a hotel with no enforcement or real residency requirements. There are cases of people unable to sell their duplex due to it being adjacent to an STR.
- 4 - an assessment of how HOAs have been enforced or verified when owners are stating their HPRs are not in compliance. There are numerous examples of permitted properties running in violation of their HOAs.
- 5 - already looking at existing prevalence of OO permits in different council districts. Or an assessment of the illegally operating AirBnBs.
- 6 - grandfathering concerns via state legislation if this is passed.

We just saw a few months ago well-funded investors are very agile to acquire and build more expensive multi-family housing. Do we really think they wouldn't be targeting even more accessible housing stocks with the same intention? Are we suggesting a new potential consequence for upzoning in certain areas? Now instead of a maximum of 12 guests on a parcel, we can accommodate 24?

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Please do not let this even advance to Metro Council for consideration without further data analysis and impact study, or help mandate a higher vote count. We see a lot (majority) of OO properties operating in bad-faith- making it even more accessible to duplexed properties is not good planning. There are already housing sale marketing campaigns suggesting that a mortgage can be paid through its AirBnB usage. This discourages neighbor presence and investing in our community.

Sincerely,

Jason Garrett

1508 Sevier Ct, 37206., district 6.

Shelby Hills Neighborhood

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Item 9: 2019S-198-001 – 542 CROLEY DRIVE

From: Kristen Heering [<mailto:kristen.heering@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 1:04 PM

To: Planning Staff

Subject: Case No: 2019S-198-001

RE: Re-Subdivision of Lot # 40, Block E Public Hearing

542 Croley Drive

To Whom it may Concern,

Thank you for taking the time to allow people who are unable to attend the meetings, to be able to email you their concerns.

I am against the re-subdivision of this lot. There comes a point when development starts to take precedence over the sanctity of the existing neighborhood. While I realize that change is upon all of us, I also know that it's up to the community to voice their concerns for their way of life.

I vote **NO** on this case.

Thank you!

Kristen Heering

From: gwe31 [<mailto:gwe31@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 7:29 PM

To: Planning Staff

Subject: Fwd: Rezoning hearing on 10/23

I omitted the following:

Case Number is 2019S-198-001

RE-SUBDIVISION OF LOT #40, BLOCK E Public Hearing: Open ON THE PLAN OF CROLEYWOOD,

SECTION II Council District 20 (Mary Carolyn Roberts) Staff Reviewer: Joren Dunnavant

This property rezoning was presented at our neighborhood association as a request to allow 3 homes at 542 Croley Dr. The association didn't approve the request. Now they're asking to put 4 homes on the property. Why would they be allowed to put 4 when their request for 3 was rejected?

I'm asking you to reject their second attempt at over-building this property. This is in an area designated as "maintain." Please vote to maintain the area and follow the decision of the neighborhood association.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Kindest regards,

Gail England

P.S. It is unfair and a conflict of interest to allow Councilwoman Mary Carolyn Roberts to petition for approval since she is employed by the real estate company representing the land owner.

From: MALLORY MARLIN [mailto:mallory.marlin@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 8:00 PM
To: Planning Staff
Subject: Case Number is 2019S-198-001

Please be advised that I am opposed to the above proposal. Please remember our current infrastructure was accomplished in the 50's, 60's and 70's designed for one structure per building lot.

Case Number is 2019S-198-001

RE-SUBDIVISION OF LOT #40, BLOCK E Public Hearing: Open ON THE PLAN OF CROLEYWOOD,

SECTION II Council District 20 (Mary Carolyn Roberts) Staff Reviewer: Joren Dunnivant

A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 542 Croley Drive, at the northeast corner of Croley Drive and Columbia Avenue, zoned R8 (0.43 acres), requested by Clint T. Elliott Survey, applicant; Genetta Lafferty and Thomas Horton, owners.

From: Ladonna Cooper [mailto:ladonnacooper@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:47 AM
To: Planning Staff
Subject: 2019S-198-001

I would like to voice my opposition to the above case number being approved. I understand it will be considered tomorrow afternoon.

Sincerely,
Ladonna Cooper
305 Errol Lane
Nashville. 37209

From: TONI ROTHFUSS [mailto:rothfuss@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:11 AM
To: Planning Staff
Cc: Dunnivant, Joren (Planning); chuck; mjhngracie@gmail.com
Subject: 542 Croley/Columbia 2019S198-001

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

I want to vote against allowing this lot to be divided again to allow four building sites. We understand and appreciate the new growth and development; however, we don't want to cram building on these lots.

Additionally:

The City has cut our traffic flow off of this area due to the interstate and has not opened new routes out, we have a huge traffic burden.

When they did the new Briley Passover, they closed the 46th Avenue Exit slowing down flow which was a huge change to our connection to Charlotte and Sylvan Park. The I-40 interstate already cuts all our streets all the way down Charlotte and the flow in our neighborhood is not good. It is getting worse with doubling/tripling the number of homes in our area.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Item 15: 2019M-032AG-001 – ROSE PARK

From: Joe Staler [mailto:joe@aloharadiant.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 10:57 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form.

The 2nd floor of this proposed building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

Respectfully,

Joe Staler
President of Hospitality Control Solutions
1301 8th Ave S
Business Owner and Coach in Edgehill

Joe Staler

From: tiffany@aloharadiant.com [mailto:tiffany@aloharadiant.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 2:33 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form.

The 2nd floor of this proposed building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

Respectfully,

Tiffany Fox
Marketing
1301 8th Ave S

My company is in Edgehill and I work with the Edgehill community
Hospitality Control Solutions
<http://www.alohancr.com>

From: Rachel Zijlstra [mailto:rachelz@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 3:32 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Kempf, Lucy (Planning)
Subject: Public land should be for public use.

Dear Commissioners,

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form. While there are numerous egregious issues with the lease amendment, I want to draw your attention to a serious land use problem.

The 2nd floor of this proposed building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

While I can see the benefit of access to an indoor batting facility for MNPS students, there's no such benefit obtained through private offices for Belmont University staff.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

Respectfully,

Rachel Tapper Zijlstra
Edgehill Resident & Leader

From: Emily Greble [mailto:emilygreble@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 4:07 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Please vote no on Belmont's Public land grab

Dear Commissioners,

re: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I am so tired of writing emails asking this city to protect our public lands, but here is yet another example of the egregious behavior of a past administration haunting current Nashvilleans and giving away our precious urban resources.

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form. While there are numerous egregious issues with the lease amendment, I want to draw your attention to a serious land use problem that violates the public trust.

The 2nd floor of this proposed building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

While I can see the benefit of access to an indoor batting facility for MNPS students, there's no such benefit obtained through private offices for Belmont University staff.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

Respectfully,
Emily Greble
1443 14th Ave South

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

From: Pam Hopkins [mailto:phopkins4619@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 4:41 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2019M-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

I'm in opposition to this lease because it is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

Pam Hopkins
1900 Acklen Ave

From: Sutton, Angela C. [mailto:angela.c.sutton@Vanderbilt.Edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 5:20 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to oppose Belmont University's lease and construction of the public land in Rose Park.

My name is Dr. Angela Sutton, and I am a historian working as a postdoctoral fellow at Vanderbilt University. Through my work with the Friends of Fort Negley, I have become an avid supporter of public lands for public use. It is my understanding that the ball fields at Rose Park are currently being used by baseball teams made up of the children in the historic Edgehill community, and that they will no longer have a space for sports recreation if Belmont is allowed to build.

As you may be aware, the historian Dr. Bobby Lovett's book on Nashville neighborhoods traces the origins of the historic Edgehill community to Fort Negley. This means that the ancestors of the children who use Rose Park worked that land, and built all of the military forts, including Fort Morton, which now is the land upon which Rose Park was built. They did this while enslaved, without pay, and their descendants were never compensated for it. The thought that the city could sell this land out from under them without going through appropriate inquiries leaves a bad taste in my mouth and will be judged harshly by historians of the future.

Public lands are for public use. Rose Park is being used by the public, and allowing Belmont to build on this land would take away something that means very much to a large group of underprivileged children, to give to a smaller group of students who have other means and avenues to success through the distinguished programming of Belmont University. I urge you to do the right thing and allow the Edgehill Neighborhood the time they ask to present their case to you.

Sincerely,

Angela Sutton (she/her)
Postdoctoral Fellow, College of Arts & Sciences

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Director, Fort Negley Descendants Project
<https://wp0.vanderbilt.edu/fndp/>
Vanderbilt University

From: Alice Rolli [mailto:aliceanna@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 7:11 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Kempf, Lucy (Planning)
Subject: Edgehill Resident - Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commissioners & Director Kempf:

Thank you for your service to our community. Given the increasing development pressures in Edgehill (as you know, we are an IMBY Neighborhood - In My Backyard - we have supported a lot of the great work outlined in the Nashville Next plan to increase density along all of the transit corridors and to push for affordable housing, increased density for apartments and offices, etc). The execution of strong land planning has led to a more vibrant, mixed-income neighborhood which is a real treat to live in and raise a family.

However, today we in Edghill find ourselves again writing to ask that you protect public land for the public benefit for which it was intended. This work has been traditionally bound to the parks department (of note, in the early work on Ft. Negley a fascinating thing happened - the up-zoning by 300+ housing units of open space, without your input!...but that chapter is behind us).

In my volunteer advocacy and work on Ft. Negley, I came to understand from former Councilman Ronnie Greer the challenges that neighborhood parkland has faced for many many years.

The issue before you today is an outgrowth of all of that work - the removal of the batting cages from Ft. Negley, and the movement of all of the land to private use for Belmont - all of that was negotiated at the same time as the public parkland of Ft. Negley was protected. It was done with a promise that no more public land would be taken away.

The issue before you is a continuation of that challenge -- when, and for what purpose, can public land be leased or sold to a private entity? This issue of private office space on public parkland was ended when it became clear it wasn't a batting cage, but significant office space, that Belmont was trying to build.

I implore you to hold the line - a batting cage is a batting cage. A batting cage isn't 2 stories of office space. Don't be fooled.

This is only coming before you now because we successfully defeated this issue with the parkland. They (Belmont) didn't want to accept the decision to allow a replacement of the Greer-stadium batting cage

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

and build a batting cage. They instead found another door to walk through to attempt to build private offices on public land. This time, MNPS property. Here, Belmont has again tried to negotiate a below-market lease of of public land for private use. This time is it school land. But in the end, it is public land. The public said no before and was supported by the parks department. The public needs to be heard again, and be supported by the planning commission.

I agree that Belmont has done a lot of good for Nashville. But Belmont has also benefitted, substantially, as well, from gifts of land and land use policy. Just because a corporate citizen makes a gift, we don't stop collecting taxes or water bills. Their generosity ought not come with strings that make you feel you need to do something you wouldn't do for any other private entity asking you to lease public land for private use. If the use is private, get market rate, at minimum.

The cost of acquiring the public land Belmont has taken over for athletic facilities would far eclipse the marginal cost of educating a few additional students at the school - and those past actions shouldn't be conflated in the issue here before you, of Appropriate Land Use. (As an aside, as a neighbor I don't feel welcome to use the track, the gates are closed it would require me jumping over to be allowed to run laps there)

I urge you to consider this issue before you. Conflating past promises with this new request isn't appropriate. Because Belmont negotiated a below-market deal 10 years ago doesn't mean you need to support that, again, here.

The city is broke.

If you are going to acquiesce and allow a long term lease on this land to a private institution for private use, be sure you get a private market rate. Employ a realtor who can help you maximize the value to we, the citizens. If we are going to break longstanding public policy for land use, again, be sure the price is worth it to deter the next attempted land grab. Additional points to consider, which I imagine you will receive several times over, are delineated below.

Ask Belmont to build a 1 story batting cage with a single, open, first floor meeting room for the team practice and coaches meeting room. Let the university find space for private offices on their privately owned land. The school has a massive institutional overlay and I'm sure can find room for their executive offices within their campus.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Alice Ganier Rolli

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

1400 Villa Place
Nashville, TN 37212
District 17 / Edgehill

- 1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
- 2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.
- 3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.
- 4) If this lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

--

Alice Rolli
Phone: 202 494 3957

From: James Dark [mailto:jdaviddark@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 7:48 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commission,

This is David Dark writing to express my opposition to to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11). I understand that the building Belmont plans to undertake will benefit the Edgehill community to a degree, but the 2nd floor existing solely for Belmont's use strikes me as inappropriate for a building on public land. I also worry about public land being leased below market value for uses that don't benefit all Nashville taxpayers.

Thank you for your time and attention,

David Dark
919 Bradford Avenue
Nashville, TN 37204

From: Allison Schachter [mailto:allisonschachter@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 7:49 PM

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: re: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form. This has moved forward with no community input. The land being leased is below market rate. The use of the land is for private gain. There is no clear community benefit to justify this decision. There is NO public access to the 2nd floor of the building. The second floor will NOT serve MNPS students. Finally Belmont is a private religious institution that DISCRIMINATES ON THE BASIS OF RELIGION.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

There must be community meetings to discuss this decision with full transparency.

Respectfully,

Allison Schachter
1022 Villa Place
37212

From: Ben Tran [mailto:benvutran@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 10:04 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: No to Belmont's Use of Public Land: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

re: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment in its current form. While there are numerous egregious issues with the lease amendment, I want to draw your attention to a serious land use problem.

The 2nd floor of this proposed building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

While I can see the benefit of access to an indoor batting facility for MNPS students, there's no such benefit obtained through private offices for Belmont University staff.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution.

Respectfully,
Ben Tran

1022 Villa Pl.
Nashville, TN 37212

From: Michael Rolli [mailto:michael@rolliman.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 10:52 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Kempf, Lucy (Planning)
Subject: Opposition to BL2019-11

Dear Planning Commissioners

I implore you oppose Bill BL-2019-11. The bill before you enables the serious misuse of public resources and sets a precedent for the further squandering of the city's assets at a time that Metro finds itself perpetually short on cash and struggles to meet its basic needs due to budget shortfalls.

The proposed building allows for public land to be used *exclusively* by a private institution. According to the amendment, the second floor of the 'batting cage' will serve neither MNPS students nor our Edgehill community.

At best, Metro will be getting ripped off by allowing a private institution to build private facilities on public land at a price far, far below the land's market value. This is a steal for Belmont. The public benefit provided by indoor batting cages pales in comparison to the value of the land grab this bill enables.

Belmont is an asset to our small community and Metro Nashville as a whole. My family is fortunate to live in its shadow. Affection for a local business, however, is not grounds for the privatization of public land at an unfair price. Furthermore, this is not the first time they have disproportionately benefitted from a below market deal and, should they succeed in this effort, I can assure you it won't be the last. Where do we draw the line?

Finally, Belmont is a religious organization. Private religious institutions are free to discriminate on the basis of religion. Such discrimination is antithetical to the principles of Metro Nashville and MNPS and such a deal should be a non-starter.

I urge you reflect on these arguments as you ponder the issue before you. Thank you for serving our community and shouldering the responsibility of being a custodian of the public interest.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Respectfully,

Michael Rolli
District 17 / Edgehill Resident
1400 Villa Place
Nashville, TN 37212

From: Dick Williams [mailto:dick206@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 11:42 PM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Commissioners:

As a friend of and church member in the Edgehill neighborhood, I am opposed to this development as a negative precedent for allowing public land to be leased, especially at below market value, where the lessee (religious or not) has control of access or use.

Thank you,

Dick Williams
2319 Selma Avenue
Nashville, TN 37214

From: CYNTHIA MATTHEWS [mailto:ceci1825@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 12:01 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Case Number 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the grant of an easement on the MNPS property "occupied by the Rose Park Magnet Middle School" to permit the erection of a 2-story "batting cage" for the practically exclusive use of one of Nashville's many institutions of higher learning. Among the many objections that I have to this change in land use is that it sets an untenable precedent for exchanging public land at far less than its fair market value to a private institution. If this institution is permitted to erect, and, control, a building on the public land in question for its own use for an extremely protracted period of time - 50 years; what is to prohibit other similarly situated institutions from using the easement granted under this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as a springboard for seeking to expand their "campuses" in a similar manner.

My second concern stems directly from the first in that the second floor of the planned structure violates public land use policy in that it will be almost completely, if not, exclusively occupied by entities of the private institution. It appears that youth school and recreational teams may have some access to the actual batting cage on the ground floor for skills practice, but will not have use of the upper floor.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Other concerns that I wish to raise are not focused on bashing the higher education institution in question because this conversion of public land would not be possible if the City negotiators involved in these two agreements had been more careful to assure that value to be received by the City was equal to, or at least closer, to the value that was being given away. There is also a need for better accounting for funds or other value received by the community and the City. In terms of the scholarships to be granted under the terms of the original lease, the University could and should be doing much more to ensure that students are able to qualify for the scholarships through tutoring or other academic assistance from Elementary or at least Middle School through High School. It clearly has an excellent mechanism for providing such in kind value. It remains unclear how many such scholarships have actually been provided to youth residing in Edgehill since the origination of the lease.

There is also a provision in the new MOU that says the annual payment of \$35,000.00 to support the "extended learning site" at Rose Park (whatever that actually means) will be reduced to \$20,000.00 if Metro adopts an operating budget that includes funding for Saturday operating hours at one or more of Metro's neighborhood park community centers. The described possible Metro funding is not specific to the Rose Park neighborhood community center, which is, of course, the specific recipient of the University's annual payment. In addition, there is no escalator clause for the annual payment during the term of the 50 year lease - a period of time during which the value of the easement can soar in value. Public land continues to be turned over to this private institution for much less than its real value. Despite the lack of parity in the agreement, the MOU permits the University to determine the organization which should receive the funding - RBI baseball, a citywide organization. It is odd that this organization is earmarked to receive funds despite the fact that the Edgehill community in which the Park and School that are the subjects of these agreements, has not yet had the opportunity to consider this matter publicly. A great deal of final negotiating and execution of agreements has already taken place, although no input from the community is being sought until October 26th and October 29th, well after the fact.

I implore your careful consideration of what is being done in these transactions and, as persons charged with land use regulation in Metro, carefully consider voting to oppose this distortion of the City's land use policy. I am sure that that you have the same interest as the Edgehill community and other neighborhoods in preserving our public land, especially, the green spaces that provide an irreplaceable amenity in any neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Clark Matthews

From: Andy Harding [mailto:jandrewharding@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 1:28 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

To Whom It May Concern:

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

I am writing in opposition to Belmont University building an athletic facility on public land. As a graduate of Belmont, I am ashamed of my alma mater's entitled actions with regard to the Rose Park and MNPS property. Belmont requested to build the facility on Metro Parks land and that plan was rejected by the neighborhood as well as the Metro Council. Now they deceptively gained approval to build on MNPS land without approval from Metro Council or the neighborhood. I am very disappointed in the Metro Board of Education for approving this land grab without any input from the community or discussion of the long-term consequences and precedent for such an action.

Furthermore, my daughter attends Rose Park Middle Magnet and they do not even have a formal outdoor recreation space. For recess, the students play in one of the open lots across Olympic St or 9th Ave from the school. A wealthy private university is taking away land from a public middle school for its own use. The development and use of this land should be wholly determined by the government and citizens of Nashville for their benefit. Please reject Belmont University's request to build on Metro Nashville Public School property. This land is precious and our students deserve better than their campus to be given away to satiate the needs of a private university's athletic program.

Sincerely,
Andy Harding
2617 W. Linden Ave
Nashville, TN 37212

For the record:

- 1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
- 2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.
- 3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.
- 4) If this lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

--

Andy Harding
andyhardingart.com
@andyhardingart

From: Joyce Harris [mailto:jnixharris@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 5:12 AM

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

I oppose BL2019-11 because the second floor of the proposed structure for construction will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

Sincerely,

Joyce N. Harris
1401 Tremont Street
Nashville, TN 37212

From: Caesar Harris, III [mailto:harrisiicaesar@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 5:20 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to

2019M-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

I am opposed to BL2019-11 because if the proposed lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Caesar Harris, III
1401 Tremont Street
Nashville, TN 37212

From: Valencia Maddox [mailto:valenciamaddox@ymail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 6:49 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because our city Government should not be giving away public land to accommodate a private institution.

From: Pippa Holloway [mailto:pippa.holloway@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:16 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Cc: CBUGGS@mnps.org; GentryforDistrict1@outlook.com; elrodforSchools@gmail.com; jill.speering@mnps.org; anna.shepherd@mnps.org; franbush5@gmail.com; virginia.pupowalker@mnps.org; amy.frogge@mnps.org
Subject: Rose Park school property issue

Dear Planning Commission,

I'm writing about the leasing of some of the property at Rose Park school to Belmont University. I'm a long time resident of Nashville and lived in 12S for over a decade though I live in East Nashville now. I've watched the Edgehill neighborhood transform in complicated ways, but in ways that certainly have resulted in the displacement of many families who lived in that area for decades, if not generations, but can no longer afford to live there. Land there is now at a premium, as you well know.

I am very concerned about the decision to allow Belmont University to lease a sizeable portion of Rose Park school's property. I am particularly concerned that this lease seems to be at well below market value. This property is public land that belongs to all the residents of the neighborhood and the city. It should not be handed over lightly to a private university.

Belmont has apparently pledged to allow some degree of neighborhood use on this property, a pledge I find doubtful. Belmont will be using the site for their own events, and opening facilities up for neighborhood use raise costs with security and liability concerns. In short, this is not going to be a community center that Belmont uses occasionally. In fact the second floor of the proposed building will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

Finally I am concerned that this proposal has not received due consideration by the school board. My understanding is that there was a contract on the consent agenda that was approved without any opportunity for discussion. This lease is a big deal that will have an impact on the neighborhood and school. It should be considered openly and carefully by our city's leaders.

Thank you for your service on the planning board and to the community.

Pippa Holloway
Professor of History
President Tennessee University Faculty Senates, 2019-2020
Middle Tennessee State University

From: Garry Long [mailto:shemia0444@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:26 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

I oppose this bill because the second floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

From: Diane Robinson [mailto:smaugly181@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:42 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I oppose this bill because the second floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

From: Victoria Hensley [mailto:vhensley16@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:52 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

Public land in Nashville is becoming increasingly valuable as developments grow across the city. Belmont University is the Edgehill neighborhood's next door neighbor. While colleges and universities can serve their communities in a beneficial way, the proposed Belmont University Athletic administrative building does not seem to have the Edgehill neighborhood in mind. Despite the promise to provide a classroom for students in the neighborhood, the building as a whole removes public land not just from Edgehill, but from Nashville residents at large. The entire second floor of the proposed building will be exclusively used for a private institution. Why should Nashville's public land be given for such an exclusive use? Furthermore, the second floor, per the contract, prohibits such public use. Again, as new developments grow across the city, the approval of this lease sets a terrible precedent for public land to be leased below market value with a private lessee controlling the terms.

In addition to the expressed opposition above, it is important to note how similar this current plan is to the University Center Urban Renewal Project, which shared a boundary with the Edgehill Urban Renewal Project, thus the neighborhood itself. As a historically African American neighborhood in Nashville, Edgehill has been subject to the whims of discriminatory development and planning for decades. Will the Planning Commission once again allow a private institution to encroach upon the neighborhood and redevelop what has traditionally been used as public space, beneficial to all? I urge commissioners to think about the neighborhood, an important, historically African American neighborhood in the heart of this city, and the development it has been subject to since the discriminatory practices of urban renewal.

I urge you to oppose BL2019-11. Not only because public land should not be used for a private institution's exclusive use, but because this project is a direct continuation of the racially discriminatory urban renewal practices of the 1950s-1970s.

Thank you,

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Victoria Hensley

Ph.D. Student | MTSU Public History

Graduate Research Assistant | MTSU Center for Historic Preservation

Adjunct Instructor | HIST 2020-005

218 W Main St Apt 24

Murfreesboro, TN 37130

From: Allen Forkum [mailto:nashretro@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 8:54 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to Belmont's use of Rose Park

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

I oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11) for the following reasons:

The exclusive use of public land by a private institution, particularly a religious one, should not have been allowed in the first place, much less the further encroachment by Belmont University that is now happening in Rose Park.

Belmont's use is exclusive not only because the current facilities were designed for and utilized primarily by them, but also because the university promotes their Christian viewpoint there to the exclusion of other religious and secular philosophies held by taxpayers, including me. I am a Davidson County resident, and I oppose the use of city land to establish a religion against my own beliefs.

Additionally, this latest Belmont expansion appears to be more cronyism between the university and the city, all to take further financial advantage of land that has a long history of use by the surrounding community, dating back to the Civil War.

Why is it that Sevier Park gets a new community center with land and sports facilities open to everyone, but the community around Rose Park has to wait in line behind a private religious school to use vast areas of its park?

Either the land is public or it isn't. This hybrid of government-bestowed favoritism is the worst possible use, and allowing Belmont to expand their campus there makes it worse still.

Thank you for your time and for your service to the city.

Sincerely,

Allen Forkum

1112 Clifton Lane, Apt. 11

Nashville, TN 37204

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

From: Avy Long [mailto:avylong@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 9:26 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I strongly oppose this lease. Has anyone really looked at the financial terms?!?? Why would the city want to enter into a 50-year lease that gives only 15K to Easley Cmnty Center? ALSO, there is no escalator to adjust for inflation in this 50-year lease. REALLY!?!?

The other 20K goes to RBI which is “kinda” OK, but not specific to our Community. We all know that U have to be careful about awarding money to organizations that are unstable, and RBI is having “issues.”

Avy Long
1222 15th Avenue South

From: Little, Geoff [mailto:geoff.little@Vanderbilt.Edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 9:35 AM
To: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); Leeman, Bob (Planning); Rooker, George (Metro Planning); Adams, Kelly (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning); Shepard, Shawn (Planning); doug.sloan@nashville.gov; Kindall, Ed (Council Member)
Cc: Planning Staff; Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Hello. I am a longtime Nashville resident, age 44, writing in opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

(I sent one email to planning.commissioners@nashville.gov this morning but it bounced back to me undelivered – please forward this email to the appropriate city commissioners working with the Belmont University/Rose Park plan. I am firmly against it.)

Once again, Belmont University, led by Dr. Robert Fisher, with chief counsel Jason Rogers, and the BU board of trust, is behaving like an enormous gorilla, determined to be an overwhelming, unwelcome presence in the Edgehill neighborhood. As you likely know, the neighborhood houses a large number of African-Americans, many of which live in challenging economic conditions.

I lived in Edgehill from 2001 to 2016 (and now live just a few miles over in The Nations neighborhood). I am an alumnus of Belmont U., a former BU employee, and since 2004 a 15-year employee of Vanderbilt University working with major gift fundraising. I know the city, its “players,” and its heart and soul. Once again, Belmont hopes to “bull-doze” through a tasteless, privileged plan with no sensitivity that they operate in a diverse city with diverse interests. Please, Planning Commission, say “NO!” to Belmont’s bid for this land use for an Athletic and administrative building at Rose Park Magnet School’s grounds.

A review of the facts puts the right action – NO! Belmont – into clear view.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

1) The proposed 2nd floor of Belmont's proposed construction will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

2) This 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students – as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). (For instance, Belmont requires all newly hired faculty and staff to sign a Statement of Faith as a "Christian.") This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.

Please, Planning Commission, say "NO!" to Belmont. They have overstepped their bounds with this proposal. This plan is bad for Nashville and a poor precedent for city government dealings. We are not a backwoods Southern city.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Little

Assistant Director

Research and Prospect Development – Development and Alumni Relations

Vanderbilt University

From: Adam Buzard [mailto:adam@edgehillneighborhoodpartnership.org]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:05 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Good morning,

I am writing in opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11). Belmont's deal with MNPS and the city sets an extremely dangerous precedent for how public land can be co-opted and privatized by private organizations at the determinant of the community at large, the very people the public space is provided to serve. Any exclusivity deal on public land severs trust with the community and the city and opens the door for the loss of more public land to private institutions, including more land to be given over to Belmont.

The community has been attempted to be kept out of this conversation at several turns, and switching from Rose Park to a deal with MNPS is just another example of Belmont not stopping until they get what benefits them and them alone. I am asking the commission to act in the best interest of all of our neighbors, not just Belmonts.

Thank you. Please feel free to reach out with any other questions or comments...

Adam Buzard

Executive Director

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Edgehill Neighborhood Partnership
1414 Edgehill Ave, 37212

From: Deymeon McAlpine [mailto:deymeon@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:15 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because if approved, it will set a dangerous precedent for public land policy. It will mean that more n more public land will be under the control of private organizations who will set their own rules for use and access.

Deymeon McAlpine
4011 Regiment Pl
Murfreesboro, TN 37128

From: Charlotte Cooper [mailto:jccoopernash@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 9:32 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Henderson, Angie (Council Member); O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member)
Subject: Vote NO on Short Term Rental text amendment

Good Morning:

I am writing regarding CM O'Connell's text amendment 2019Z-017TX-001, Short Term Rental Properties. I am opposed to this amendment.

Neighbors from all across Nashville worked hard to enact neighborhood-friendly reforms through BL2017-608 in 2018. The language in this amendment would clearly reverse one of the main reforms - limiting STRs in residential neighborhoods.

Owner-occupied permits are tricky. There are documented cases of some owners applying for owner-occupied STR permits, but not actually living permanently at the location. Metro Codes does not have the resources to monitor the truthfulness of the applications. Without stronger and stricter language regarding actual owners who apply for owner-occupied STR permits, I believe this amendment will exacerbate our existing STR problems in residential neighborhoods. Some of my concerns include:

- For owner-occupied STR permits, the owner should be required to live full-time in the residence and be onsite when the rooms are rented. If there is no owner onsite, the property is used as a non-owner occupied STRP.
- The current language in 17.04.060 defines an owner occupied short term rental property as a residential unit containing not more than four sleeping rooms, the same as non-owner occupied STRPs. The original guest limit was 12 individuals. I believe the language should be changed for

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

all owner-occupied STR permits limiting them to two sleeping rooms and four guests. I see ads that say accommodates up to 15 or 18 or 20 guests; even 12 guests in each duplex unit would be ridiculous. Adding more permits in residential neighborhoods is so unfair to the long-term, full-time neighbors.

- The majority of new duplexes are crammed onto lots that were clearly intended for one house. This limits the amount of onsite parking, which lends to over crowded street parking for transients who rent these short-term rentals. There should be a requirement for onsite parking for transients in owner-occupied STRPs.

The original STRP regulations were so poorly thought out, we have been trying to backtrack for years. BL2017-608 was a first step in the right direction to get STRs out of residential neighborhoods. This amendment sends us down a wrong path and would be bad for all residential neighborhoods.

I urge you to vote NO on this amendment.

Charlotte S. Cooper
3409 Trimble Road
Nashville TN 37215
District 34

From: Paulina Jones [mailto:ppjones2251@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:30 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE2019-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because our city government should not be giving away public land to accommodate a private institution. Our community should not be deprived of their freedom to enjoy public land. Your consideration regarding this matter would be greatly appreciated. Thanks

Paulina P. Jones
108 9th Circle South
Nashville, TN 37203

From: gobbles615 [mailto:gobbles615@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:37 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because if approved, it will set a terrible/bad/dangerous precedent for public land policy. It will mean that more and more public land will be under the control of private organizations who will set their own rules for use and access.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Sincerely,

Tim Peterson
958 Needham Dr.
Smyrna, TN 37167

From: Andrea Sullivan [mailto:andreasully@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:48 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Commissioners,

Please do not support the proposed lease amendment with Belmont University as currently written. There are serious issues that relate to the land usage, specifically that the second floor of this building violates proper land use on the following grounds:

1. The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. There is no public access. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
2. The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the amendment expressly excludes public use.
3. The Metro Nashville Government and MNPS do not discriminate on the basis of religion. Private religious institutions can and do. Religious discrimination on MNPS property is an improper use of public land.

While I can see the benefit of access to an indoor batting facility for MNPS students, there's no such benefit obtained through private offices for Belmont University staff. Those offices should be elsewhere, on their own property, or this space should be available for public use.

In addition, the 'grant' to use this space is far far below market value and does not represent a fair exchange of goods. This is prime land in a zone that has seen much abuse of good faith. It should be leased at a fair market rate.

Please do not support the current version of the bill that gives control and exclusive use of MNPS property to a private religious institution, at a rate below market value, for fifty years.

Respectfully,
Andrea Sullivan
Edgehill community resident since 2000

From: Bakari Osaze [mailto:bakari.longsmith@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 10:52 AM

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items

Received through October 23, 2019

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001(BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because if approved, it will set a dangerous precedent for public land policy.

It will mean that more and more public land will be under the control of private organizations who will set their own rules for use and access.

-Bakari Long-Smith, 1310 Grand Ave. Nashville, TN. 37212

From: Tara Little [mailto:taracarneylittle@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:15 AM

To: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); Leeman, Bob (Planning); Rooker, George (Metro Planning); Adams, Kelly (Planning); Milligan, Lisa (Planning); Shepard, Shawn (Planning); doug.sloan@nashville.gov; Kindall, Ed (Council Member)

Cc: Planning Staff; Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Hello. I am a Brentwood native who has lived within Metropolitan Nashville for a decade. I am writing in opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Belmont University, led by Dr. Robert Fisher, with chief counsel Jason Rogers and the BU board of trust, is behaving utterly contrary to the city's needs and interests by pursuing Rose Park for private use.

I am a recent Belmont alumna, completing an MBA in December 2018. Belmont's self service in this Rose Park proposal, using taxpayer land for its own wealthy, private Christian educational needs, is immoral and unethical. I am sad to say, this is who I think Belmont University is, but it is not who I know Nashville is.

I have worked at Vanderbilt University and the Nashville Symphony, volunteered with Pencil Partners and CASA, and run thousands of miles on our beautiful greenways. I have the privilege to know Nashvillians of all walks of life. We value all people and do not privilege private interests above public good. Please, Planning Commission, say "NO!" to Belmont's bid for this land use for an Athletic and administrative building at Rose Park Magnet School's grounds.

A review of the facts puts the right action – NO! Belmont – into clear view.

1) The proposed 2nd floor of Belmont's proposed construction will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

2) This 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students – as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

institutions can (and do). (For instance, Belmont requires all newly hired faculty and staff to sign a Statement of Faith as a "Christian.") This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.

Please, Planning Commission, say "NO!" to Belmont. They have overstepped their bounds with this proposal. This plan is bad for Nashville and a poor precedent for city government dealings. We are not a backwoods Southern city.

Sincerely,

Tara Little
4605B Kentucky Avenue
Belmont MBA '18

From: M. Simone Boyd [mailto:msimoneboyd@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:33 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Taylor, Brandon (Council Member); Mendes, Bob (Council Member); Phillip
Subject: E.S. Rose Park 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to ask that you **deny the proposed lease agreement between Belmont University and MNPS (2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11))**. Approving this lease for a 20,000 sqf building would set a dangerous precedent and signal that public land is available for the taking. Public land should be reserved for public use. I raise three points for your consideration.

First, Director Kempf's letter notes that "The second floor, which will not be open to the public, will be unique space to be used by Belmont for a locker room, athletic therapy and treatment, meetings and administrative space." **A second floor that is closed to the public and reserved for Belmont's sole use does not meet the Civic (CI) Policy standard, because MNPS students will not have access to the space for educational purposes.**

Second, MNPS has limited resources and Rose Park Math & Science Magnet is a high-performing school. **I am concerned that MNPS funding that should be allocated towards improving literacy and educational outcomes for low-performing schools will be diverted to athletics at a high-performing school.**

Finally, has MNPS explicitly stated its need for an indoor batting facility prior to this proceeding? If not, MNPS should not manufacture student needs in order to serve the interests of private entities.

With Gratitude,
Phillip & M. Simone Boyd
Cephas Street
Nashville, TN 37208

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Cc: Councilman Brandon Taylor and Council Member At-Large Bob Mendes

From: Claudia Peterson [mailto:petersonclaudia@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:37 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: SUBJECT: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I oppose this lease because if approved, it will set a dangerous precedent for public land policy. It will mean that more and more public land will be under the control of private organizations who will set their own rules for use and access.

Claudia Peterson

From: Sarah McAlpine [mailto:smsorrell44@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:43 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

To whom it may concern,

I vehemently oppose this lease because, if approved, it will set a reprehensible precedent for public land policy (here AND in surrounding counties). It will mean that more and more public land will be under the control of private organizations who will set their own rules for use and access (which will most definitely exclude those whose lives currently are and, in the future will be enriched by said property.)

Sincerely,

Sarah McAlpine
4011 Regiment Place
Murfreesboro, TN 37128

From: princess maynie [mailto:princessmaynie75@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:47 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

TO: Metro Nashville Planning Commissioners

I am in opposition to the building of a Belmont University Athletic administrative building with locker rooms, training facility, meeting rooms, and a batting cage on land owned by MN Public Schools at Rose Park Magnet School for the following reasons:

1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.

4) If this lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

Belmont has gained use of a vast majority of ES Rose Park for their athletic field and even though the public has use of it during certain times, it is still a Belmont entity.

Why won't you allow a building to be erected for the specific use by our Rose Park Magnet School children instead of a private entity?

Metro Nashville has to do better for our children.

Princess Maynie

5835 Woodland Hills Drive

Nashville, TN 37211

From: Janet Shands Mutual Contractors [mailto:shands.janet@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:48 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Sledge, Colby (Council Member); O'Connell, Freddie (Council Member); Mendes, Bob (Council Member)

Subject: Case number 2019M-032AG- 001

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you, Chairman Adkins and Director Kempf, for allowing a public hearing on the Rose Park/Belmont land use. Those who oppose the current use as it stands have been denied the opportunity of public input and information on this arrangement despite multiple requests to Councilman Sledge for the last year. My letter is to express my lack of support for the use of this land as the applicant requests and to offer a greater context for this case. These are stated below:

1. Does the building must meet the educational needs of the students of MNPS? Allowing exclusive use of the second floor by a private institution that discriminates on the basis of religion in its hiring practices on public land sets a dangerous precedent. Is this even legal? Please do not approve the second-floor use as it is currently planned.

2. As decision makers for our city, please consider the greater context of this issue. We know that the Planning Commission is a quasi-judicial body and as such is not responsible for the terms of the lease. However, please be aware of how your decisions play into the larger context of good public governance.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

a. We acknowledge that our Metro Departments have for years been underfunded and stretched to an extreme. So, we can appreciate the desire of Metro Departments to capture additional funding when a private entity offers resources. However, if public/private partnerships are a mechanism that the new administration and council choose to embrace, we strongly encourage our leaders to utilize checks and balances that will guarantee the public is receiving equitable and transparent agreements.

b. Why are the public policies for building on public property not being followed? The mechanisms are in place that require review from Metro Legal, Metro Finance, the Council and the Mayor's Office. Ceding private land to private institutions needs to be a very transparent and public process. How will the nondiscrimination laws and the procurement rules of Metro translate legally in these private/public partnerships?

c. In this lease agreement process, did MNPS contract with a professional commercial appraisal company to get the fair market value of the land in question? What standard financial accountability measures are in place to ensure that the terms of the lease and the financial payments are paid and allocated as planned? Where are the checks and balances?

d. If this private institution had purchased private properties directly across the park on Edgehill Avenue, they could be building whatever they desire within the Metro Code. Perhaps they would have had to pay above market rate to acquire the land, but this is Edgehill's new reality. The land has become very valuable. The previous Belmont indoor batting cage was located at Greer Stadium at Fort Negley. The players traveled by car to access. Having a facility across the street would have worked. For the record, there were also no administrative offices at the indoor batting cage at Greer Stadium.

e. When previously challenged, this private institution pointed to all the good things they are doing for the community. Because Edgehill has tremendous needs, we welcome all persons who would join us in meeting those needs by being good neighbors. We agree that financial support to Edgehill non-profits is a good thing and we are grateful. We welcome Belmont's sending their faculty and students to Edgehill. Belmont students can earn required community service credits toward their degrees within one mile of their main campus. It is a win/win. However, we reject the notion that this lease agreement is an either/or proposition. During this process Belmont has publicly stated "because we do this, you should agree to this lease." Is this not "quid pro quo" at its essence?

Most of us in opposition have lived here for a long time, some of us for decades. We care deeply about the well-being of Edgehill and all its members. Most of our children have attended MNPS schools. Many of us volunteer and contribute to those organizations on the frontline of meeting our community's needs. We welcome partnerships that are mutually beneficial to our community. However, we strongly question the ceding of public land for private use without due process. Is this the precedent Metro government wants to set?

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these matters.

Janet Shands

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

1001 14th Ave South
Nashville, TN 37212
(31year resident of Edgehill)

From: Rob Benshoof [mailto:rob82b@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:50 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear planning commission members,

I oppose the subject bill for the following reasons;

- 1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
- 2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.
- 3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.
- 4) If this lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

Thank you for your time and dedication to Nashville,
Rob Benshoof
916 14th Ave S, Nashville, TN 37212

From: Andrew Krinks [mailto:andrewkrinks@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:52 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11), the proposal to allow Belmont University to build facilities that will be used for private purposes on public land.

As someone who has partnered with both faculty at Belmont University, and with leaders and residents in the Edgehill community, it is clear to me that this proposal is harmful to Edgehill residents for at least the following reasons:

- It allows public land to be used for private purposes, which does not serve the common good of our community and some of its most impoverished residents.
- The plan would not fully serve MNPS students, because the contract prohibits the public or MNPS students from using parts of the facility. It seems clear that the idea of Belmont allowing

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

MNPS students and the public to use parts of the property is a minor concession in what is otherwise a benefit for Belmont at the expense of others.

- Allowing a private entity (Belmont) to use the land allows their specific policies (including religious liberties) risks limiting who can actually use the property.
- This proposal sets a precedent in the wrong direction for a Nashville that is losing more and more public land to private developers and institutions. A Nashville that grows by way of increasing privatization will not create an equitable future.

Opposing this proposal will establish important precedent and allow Edgehill residents to claim the full access to Rose Park that they deserve.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Andrew Krinks

From: Mike Hodge [mailto:michael.m.hodge@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:54 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Planning Commissioners,

I am writing in opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11), which would allow the construction of a Belmont University Athletic administrative building with locker rooms, training facility, meeting rooms, and a batting cage on land owned by Metro Nashville Public Schools at Rose Park Magnet School.

Although I now live elsewhere, for 20 years, my home was very near the Edgehill neighborhood, near the fairgrounds. I have been a member of Edgehill United Methodist Church (just down the street from Rose Park) since 1980. In 2006-2007, I was working with ONE (Organized Neighbors of Edgehill) when Belmont University proposed its lease and ball field construction for Rose Park. I do not speak officially for the church or the neighborhood, but for myself as someone who cares about Edgehill and about neighborhoods in Nashville.

In 2006, Belmont President Bob Fisher personally promised me -- and several others in one-on-one meetings -- that if the neighborhood did not want this development, Belmont would not pursue it. After seeking more information for over a year, the neighborhood held a community meeting and voted to oppose this development. In spite of the president's promises, Belmont pursued its lease of Rose Park. The neighborhood opposed it at the Board of Zoning Appeals, Metro Planning, and Metro Council -- and eventually in court.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

One of the most telling moments occurred when the area Council Member convened a negotiating session between the neighborhood and Belmont. Since the neighborhood was concerned about future expansion into the Edgehill area, President Fisher was asked if he could make a commitment that Belmont would not attempt to expand its campus across Wedgewood. He refused to do so.

All of this is history now. Edgehill's history includes not only Belmont's use of Rose Park, but also the forced movement of Edgehill residents by Urban Renewal in the 60's and by gentrification now.

This history is the context for the decision you are being asked to make about the further expansion of Belmont University into the Edgehill area. But even beyond this history, there are clear reasons for opposing this specific expansion.

The question before the Commission is land use. Does this building meet the criteria of "an educational use that meets the needs of its students"?

- 1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.
- 2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.
- 3) MNPS and Nashville do not discriminate against religious affiliations, however, private religious institutions can (and do). This is not consistent with land use for Nashville tax payers.
- 4) If this lease is approved, it will set a terrible precedent. It will allow any public land to be leased below market value with the lessee controlling terms of use and access.

Thank you for the chance to share my views on this project. I hope that you will oppose this continuing intrusion into the Edgehill neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Mike Hodge
3111 Brick Church Pike
Nashville, TN 37207

From: Sarah Martin [mailto:sarahmartin1026@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Please disapprove 2019M-032AG-001

Dear Commissioners,

Let me start by saying I got a great education at Belmont University, and Belmont does a lot of great things in our community. Nonetheless, Belmont is a well-endowed, private university that can afford to pay market value for property and shouldn't be on the receiving end of a handout of public property for

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

its almost-exclusive use. The second floor will certainly not serve the needs of MNPS students, considering the contract expressly prohibits public use of that floor.

Also of note, Belmont is not just a private institution but a religiously affiliated one—one that discriminates against current and potential employees on a religious basis and, I might add, one that came under fire last year for not appropriately accommodating pregnant law students. These things do not align with our values as a city.

Please stop this privatization of public land at below market value—it is not a good deal for taxpayers.

Thanks,
Sarah Martin

From: Vee Gibbs [mailto:veegibbs8@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:57 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: OPPOSE 2019-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Good morning,

Last night I was given the sad news about proposed changes to a park that I grew up going to. I no longer live in Davidson county, but grew up in the county. I went to Woodbine, Rose Park, Donelson, Glencliff('87), and Vanderbilt. I still have family in the Edgemoor area and have taken my kids to ES Rose park. Having the park available to the all of the community wonderful way to create good memories and community cohesiveness. How available and open will it be to the surrounding communities if it is leased to a private entity?

I oppose this lease because our city government should not be giving away public land to accommodate a private institution.

Thank you for your time,
Vanecia Gibbs
486 Sunnybrook Dr
Brentwood, Tn
37027

From: Schmeller, Erik [mailto:ESCHMELLER@Tnstate.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 11:57 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As a 12 year resident of the Edgemoor Neighborhood, I'm very concerned about Belmont University's

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

aggressive approach to taking public land for its exclusive use. I'm aware that they have devised a very inexpensive lease for their use of land that is public. Yes, they are providing some access for local community members, but the 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use.

Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

I'm very concerned that this will set an unfortunate precedent. Please protect our public spaces.

Thank you, Erik Schmeller, 1010 15th Avenue South, Nashville 37212

From: Edgehill Neighborhood Coalition [mailto:edgehillneighborhoodcoalition@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 12:01 PM

To: Kempf, Lucy (Planning); Planning Commissioners

Subject: Opposition to 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11).

Dear Ms. Kempf and Planning Commissioners,

Thank you for very much for inviting public comment in your consideration of the proposed Rose Park lease amendment (2019M-032AG-001, BL2019-11). 2019M-032AG-001, BL2019-11). We are writing to state our opposition to the proposed amendment and specifically to its provisions for a second floor devoted to Belmont University offices and other exclusive, private use.

Objection to the second floor of the proposed athletics building has been central to neighborhood and public opposition since 2017, when it was discovered that a proposed "batting cage structure" in Rose Park was actually a two-story building with more than 20,000 square feet of floor space for primary or exclusive use by Belmont.

Mayor Cooper, who has supported Edgehill from the beginning, summarized his involvement and that of other Council members when campaigning in Rose Park this summer:

"Belmont's original batting cage proposal was not a cage; it was a building; and it was deceptive. I and others on the Council tried to help Edgehill push back on this enough [until] what happened is that they went into MNPS."

Among the many reasons that Belmont's proposal could not withstand the public scrutiny of a Council process, three primarily concern the misuse of public land -- represented most clearly by the second floor of the proposed building.

First, there is simply no positive precedent or defensible rationale for the use of scarce park and school property for a university athletics building. There is instead a historic, nationally infamous negative precedent.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

The failed attempt of Columbia University to build a university gym -- with partial access for the public and an annual rent of \$3,000 -- on two acres of Morningside Park in 1968 has been widely recognized and researched for years as a historic civil rights and public policy victory. No city government in the United States, to our knowledge, had since attempted anything like this prior to Belmont's recent actions. Approval of the proposed Rose Park lease amendment -- with uncannily similar terms of access, extent of land use, and financial terms (adjusted for inflation) -- would represent a terrible precedent and a historic embarrassment for Nashville.

Nashville's reputation for public land use should be symbolized by recent successful efforts to save Fort Negley Park, which Mayor Cooper has lauded as new turning point for Nashville. Rose Park (the historic Fort Morton) is an important part of this vision. Adding a building with private Belmont offices and other facilities in or adjacent to Rose Park literally cements mistakes of the recent past -- including a hasty effort to make Belmont a beneficiary of the Cloud Hill development -- rather than looking toward this future.

Second, public land, and especially an MNPS building, should not be used in any way that supports religious discrimination.

Belmont University publicly asserts a right to practice religious discrimination and requires applicants for coaching positions and other positions, for example, to submit "a one-page essay of about 300-400 words that describes how your Christian faith informs and influences your personal and professional life."

Belmont's use of religious identify as a criterion for employment and the religious aspects of its athletics programs are its prerogative, but they cannot govern the use of an MNPS building for 50 years.

Concerns in 2010 about employment discrimination in Belmont athletics led two Council members -- including Mayor Cooper's current Director of Legislative Affairs -- to file a bill to rescind the Rose Park lease. Although the Belmont-specific bill was withdrawn, a substitute non-discrimination ordinance framed in more general terms led to state counter-legislation that still constrains Metro government's efforts to oppose discrimination and promote diversity. It was significantly the former Belmont athletics employee facing discrimination who unsuccessfully challenged the state law in courts through 2014.

Approving religious discrimination on MNPS property would betray Metro Nashville's commitment to diversity and sets the city up for frustrations of this commitment for many years to come.

Third, a two-story athletics building adjacent to Rose Park violates land use provisions of the 2007 lease intended to minimize Belmont's physical impact on Rose Park and adjacent schools.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

The Metro Planning Department's 2005 plan for Edgehill identified "**major open space centered on E.S. Rose Park, Reservoir Park and the former Murrell elementary school sites**" as the first element of its Structure Plan.

Belmont's efforts in 2007 to suggest that its athletics facility would not impinge on this "major open space" were similar to more recent misrepresentations of its proposed athletics building. Speaking before the Planning Commission in 2007, Belmont University President Robert Fisher compared Belmont's plans to the "good example" of Shelby Park "where those fields are run by the Old Timers Association." Reverend Bill Barnes and other Edgehill advocates at the same meeting knew better, with Barnes admonishing commissioners not to "buy the Brooklyn Bridge for \$2."

Following Planning Commission approval, Edgehill residents unsuccessfully tried to persuade Belmont to preserve some level open green space for light recreation in the park similar to the green space it was able to create on its campus by relocating its outdoor athletics facilities. In the end, Edgehill was only able to obtain conditions (some neglected) in the lease such as limitations on the construction of seating, retractable netting to preserve views to and from adjacent schools, and the stipulation that the fields would be "convertible for children's uses."

Needless to say, these limitations would have also excluded the construction of a two-story, 20,000+ square-foot athletics building if it had been possible even to contemplate this scenario.

Campaigning at the same Rose Park event with Mayor Cooper this summer, Vice Mayor Shulman reiterated his 2007 vote against the Rose Park lease, saying:

"I was actually on the Council when this thing was done and voted against this because it is a limited amount of public space that belongs to the public. It does not belong to Belmont University, and I voted against it. It happened anyway, I know, but I voted against it."

The more than 300 signatures on petitions against Belmont's plans to build on public land certainly include many people who hold this position, but the larger truth is that Edgehill residents and advocates simply want what is best for our neighborhood and the larger Nashville neighborhood. Whether or not the Rose Park lease was a mistake, a clear missed opportunity was the leveraging of public offices and expertise in resisting maximum private demands, holding Belmont to its word, and serving the public interest.

One can still imagine a Rose Park where open green space for light recreation occurs alongside the "good example" of a university using some ball fields. And one can still imagine next to the park a one-story "batting cage structure" -- no deception, no discrimination -- just the win-win that was maybe possible after all. Thank you for considering ways to help make this the reality for Rose Park, Edgehill, and Nashville.

Sincerely,
The Edgehill Coalition Rose Park Committee

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items Received through October 23, 2019

Joel Dark, Edgehill Neighborhood Coalition
King Hollands, Board Member, Organized Neighbors of Edgehill
Cynthia Matthews, Board Member, Edgehill Neighborhood Partnership
Avy Long, Edgehill Neighborhood Coalition
Joe Staler, Board Member, Organized Neighbors of Edgehill
Ben Tran, Edgehill Village Neighbors Association
Rachel Zijlstra, Edgehill Village Neighbors Association

From: John Green <john.green1914@gmail.com>
Date: October 23, 2019 at 11:50:27 AM CDT
To: Lucy Alden Kempf <lucy.kempf@nashville.gov>
Cc: Jason Rogers <jason.rogers@belmont.edu>, Tom Cash <Tom.Cash@nashville.gov>, "Sledge, Colby (Council Member)" <colby.sledge@nashville.gov>
Subject: Item 15.2019M-032AG-001 Re Rose Park and Belmont University on Planning Commission Agenda

Lucy

Good afternoon and hope that you are well. I writing in regards to the above Agenda Item that will be discussed at the Planning Commission Meeting on Thursday October 24, 2019.

As you may be aware, I am the Chair of the Belmont University Neighborhood Advisory Committee. I have been member of this committee since it was formed in 2005 after passage of the first Institutional Overlay. In accordance with the Lease Agreement between Belmont and Metro Parks, in 2009 our committee expanded to include Committee members who are near that area .

Consequently, the Advisory Committee regularly discusses issue relating to Rose Park when we meet. Over the last two years we have discussed numerous times issues surrounding Belmont's plans to build a batting facility.

The solution worked out between Belmont and Metro Nashville Public Schools would be a win/win for both organizations. While Belmont gains batting facilities for its baseball program, MNPS gains access to NCAA Division I level facilities for its students. This will allow MNPS to better serve its students, especially students who might never gain access to this type of top-flight facilities.

Additionally, Belmont University is committed to further funding the Rose Park Community Center to allow for expansion of its hours of operation, especially for opening on Saturday. Adequate funding of this community center to provide services for the youth population in the area, has been a key focus of our Committee.

The agenda indicates that the Staff is recommending approval of this item. It is my recommendation that all the Commissioners support this item.

Comments on October 24, 2019 MPC Agenda Items **Received through October 23, 2019**

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or concerns about this matter, please feel free to contact me at 615.500.8528.

John C. Green

p - [615.500.8528](tel:615.500.8528)

e - john.green1914@gmail.com

From: Dunlap, Carolyn [mailto:carolyn.dunlap@Vanderbilt.Edu]

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 12:13 PM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Dunlap, Carolyn

Subject: Oppose 2019M-032AG-001 (BL2019-11)

I oppose this bill because....

- 1) The 2nd floor will be for a private institution's exclusive use. Public land should not be for the exclusive benefit of a private institution.

- 2) The 2nd floor will not serve the education or recreational needs of MNPS students as the contract expressly prohibits public use.

Carolyn T. Dunlap

Direct Phone: 615-322-3434

2100 West End Avenue

Nashville, TN 37203