



**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT
OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

Planning Department
Lindsley Hall
730 Second Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37201

**Minutes
Of the
Metropolitan Planning Commission**

February 9, 2006

4:00 PM

Howard School Auditorium, 700 Second Ave., South

PLANNING COMMISSION:

James Lawson, Chairman
Ann Nielson
Victor Tyler
James McLean
Judy Cummings
Councilmember J. B. Loring
Tonya Jones
Phil Ponder, representing Mayor Bill Purcell

Staff Present:

Rick Bernhardt, Executive Director
Ann Hammond, Assistant Director
Brooks Fox, Legal Counsel
David Kleinfelter, Planning Mgr. II
Bob Leeman, Planner III
Kathryn Fuller, Planner III
Trish Brooks, Admin. Svcs. Officer 3
Luis Pereira, Planner I
Jason Swaggart, Planner I
Adriane Harris, Planner II
Jennifer Carlat, Communications Officer
Cynthia Wood, Planner III
Bob Eadler, Planner III
Karen Hilton, Planning Mgr. II
Anita McCaig, Planner II

Commission Members Absent:

Doug Small, Vice Chairman
Stewart Clifton

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Hammond announced that there was an addendum to the agenda. Item #16, 2006Z-017T, contained under "Other Business" was a request to amend various sections of the Metropolitan Zoning Code relative to landscaping and tree protection requirements as requested by the Codes Department .

Ms. Nielson moved, and Ms. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to adopt the agenda as presented. **(8-0)**

III. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 26, 2006 MINUTES

Mr. Ponder moved and Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve the January 26, 2006 minutes as presented. **(8-0)**.

IV. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

3/31/2006 1:20:50 PM

Councilmember Gilmore spoke in reference to Item #X – Request to amend the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update. She stated she would be requesting that Metro Council approve the proposal on its first reading, then request that the proposal be deferred indefinitely. This would allow additional time to further investigate this development with the community. She also mentioned that an advisory committee would be formed and charged to assist in this investigation.

Councilmember Toler announced that he would speak regarding Item #VIII, Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update once it was presented to the Commission.

Councilmember Summers stated he would address the Commission after his item was presented to the Commission.

Councilmember Briley stated he would address the Commission after his item was presented to the Commission.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: ITEMS REQUESTED TO BE DEFERRED OR WITHDRAWN

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|---|
| 4. | 2005SP-099U-10 | Request to rezone from R20 to SP district property to permit 8 duplex structures (a total of 16 units) located at 2201 Hobbs Road, 4207 and 4211 Stammer Place, 2200 Castleman Drive | - deferred to February 23, 2006, at the request of the applicant. |
| 9. | 2006S-055G-06 | Travis Place - Request for preliminary plat approval to create 140 lots located on the east side of McCrory Lane and the west side of Beautiful Valley Drive | – deferred to February 23, 2006, at the request of the applicant. |
| 10. | 2006S-060G-12 | Turner Farms - Rrequest for preliminary plat approval to create 151 lots located on the south side of Burkitt Road, approximately 565 feet west of Gloryland Lane | – deferred to February 23, 2006, at the request of the applicant. |
| 14. | 95-71-G | MetroCenter, Lot 1 (Crest Hummer Dealership) | – deferred indefinitely at the request of the applicant. |

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to adopt the Deferred and Withdrawn items as presented. **(8-0)**

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: CONSENT AGENDA PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS AND ITEMS ON PUBLIC HEARING

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|------------------------|
| 2. | 2005S-304G-03 | The Meadows of Fontanel - Request for preliminary plat approval to create 14 lots on the east side of Whites Creek Pike | - Approve w/conditions |
|----|---------------|---|------------------------|

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|------------------------|
| 3. | 2004Z-163U-11 | Request to change from RS5 to SP zoning, property located at 104 Glenrose Avenue | - Approve w/conditions |
| 7. | 2006Z-020T | Request to change Section 16.28.190 of the Metro Code relative to demolition permits for historic structures | - Approve |
| 8. | 2006Z-022T | Request to amend Section 17.04.060 of the Metro Zoning Code modifying the definition of “two-family” structure to include two detached dwelling units | - Approve |

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS (revisions)

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---|-------------------------|
| 11. | 2001UD-001G-12 | Lenox Village, Section 3 - Request for final approval for Section 3 of the Urban Design Overlay district located along the south side of Lenox Village Drive, to develop 36 condominiums, and 31 single family lots | - Approve w/ conditions |
| 12. | 2001UD-001G-12 | Lenox Village, Phase D - Request to revise a portion of the approved UDO, and final approval for Phase D of the Urban Design Overlay district, to develop 21 condominium units, | - Approve w/ conditions |

requested by Batson and Associates for Lenox Village I, LLC, owner.

MANDATORY REFERRALS

- 13. 2005M-268U-11 A request that the name of P Pool Avenue from Elm Hill Pike to Transit Ave be officially changed to "Lannie Boswell Avenue" in honor of Lannie Boswell - Approve

OTHER BUSINESS

- 15. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Metropolitan Public Health Department in the amount of up to \$7,325.02 to provide matching funds to support the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Grant (CMAQ)." - Approve

Ms. Nielson moved, and Ms. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. (8-0)

VII. GREEN HILLS-MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN: 2005 UPDATE INVOLVING PROPERTIES AT 110-118 WOODMONT BOULEVARD

APPLICANT REQUEST - Change the ‘Structure Plan’ land use policy from “Residential Medium Density (RM)” to “Residential High Density (RH)” for a ±1.37 acre area located along the northeast margin of Woodmont Bv about 600 ft. southeast of Harding Pk.

The applicant is proposing to build 34 condominium units on five existing parcels totaling 1.66 acres. One of the parcels is already in RH policy. The applicant is seeking the change to RH policy for the other four parcels because the current RM policy does not support the type and intensity of residential development being proposed. This request was reviewed as a “major plan amendment,” which requires notification describing the request to be sent to property owners within 500 ft of the subject site, and that a community meeting be held ahead of the public hearing. In this case, since the notification for the associated zone change included properties within 600 ft of the proposed zone change, the notification for the community meeting and the public hearing on this plan amendment was the same as that for the proposed zone change. The community meeting was held on Thursday October 20, 2005. Re-notification of the January 12th public hearing was mailed to surrounding property owners and given in newspaper ads.

EXISTING LAND USE POLICY “Residential Medium Density (RM)” RM policy allows residential development in the range of 4-9 housing units/ac. and appropriate civic and public benefit activities. A broad general goal of the community plan for this and all other residential policy categories is preservation and protection of established residential areas.

PROPOSED LAND USE POLICY-“Residential High Density (RH)” RH policy allows residential development above 20 housing units per acre. RH also allows appropriate civic and public benefit activities.

ANALYSIS - This request raises two key planning issues: (1) the appropriateness of the location for high density housing and (2) establishing both an appropriate and an effective transition.

Locational Suitability. Locations deemed appropriate for RH policy are those that make up centers with a fairly intense mixture of activities that serve communities or larger areas. Proximity to existing or planned transit service and access to a 4-lane arterial are additional locational criteria. The subject site and the abutting parcel to the northeast, which is already in RH policy, are next to a high-rise office building in “Mixed-Use (MU)” policy that is part of the area referred to as “Harding Town Center.” The site is within a walkable 550-900 ft. of existing transit service on Harding Pk. Woodmont Bv. is a 2-lane arterial. The site meets basic locational criteria for RH policy, except for 4-lane arterial access. The access criteria for RMH policy (9-20 units/ac.) is a collector or any arterial. If the density for this site is held close to the 20 unit/ac. break point between RMH and RH policy (which could be accomplished through a special policy), the site would reasonably meet the locational criteria. The RH policy is being requested mainly because RMH policy does not support base zoning that would allow significant building height next to the existing high-rise (for example, 10 story building height for a portion of the proposed development).

Transition. While it is possible to achieve a stable boundary and harmonious land use relationship at the interface of fairly intense mixed use development and medium density residential uses, such a relationship is more tenuous and difficult to sustain when there is little horizontal separation and there is a sharp contrast in the bulk and intensity of development at that interface. A gradual transition in intensity would be preferable.

The subject request raises two particular concerns. First, it is at the edge of a predominantly developed area where the broad goal of the plan is conservation. Changing, rather than conserving, the edge of this neighborhood was one of the concerns expressed at the community meeting and at prior meetings at which the associated zone changes and development were discussed. Second, like MU, RH policy has the potential to be very intense and by itself is not an assurance that a desirable transition in intensity would occur. Staff concluded that the requested change to RH policy would be appropriate only if it is accompanied by a special policy that satisfactorily addresses the above concerns. With the special policy, such a change to RH policy would effectuate an acceptable transition and establish a clear intent to maintain the existing RM policy along Woodmont Bv. to the southeast of the subject site. Accordingly, staff suggests the “special policy,” as described below, to accompany the requested policy change to RH.

Suggested Special Policy. The suggested text of the special policy is as follows:

1. The intent within this area is to provide transition in the intensity of development for this side of Woodmont Bv. between the adjoining intense mixed-use development to the northwest and the established medium density residential area to the southeast. As part of that transition, the height of buildings should be varied, with the tallest ones, up to ten stories, in the northwestern section of the site, and the shortest ones, up to three stories, in the southeastern section of the site.
2. The southeastern edge of this area is intended to be the limit of residential development above medium densities (9 housing units/ac) along this side of Woodmont Bv. To reinforce this boundary, generous landscaping should be provided along this edge of the site. Generous landscaping or other design features should be provided along this edge of the site to provide an attractive buffer and reinforce this boundary.
3. Development at the low end of densities supported by “RH” policy, not exceeding 21 housing units/ac., is intended in this area.
4. Development should be implemented through zoning that provides assurance that the development will occur as intended, such as the SP district, or PUD or UDO overlay zoning in combination with other appropriate base zone districts.

As shown in the graphic, the special policy would apply to the area for which RH policy is being requested, plus the parcel that is already in RH policy. This would be “Special Policy # 15” in the *Green Hills – Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update*.

Mr. Eadler presented and stated that staff recommends to approve the subject request together with “Special Policy #15” as contained in the report.

Mr. Bernhardt announced that Items #5 and 6, 2005Z-168U-10 and 2005P-32U10, will be presented following the Community Plan Update.

Mr. Bill Lockwood, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner & Cannon spoke in favor of the community plan update.

Mr. Richard Rhea, 2112 Woodlawn Drive, spoke in favor of the community plan update.

Mr. William Hastings spoke in favor of the plan update.

Councilmember Summers spoke in favor of the plan update. He stated that the majority of the residents affected by this update were in favor and he requested the Commission’s approval.

Mr. Will Johnson, 187 Kenner, spoke in favor of the community plan update.

Ms. Douglas Dempsey, 3942 Woodlawn Dr., spoke in opposition to the community plan update.

Ms. Bell Newton, 3950 Woodlawn Drive spoke in opposition to the community plan update.

Ms. Jennifer Pennington, 3700 Woodlawn Dr, spoke in opposition to the community plan update

Mr. Jennifer Rothrock, 3913 Westmont Ave., spoke in opposition to the community plan update.

Mr. John Morgan, 125 Kenner Ave., spoke in favor of the community plan update.

Mr. Ponder requested further clarification on the Special Policy included in the Community Plan Update and how it differs from the original plan.

Mr. Eadler explained that the Special Policy addresses density and building heights included in the plan.

Mr. Tyler requested additional information on the current zoning for this area and the surrounding parcels.

Ms. Cummings mentioned concerns regarding building heights.

Ms. Neilson questioned staff on whether a traffic study was completed.

Mr. Swaggart explained the proposal is at the preliminary stage and is not currently required.

Mr. Loring moved and Mr. McLean seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve the Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update involving properties at 110-118 Woodmont Boulevard. **(8-0)**.

Resolution No. RS2006-045

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update Involving Properties at 110-118 Woodmont Boulevard is **APPROVED (8-0)**”

VIII. AMENDMENT TO THE SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PLAN: 2004 UPDATE IN THE VICINITY OF OLD HICKORY BOULEVARD, PETTUS ROAD, AND CANE RIDGE ROAD

Staff Recommendation - Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - Change the Structure Plan land use policy from Residential Low Medium Density and Rural to Neighborhood General and Neighborhood Center for approximately 1,190 acres for property located along Old Hickory Boulevard, Pettus Road, and Cane Ridge Road, expand the Infrastructure Deficiency Area, and make changes to the planned street system for the area, including recommended Southeast Parkway cross sections.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - Staff held community meetings on November 17, 2005 and January 19 and 24, 2006 to discuss the proposed amendment. They were attended by a total of about 160 people. Attendees expressed mixed opinions about the proposed amendment. There was general support for improved design guidance and recognition that there were new regulatory tools available as well as more community experience with design issues and tools. Although there were a few requests for removal from the amendment area, there were also requests for property to be added, and the amendment area has grown from its original 880 acres to 1,190.

There was some concern expressed about density, which staff expects to be between 4 and 5 units per acre overall for the area when fully developed, which would include pockets of higher as well as lower density due to the carefully arranged mixture of housing types. There was also concern about the inadequacy of transportation infrastructure in the area, and therefore staff is recommending that the portion of this area that is now in Rural policy be added to the Southeast Community Plan’s Infrastructure Deficiency Area as part of this amendment.

Existing Land Use Policies

Residential Low Medium (RLM) - RLM policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a

density range of two to four dwelling units per acre. The predominant development type is single-family homes, although some townhomes and other forms of attached housing may be appropriate.

Rural (R) - Rural is a category designed for areas that are generally physically suitable for urban or suburban development but for which the community has chosen that they remain predominantly rural in character. The predominant type of development in Rural areas is low density residential that is rural in character. Agricultural uses and low intensity community facility uses are also found in Rural areas.

Proposed Land Use Policy

Neighborhood General (NG) - Neighborhood General is a Structure Plan classification for areas that are primarily residential in character. To meet a spectrum of housing needs, ideally, Neighborhood General areas contain a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located. Civic and public benefit activities are also characteristic of Neighborhood General areas. Transitional offices are another use occasionally found along the edges of these areas next to an intense center or incompatible district.

ANALYSIS - Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendment subject to the attendant expansion of the Infrastructure Deficiency Area because it will enable the area in question to be developed with greater attention to design with the goal of achieving a neighborhood setting as the area continues to grow rather than achieving a collection of loosely connected subdivisions. There has been a desire expressed by area councilmembers and their constituents to improve the character of development in this emerging area of Nashville, particularly with the aim of giving it a distinct identity as a community. This can be better achieved through Neighborhood General policy with its strong design guidance than through Residential Low Medium Density policy, which is more appropriately used for existing neighborhoods that have RLM character than for newly developing areas that are in the process of forming their character. Also, as is made clear in Land Use Policy Application, RLM is not the most appropriate for areas that are or will be very accessible, competitive locations such as this study area, which is along the future Southeast Parkway.

Since the plan was adopted in mid-2004, there has been rapid growth in this portion of the Southeast Community (known as Cane Ridge) accompanied by increased expressions of concern that the design of new development in the area is not meeting community standards. In the past 20 months, there have been 816 new residential building permits issued in the area bounded by Bell Road, I-24, and Nolensville Road since the plan's adoption, and there are also 870 lots that have received preliminary PUD or subdivision approval. This is comparable to 75% of the buildout of the entire 512-acre Carothers Crossing development, which is expected to be built over the course of a decade. Further, the number of residential building permits issued in the Cane Ridge area over that 20-month period equaled 13.75% of all building permits issued throughout the county. The number of preliminary lots approved in Cane Ridge equaled 20% of the preliminary lots issued in the county. In contrast, Cane Ridge equals about 4% of the county's land area. The next several years will be critical in the formation of the identity of this rapidly growing and changing community, and staff believe it is important to respond to the concerns that have been expressed prior to the next scheduled plan update.

Another factor to consider is that the future Southeast Parkway will bisect this area, and Neighborhood General policy with its carefully arranged mixture of housing types will provide improved flexibility in integrating the Parkway into the community. The ability to use a wider mix of residential densities, setbacks, lot sizes, and building types within the area will allow developers to better respond to the Parkway while enabling the development of a collection of neighborhoods that together will form a distinct local community.

The land use policy amendment under consideration at one time included a proposed Neighborhood Center area along Old Hickory Boulevard between its two intersections with Pettus Road. This proposed Neighborhood Center has been eliminated because of community opposition and uncertainty about the need for it. In addition, at one point the amendment area was proposed to extend the Neighborhood General policy all the way down to Burkitt Road. Staff decided against including this Burkitt Road frontage in the recommended amendment area because to do so would produce a problematic incursion into a portion of the Rural policy area that could and should otherwise be left intact.

The community plan amendment also includes changes to the area's local street network that are intended to facilitate the use of special zoning tools such as the Urban Design Overlay within this area. The "required street connections" in the current plan are necessary to assure at least a minimal network level across or among the scattered subdivisions. Removing the designation of required connections does not reduce the level of connection

but rather increases both the number of connections and the flexibility of their locations as larger areas are planned for development under an Urban Design Overlay or through Specific Plan zoning. In addition, staff has developed recommended cross sections for sections of the parkway as they pass through different development environments based on topography and other factors.

The recommended changes are shown on the series of attached graphics:

- A. the recommended land use policy arrangement
- B. the current planned street network that is included in the community plan
- C. the recommended new planned street network
- D. Recommended expanded Infrastructure Deficiency Area
- E. Recommended Southeast Parkway Cross Sections

[Note: Item VIII and Item IX were discussed by The Metropolitan Planning Commission together. See Item IX for actions and resolutions.]

IX. MAJOR AND COLLECTOR STREET PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR THE SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY.

Staff Recommendation - Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST

- (1) Amend the adopted Collector Street Plan by adding two proposed collector streets
- (2) Amend the adopted Collector Street Plan by redesignating a section of Pettus Road as an arterial
- (3) Amend the adopted Major Street Plan by realigning a segment of the proposed Southeast Parkway, and
- (4) Amend the adopted Major Street Plan by redesignating the section of Pettus Road that was formerly designated as a collector as a U4 Urban Arterial

These changes are recommended in association with the Southeast Community Plan amendment that is also on this Planning Commission agenda. The currently adopted street plans do not reflect the major and collector street plans recommended in the *Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update* and the pending amendment. The amendments are necessary for the layout of streets in developments in the area affected by these proposed changes to reflect the location of major and collector streets as intended in the community plan as amended.

PROPOSED MAJOR AND COLLECTOR STREET PLAN AMENDMENTS

Proposed Collector Street Plan Amendments: the “Collector Street Plan” is proposed to be amended by adding two proposed collectors, one north-south and one east-west, as shown with purple dashed lines on the accompanying graphic. Also, a section of Pettus Road that is designated as a collector (shown in solid purple) would be removed from the Collector Street Plan so that it can be added to the Major Street Plan to better reflect the role of Pettus Road in connecting to the planned Southeast Parkway.

Proposed Major Street Plan Amendments: the Major Street Plan is proposed to be amended by making a slight realignment to a section of the proposed Southeast Parkway as shown on the accompanying graphic. This realignment will provide better intersection spacing in the area. The Major Street Plan is also proposed to be amended by adding to it as a “U4” (Urban 4-lane arterial) the above-referenced section of Pettus Road.

ANALYSIS - The adopted Major and Collector Street Plans are the official guides for determining how these types of streets are taken into account and reflected in the layout of proposed developments. There is currently an inconsistency between the adopted major and collector street plans and the plans for those streets as recommended in the community plan.

The major street plan changes were part of the community meetings and the public hearing in conjunction with the adoption of the updated Southeast Community Plan in July 2004, but had not been specifically called out as amendments to their respective street plans. The collector street plan additions were discussed at the community

meetings on November 17, 2005 and January 19 and 24, 2006 as part of the overall package of amendments for this area. These proposed amendments are necessary for the provision of major and collector streets in new developments in this area to occur as envisioned in the community plan.

Ms. Wood presented and stated that staff is recommending approval of the Amendment to the Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update in the vicinity of Old Hickory Boulevard, Pettus Road and Cane Ridge Road as well as amend the Major Street Plan and the Collector Street Plan.

Mr. Steve Abernathy, 5929 Pettus Road, spoke in opposition to both plan updates.

Mr. John Roeder, 6650 Burkitt Road., spoke in opposition to the plan update.

Ms. Orvella Walker, 5961 Pettus Road, spoke in opposition to the plan updates.

Mr. B F Rucker, a resident on Battle Road, spoke in opposition to the plan updates.

Ms. Sally Smith, 13545 Old Hickory Blvd, spoke in favor of the plan updates.

Councilmember Toler spoke in favor of the plan updates. He mentioned the plans would assist in preserving the beauty of the area while allowing development. He requested the approval of the plan updates.

Ms. Nielson spoke in favor of the plan updates. She mentioned that without a plan, there would be random developments.

Mr. McLean requested clarification on the density per acre versus neighborhood general.

Ms. Wood explained this concept.

Mr. Tyler requested further clarification on the rural areas included in the original plan and how the plan updates will affect these areas.

Mr. Ponder requested additional information on the changes that have taken place since the last community meetings.

Ms. Wood explained the changes to the Commission.

Mr. Ponder asked whether the changes were results of community meetings.

Ms. Cummings requested clarification on how much green space would be included in a neighborhood general plan.

Mr. Loring commended the staff for their work on this project and moved for approval.

Mr. Loring moved and Mr. McLean seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve the Amendment to the Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update in the vicinity of Old Hickory Boulevard, Pettus Road and Cane Ridge Road as well as amend the Major Street Plan and the Collector Street Plan. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-046

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Amendment to the Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update in the Vicinity of Old Hickory Boulevard, Pettus Road, and Cane Ridge Road AND the Amendment to the Major Street Plan and Collector Street Plan was **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

**X. AMENDMENT TO THE BORDEAUX-WHITES CREEK COMMUNITY PLAN:
2003 UPDATE TO ADD A SPECIAL POLICY PERTAINING TO BELLS BEND**

Ms. Cynthia Wood presented the Amendment to the Boardeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update to Add a Special Policy pertaining to Bells Bend and stated that staff is recommending approval.

Ms. Kim Hawkins, 2005 Natchez Trace, spoke in favor of the development.

Ms. Ann Poindexter spoke in favor of the development.

Mr. Sumter Camp, 5204 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Jim Price, 5268 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Bill Cole, 5033 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Jane Cobble, 5033 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Rev. Joe Ingle, 5711 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Barry Sulkin, 4443 Pecan Valley Rd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. David Humphrey, 5318 Tidwell Hollow Rd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Shelby White, 6733 Currywood Drive, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Hank Brockman, 3988 Old Hickory Boulevard, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Brenda Butka, 5188 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Kathleen Wolff, 5268 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Jeremy Heidt, 4502 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Chris Utley, 511 Emerald Ct., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Julia Eastman Graves, 4388 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. John Drummond, 5330 Tidwell Hollow Rd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Minda Lazarov, 4443 Pecan Valley Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Keith Vaughn, 4194 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Beth Siegenthaller-Courtney spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Wesley Barnes, 4118 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in support of the proposal.

Ms. Bea Hubbard, 6415 Arden Court, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. William Kantz, 5110 Ashland City Highway, spoke in support of the proposal.

Mr. Matt Walker, 1709 Windover Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Sherry Dawn, 5204 Tidwell Hollw Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Julia Drummond, 5330 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Sandra Lee, 1244 Mary Helen, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Margaret Sleas, 5547 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Mary Sue Cheek spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Jerry Wood, 4725 Old Hickory Boulevard, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Devinder Sandhu spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. George West, a farmer in Bells Bend, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Jeff Zeitlin, 4301 Hillsboro Road, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. McLean moved, and Ms. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to close the public hearing, defer the proposal to February 23, 2006 in order to allow additional information be provided to the Commission. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-048

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Amendment to the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update to Add a Special Policy Pertaining to Bells Bend is **DEFERRED to the February 23, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. (8-0)**”

The Commission recessed at 6:50 p.m.

The Commission resumed at 7:12 pm.

Mr. McLean commended Ms. Wood for her work and diligence as being displayed at the meeting.

XI. ADOPTION OF THE EAST NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN: 2006 UPDATE

Staff Recommendation-*Adopt all three plans as proposed*

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - Staff conducted a combined total of 17 meetings in the community between March 2005 and January 2006 for these three plans. Attendance ranged from as few as 20 at some neighborhood meetings to around 65-80 at some of the community meetings. Staff estimates that overall, more than 390 different individuals attended and participated in at least one of those meetings.

HIGHLIGHTS *East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update*

Land Use Element - Substantively, the land use and intensity differences between the proposed plan and the 1994 plan it will replace are limited in many areas. The vast majority of established residential areas and those committed to residential uses in the 1994 plan are envisioned to remain residential. Nonresidential areas in the 1994 plan are envisioned to evolve to a greater mixture of uses in the proposed plan with few exceptions. In some areas, such as the Cowan Street area and mixed industrial areas west of Dickerson Pike, the changes are expected to be substantial as these areas are planned to evolve to intense mixed use urban neighborhoods over the long term.

Much of the difference between the two plans is a change in appearance that results from two main format changes. The first is that major individual institutional uses (i.e. Nashville Auto Diesel College and the State office campus) are specifically recognized in the proposed plan, but were not in the 1994 plan. The second is that the newer structure plan policies used in conjunction with detailed design planning are applied to the neighborhoods and corridors identified for design plans.

The highlights of the proposed plan are as follows:

A major focus and goal of the plan is preservation and protection of the vast majority of the community's established residential areas.

- To allow for residential growth, opportunities for intensification and redevelopment are provided in many locations, especially along major community and neighborhood corridors west of Dickerson Pike. Zoning

tools such as Urban Design Overlays and the Specific Plan district will be used to ensure that high standards of urban design are met that provide an environment that meets the needs of pedestrians as well as cars.

- Economic development is envisioned mainly through the intensification of already established areas of nonresidential development, mainly at major nodes along the Dickerson and Gallatin Pike corridors and in the planned high-intensity mixed use urban neighborhoods west of Dickerson Pike.
- Revitalization of neighborhood centers is encouraged, such as Five Points, Douglas and Lischey Avenues, and Chapel/Eastland/Scott Avenues.
- The plan promotes more active lifestyles to improve the general health of the community's residents. More mixed use development, more compact residential development, additional parks and pedestrian-oriented transportation system improvements are all aimed at fostering more active living.
- The plan identifies 27 urban neighborhoods with mixed use centers for which detailed design planning is intended. Plans for two clusters of those neighborhoods (discussed below) were prepared, and are being considered for adoption, along with this community plan.

Transportation Element -For enhanced multi-modal travel, traffic relief and greater pedestrian friendliness, selective major street widening and intersection projects, transit, bikeways, more sidewalks, greenways, and traffic management/ calming projects are recommended throughout the community.

With the exception of parts of Ellington Parkway and the street and interstate section along and west of Dickerson Pike, the recommended changes are essentially the same as those in the 1994 community plan. These recommended changes have not yet been adopted as amendments to the official Major and Collector Street Plans. Official adoption of the community plan transportation element is recommended to be done during 2006 as part of the network analysis and overall synchronization of the community plans and the Major and Collector Street Plans.

Cleveland Park, McFerrin Park, and Greenwood Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan [DNDP] (see following graphic for neighborhood locations)

The highlights of this DNDP are:

- Redeveloping Dickerson Pike into a vertically mixed use corridor with a substantial residential presence
- Revitalizing neighborhood centers, such as at McFerrin and West Eastland Avenues, Meridian and Wilburn Streets, and Douglas and Lischey Avenues.
- Completing the redevelopment of the former Sam Levy Homes housing complex so that it no longer seems separate from the McFerrin Park neighborhood.
- Providing a variety of housing to meet the diverse needs of current and future residents while preserving the area's predominantly single family character.
- Providing choices for travel by making transit viable, and accommodating bicycles in addition to safe pedestrian facilities for a complete multi-modal network.
- Gradually changing the industrial areas between the railroad tracks and Ellington Parkway into either public open space or mixed housing and open space.

East Hill, Renraw, and South Inglewood (West) Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan (see following graphic for neighborhood locations)

The highlights of this DNDP are:

- Managing the growth of the Nashville Auto Diesel College in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, improves campus circulation, and improves the area's urban design while meeting the needs of students.
- Providing neighborhood commercial services in a vertically mixed use environment along a segment of Gallatin Pike adjacent to the Nashville Auto Diesel College.
- Gradually transforming Gallatin Pike into a vertically mixed use environment with a substantial number of residential units and a high-intensity mixed use concentration at Gallatin Pike and Trinity Lane, one of the six Centers along the Gallatin Pike corridor that area identified in the East Nashville Community Plan.
- Providing the opportunity for the existing industrial area between the railroad tracks and Ellington Parkway to redevelop as a either public open space or mixed housing and open space.
- Providing a variety of housing while preserving the area's predominantly single family character.
- Providing choices for travel by making transit viable, and accommodating bicycles in addition to safe pedestrian facilities for a complete multi-modal network.

The Commission should be aware that there have been a few changes from the draft that was presented at the community meeting to the one that was included with this staff report. These changes resulted from the community meeting and subsequent discussion with Councilmember Pam Murray. Most of the changes affect the DNDPs. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- Special Policy Area 16, located on East Trinity Lane adjacent to Ellington Parkway, was changed from a Transition area in Industrial policy to a Transition area in Neighborhood General and Residential Medium Density policies.
- The small Industrial area in the East Hill, Renraw, and South Inglewood (West) DNDP that is also on Trinity Lane at Ellington Parkway was changed to Civic or Public Benefit to reflect the fact that it is to be the site of the new East Precinct.
- A portion of Special Policy Area 19 (Mixed Housing) on Strouse Avenue in the East Hill, Renraw, and South Inglewood (West) DNDP was changed to be Special Policy Area 21 (limited Mixed Use).
- Special Policy Area 22 (Commercial) was established for the Cleveland Park, McFerrin Park, and Greenwood DNDP to allow for a Transition area between the commercial development and the neighborhood to the south.
- Subdistricts 2 (Mixed Housing) and 3 (Sam Levy Homes redevelopment) in the Cleveland Park, McFerrin Park, and Greenwood DNDP were merged to better reflect the desired full integration of the former Sam Levy Homes site into the neighborhood.
- The section on Subdistrict 6 (formerly 7), the site of the above-referenced Special Policy 22, was added. It was inadvertently left out of the copy that went on the website in advance of the community meeting.

Cynthia Wood presented that staff recommends adoption of the East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update; the Cleveland Park, McFerrin Park and Greenwood Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan and the East Hill, Renraw and South Inglewood (West) Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan.

Mr. Jeff Kennedy spoke in opposition to the plans.

Mr. John Wendt, 937 Cahal Avenue, spoke in favor of the plans.

Mr. Sam McCullough, 532 Edwin Street, spoke in favor of the plans.

Ms. Kim Tucker, 2428 English Street, spoke in favor of the plans.

Councilmember Murray commended the staff for their work. She spoke in favor of the staff recommendation.

Ms. Dorothea Sherwood, 1121 Chester Avenue spoke in support of the plans.

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Loring seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve the adoption of the East Nashville Community Plans: 2006 Update to include the mentioned detailed neighborhood design plans. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-047

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Adoption of the East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update is **APPROVED, INCLUDING THE CLEVELAND PARK AND RENRAW DETAILED NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN PLANS. (8-0)**”

XII. PUBLIC HEARING: PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS
ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

1. **2005P-029U-05**
Nashville Auto Diesel College (Re-referred from Council)
Map 072-13, Parcel Various
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 5 - Pam Murray

District 6 – Mike Jameson
District 7 - Erik Cole

A request to apply an Institutional Overlay District to various properties located between Gallatin Pike and Emmett, and between McClurkan and Douglas, classified RS5, RM20, OR20, ORI (35.73 acres), requested by RM Plan Group on behalf of Nashville Auto Diesel College.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions*

APPLICANT REQUEST

Institutional Overlay District - Request to apply an Institutional Overlay (IO) district to 86 properties on 35.73 acres between Gallatin Avenue and Emmett Avenue, along McClurkan Avenue, Strouse Avenue, Douglas Avenue on the west side of Gallatin, and between Chester Avenue and Douglas Avenue on the east side of Gallatin Avenue.

Proposed Zoning Overlay

IO district - The purpose of the Institutional Overlay district is to provide a means by which colleges and universities situated wholly or partially within areas of the community designated as residential by the General Plan may continue to function and grow in a sensitive and planned manner that preserves the integrity and long-term viability of those neighborhoods in which they are situated. The institutional overlay district is intended to delineate on the official zoning map the geographic boundaries of an approved college or university master development plan, and to establish by that master development plan the general design concept and permitted land uses (both existing and proposed) associated with the institution.

SUBAREA 5 COMMUNITY PLAN (Existing Plan)

Residential Medium Policy (RM) - RM policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range of four to nine dwelling units per acre. A variety of housing types are appropriate. The most common types include compact, single-family detached units, town-homes, and walk-up apartments.
Commercial Arterial

Existing (CAE) - CAE policy is intended to recognize existing areas of “strip commercial” which is characterized by commercial uses that are situated in a linear pattern along arterial streets between major intersections. The intent of this policy is to stabilize the current condition, prevent additional expansion along the arterial, and ultimately redevelop into more pedestrian-friendly areas.

Policy Conflict - No. The IO district is intended for areas designated wholly or partially as residential by the General Plan. The area included in the NADC plan is both residential and commercial.

PROPOSED EAST NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN

Major Institutional Policy (MI) - MI is intended to apply to existing areas with major institutional activities that are to be conserved, and to planned major institutional areas, including expansions of existing areas and new locations. Examples of appropriate uses include colleges and universities, major health care facilities and other large scale community services that do not pose a safety threat to the surrounding neighborhood. On sites for which there is no endorsed campus or master plan, an Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in this policy area.

Mixed Housing - MH is intended for single family and multi-family housing that varies on the size of the lot and the placement of the building on the lot. Housing units may be attached or detached, but are not encouraged to be randomly placed. Generally, the character should be compatible to the existing character of the majority of the street.

Mixed Use - MU is intended for buildings that are mixed horizontally and vertically. The latter is preferable in creating a more pedestrian-oriented streetscape. This category allows residential as well as commercial uses. Vertically mixed-use buildings are encouraged to have shopping activities at street level and/or residential above.

PLAN DETAILS - Staff has reviewed the plan and finds that it meets the requirements outlined in the Zoning Code. The plan establishes future uses of buildings, design standards, setback standards, and height standards. It establishes proposed parking as well as open space, buffering, screening, and lighting standards. The plan also establishes a phasing plan.

Code Requirements - The Zoning Code intends for the application of the Institutional Overlay district to be limited to those land areas encompassed by a college or university master development plan. The plan must adequately describe the extent of the existing and proposed campus of the institution along with long-range growth objectives and an assignment of institutionally related land uses. The master development plan and accompanying documentation shall be sufficient in detail to provide the public with a good understanding of the developed campus's impact on the adjoining neighborhood(s).

The master development plan must distinguish between the following types of generalized campus activities: academic areas, such as classrooms and labs; general administrative offices; support services, such as major parking areas, food services and bookstores; campus-related residential areas, including dormitories, fraternities and sororities; operational areas, such as maintenance buildings, power plants and garages; and athletic areas, including gymnasiums, intramural facilities, stadiums and tracks.

In the approval of a master development plan, the Council may require the inclusion of a phasing plan to insure that campus expansion occurs in a manner that can be supported by adequate public services and minimizes disruption to the surrounding residential community.

STAFF COMMENTS - After reviewing the Nashville Auto Diesel College Institutional Overlay, staff has determined that the proposed plan, as amended by incorporating staff conditions, meets the general requirements, as outlined by the Metro Zoning Code, for applying the IO district. The applicant has held several community meetings to gather input as to the design and goals of the master plan. The applicant has also been working with staff to make changes consistent with the intent of the Code, as well as to meet basic design standards, and to provide appropriate standards to address concerns as to how the development will impact the neighboring properties.

Staff acknowledges that the community and the district council members will likely continue to work with Nashville Auto Diesel College to address additional issues.

Staff recommends that the following conditions be addressed in the plan prior to third reading at Council, or made conditions of the approval, if approved.

CONDITIONS

Prior to third reading by the Metro Council, the following conditions should be amended into the bill, or included on the Master Plan.

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the development of any part of this plan the existing fencing around the parking areas shall be removed or reduced in height to a maximum of 3.5 feet tall. Chain-link fences are prohibited.
2. The plan shall be revised to add a requirement that development site 4 be designed to front both McClurkan Avenue and the proposed park at the corner of McClurkan Avenue and Emmett Avenue.
3. The plan needs to provide a maximum setback for new buildings or additions to existing buildings along Gallatin Pike of 10 to 15 feet from the property line, or that approved by Planning Commission staff to meet the intent of an urban campus. The intent of this plan is for the NADC to be an urban campus with a strong street wall along Gallatin Pike, including the phasing out of parking in front of buildings. The buildings need to be close to the street with visual and direct pedestrian access, and an adequate sidewalk width provided (greater than 5 foot standard).
4. Regarding Architectural Standards, revise/rework the proposed standards as follows:
Academic
 - Entry doors (vehicular and pedestrian) on principal facades shall create a sense of entry through a recess or projection.
 - Blank walls facing streets shall be avoided. Building facades shall be broken into distinct bays of no more than 30 ft. in width. Recesses and projections that simulate openings may be appropriate in achieving this standard.
 - New buildings and expansions shall be made of similar, durable materials with similar colors and texture to ensure a unified campus. The use of metal siding should be avoided; metal is permitted as a secondary material. Pre-engineered buildings shall be prohibited.

- Temporary buildings other than those used during construction shall be approved by the Planning Commission.
- Building design shall be consistent with neighborhood residential compatibility standards as identified in the site development chapter.

Mixed Use and Residential, shall include all of the above, as well as the following:

- Corridors accessing residential units shall be enclosed and not visible from a public street.
5. All bicycle routes shall be signed.
 6. The plan shall provide more detail as to what standards will apply when the plan lacks detail regarding signage. The minimum requirements of the Zoning Code shall apply when the plan does not specify a standard.
 7. All Open Space and Park areas shall be maintained appropriately by the College.
 8. “Food Dispensing” shall be defined as allowing vending machines and sales of pre-made foods such as sandwiches, pastries, and drinks. Restaurants, as defined by the Metro Zoning Code do not qualify under this definition.
 9. The Interim Parking standards outlined in the Plan shall be changed from a maximum of 10 years to a maximum of six years.
 10. The following Traffic conditions must be completed, bonded, or satisfied prior to any new development, as outlined by the Traffic Impact Study and/or Metro Public Works:

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION - Any approval is subject to Public Works approval of the construction plans. Final design and improvements may vary based on field conditions.

Nashville Auto Diesel College Conditions

A revised Traffic Impact Study shall be completed when the student population exceeds 3,500 students. In accordance with Metropolitan Nashville Institutional Overlay ordinance, submit an updated Traffic Impact Study at least every five years.

Douglas Avenue and Ellington Parkway southbound ramps

Nashville Auto Diesel College (NADC) shall conduct traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of Douglas Avenue and Ellington Parkway southbound ramps upon the enrollment of 2,500 students, and with the updated Traffic Impact Study submitted at least every five years. Upon approval of a traffic signal by the Traffic and Parking Commission, NADC shall submit a signal plan with signal interconnect and pedestrian facilities per ADA standards and install signal upon approval.

Emmett Avenue

1. NADC shall construct the extension of Emmett Avenue from Strouse Avenue. Public roads shall be designed in accordance with the guidelines and standards of Public Works. The extension of Emmett Avenue should intersect Strouse Avenue at a 90-degree angle directly opposite the existing intersection of Strouse Avenue and Emmett Avenue. The extension of Emmett Avenue should intersect Douglas Avenue at a 90-degree angle directly opposite the existing intersection of Douglas Avenue and Emmett Avenue.

No new construction along Emmett Avenue shall be approved until Emmett Avenue is extended to Douglas Avenue, or as approved by Public Works if traffic counts indicate there is sufficient capacity to handle the development.

2. NADC shall construct the northbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Strouse Avenue to include a separate left turn lane with at least 50 feet of storage and tapers designed to AASHTO standards. Also, a stop sign should be installed on the northbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Strouse Avenue.

3. NADC shall construct the southbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Douglas Avenue to include a separate left turn lane with at least 50 feet of storage and tapers designed to AASHTO standards. Also, a stop sign should be installed on the southbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Douglas Avenue.
4. NADC shall construct a separate eastbound left turn lane and westbound left turn lane at the intersection of Douglas Avenue at Emmett Avenue Extension construction. The eastbound left turn lane on Douglas Avenue should be designed to include at least 125 feet of storage with tapers designed to AASHTO standards. The westbound left turn lane shall be design to include at least 50 feet of storage with tapers design to AASHTO standards.

Turn lane construction on Douglas Avenue shall be at time of construction of Emmett Avenue extension.

5. NADC shall conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of Emmett Avenue and Douglas Avenue upon an enrollment of 2,500 students, or at the time of parking facilities on Emmett Avenue, and submit to Metro Traffic Engineer. Upon approval of a traffic signal by the Traffic and Parking Commission, NADC shall submit a signal plan with signal interconnect and pedestrian facilities per ADA standards and install signal upon approval.

Gallatin Pike and Douglas Avenue

1. NADC shall dedicate additional right of way and construct a southbound right turn lane on Gallatin Pike at Douglas Avenue with at least 100 feet of storage at the time of development of the northwest corner of Gallatin Pike and Douglas Avenue.
2. NADC shall reserve right of way along Gallatin Pike to provide right of way for a U-4 arterial classification in accordance with Metro major street plan at the time of redevelopment of properties along Gallatin Pike.

McClurkan Ave. and Trevecca Ave. Roundabout

The master plan indicates that a roundabout is to be installed at the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Trevecca Avenue. NADC shall construct the proposed roundabout at the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Trevecca Avenue as a single-lane modern roundabout in accordance with current AASHTO and Metro Public Works Standards. This roundabout should be designed to include striping and signage in accordance with current MUTCD standards including striping and signage for pedestrians on each approach.

Site Access

1. Individual focus access studies shall be conducted as specific NADC sites are developed. Once a specific development of significant size is within the design stages, all access points shall be analyzed for levels of service and evaluated for sight distance and traffic operations.
2. Direct access to the campus from Gallatin Pike shall be reduced, subject to ownership and development patterns. The current NADC master plan indicates that no direct access points are to be provided along the east side of Gallatin Pike. Along the west side of Gallatin Pike the current Master Plan indicates that one existing access point is to remain.
3. NADC shall develop a way-finding master plan to be implemented in phases as new areas are developed and buildings constructed.
4. NADC shall retain all public street connectivity with no street privatization.

Pedestrian Facilities

1. NADC shall improve existing pedestrian facilities as well as construct new pedestrian facilities along the public roadway network, as required by Metro Zoning Ordinance 17.20.120.
2. NADC shall develop and install pedestrian way-finding system directing pedestrians to marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals.
3. NADC shall re-stripe the intersection of Gallatin Pike and McClurkan Avenue/Chester Avenue to include a crosswalk across the northbound approach of Gallatin Pike. NADC shall relocate pedestrian signals to align with the crosswalk, if necessary.

4. Developer shall submit 4-way stop analysis study for the intersection of Strouse Avenue and Emmett Avenue and the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Emmett Avenue, and submit to Metro Traffic Engineer for approval at the time of any redevelopment or construction of facilities west of Gallatin Pike and north of Straightway Avenue.

Transit TDM

1. NADC shall pursue a school sponsored Traffic Demand Management program in the way of a partnership with MTA to allow students, faculty and staff to ride the MTA buses for a reduced rate or no charge upon approval of the master plan UDO.
2. Upon redevelopment along Gallatin Pike, NADC shall construct a bus bay at MTA bus stop locations along Gallatin Pike property frontage in accordance with MTA standards.

Parking

1. For a student population of 3,500 students and a supply-demand ratio of 85 percent, NADC shall provide a minimum of 2,363 parking spaces.

Mr. Leeman presented and stated that staff is recommending approval with conditions on 2005P-029U-05.

Mr. McLean questioned whether the corridor condition mentioned would apply to the existing buildings included in the plan.

Mr. McLean mentioned he had requested previously that some of the current properties consider enclosing their corridors to assist with the aesthetics of the project.

Mr. McLean left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Mr. David Shearon, 2129 East Hill Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Jay Wilson, 3606 Crystal Springs Blvd, NADC, spoke in favor of the proposal..

Mr. Tom Curtis, NADC, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Gary White, NADC, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Barbara Blackman, 7904 Indian Springs, NADC, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Ryan Macek, 1003 Douglas, NADC, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Jack Freidman, 1007 Carolyn Ave., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Stephanie Hatchett, 1138 Cahal, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. John Hickman, 1108 Chester Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the overlay.

Mr. Jeff Kendig, 1143 Old Hickory, spoke expressed issues with the proposal.

Mr. Steven Meade, 972 Strouse, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Sharon Hunter, 1308 Gallatin Avenue spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. John Wendt, 937 Cahal Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Currey Worsham, 929 Cahal, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Nancy Shelton, 1907 Boscobel Street, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Caryn Lax, 1907 Boscobel Street, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Don Driscoll, 1211 Gartland Ave, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Steve Louvorn, 1524 Gallatin Road, NACD, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Lisa Bacon, 1933 Shenadoah Tr., NACD spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Joe Hutto, 2408 Ingle St., spoke in support of the proposal.

Mr. Al Raby, 3921 Vailwood Drive, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. John Trudell, 5011 Whispering Hills Ct., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Councilmember Murray spoke in favor of the proposal. She explained the many issues originally associated with the overlay that have since been addressed. She also explained that area residents have been given the opportunity to opt out of the overlay if they so choose to do so. She stated the majority of the neighbors are in support of the plan. She acknowledged the possibility of continued amendments prior to its third reading at the Council level. She also requested that prior to its approval that Nashville Auto Diesel College install security cameras on campus. She requested its approval.

Mr. Michael Mock, 916 McClurkin, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Ms. Laura Shearon spoke of issues associated with the proposal.

Mr. Loring acknowledged the work involved in this overlay. He commended the Councilmember as well as the college for working with community members. He stated that the majority of the neighbors are in favor and he moved for its approval.

Ms. Nielson spoke of the Master Plan of the college in relation to traffic issues. She suggested that some sort of screening be provided along Douglas Avenue.

Mr. Leeman stated that staff could request additional landscape be added to the plan prior to its third reading at Council.

Mr. Loring moved, and Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve Institutional Overlay 2005P-029U-05. **(7-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-049

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005P-029U-05 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (8-0), including that prior to third reading at the Metro Council, the applicant work with staff to to revise the plan to add additional landscape buffering along Douglas Avenue, in front of the existing dormitory building, if possible.**

Conditions of Approval:

Prior to third reading by the Metro Council, the following conditions should be amended into the bill, or included on the Master Plan.

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the development of any part of this plan the existing fencing around the parking areas shall be removed or reduced in height to a maximum of 3.5 feet tall. Chain-link fences are prohibited.
2. The plan shall be revised to add a requirement that development site 4 be designed to front both McClurkan Avenue and the proposed park at the corner of McClurkan Avenue and Emmett Avenue.
3. The plan needs to provide a maximum setback for new buildings or additions to existing buildings along Gallatin Pike of 10 to 15 feet from the property line, or that approved by Planning Commission staff to

meet the intent of an urban campus. The intent of this plan is for the NADC to be an urban campus with a strong street wall along Gallatin Pike, including the phasing out of parking in front of buildings. The buildings need to be close to the street with visual and direct pedestrian access, and an adequate sidewalk width provided (greater than 5 foot standard).

4. Regarding Architectural Standards, revise/rework the proposed standards as follows:

Academic

- Entry doors (vehicular and pedestrian) on principal facades shall create a sense of entry through a recess or projection.
- Blank walls facing streets shall be avoided. Building facades shall be broken into distinct bays of no more than 30 ft. in width. Recesses and projections that simulate openings may be appropriate in achieving this standard.
- New buildings and expansions shall be made of similar, durable materials with similar colors and texture to ensure a unified campus. The use of metal siding should be avoided; metal is permitted as a secondary material. Pre-engineered buildings shall be prohibited.
- Temporary buildings other than those used during construction shall be approved by the Planning Commission.
- Building design shall be consistent with neighborhood residential compatibility standards as identified in the site development chapter.

Mixed Use and Residential, shall include all of the above, as well as the following:

- Corridors accessing residential units shall be enclosed and not visible from a public street.
- All bicycle routes shall be signed.
- The plan shall provide more detail as to what standards will apply when the plan lacks detail regarding signage. The minimum requirements of the Zoning Code shall apply when the plan does not specify a standard.
- All Open Space and Park areas shall be maintained appropriately by the College.
- “Food Dispensing” shall be defined as allowing vending machines and sales of pre-made foods such as sandwiches, pastries, and drinks. Restaurants, as defined by the Metro Zoning Code do not qualify under this definition.
- The Interim Parking standards outlined in the Plan shall be changed from a maximum of 10 years to a maximum of six years.
- The following Traffic conditions must be completed, bonded, or satisfied prior to any new development, as outlined by the Traffic Impact Study and/or Metro Public Works:

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION - Any approval is subject to Public Works approval of the construction plans. Final design and improvements may vary based on field conditions.

Nashville Auto Diesel College Conditions

A revised Traffic Impact Study shall be completed when the student population exceeds 3,500 students. In accordance with Metropolitan Nashville Institutional Overlay ordinance, submit an updated Traffic Impact Study at least every five years.

Douglas Avenue and Ellington Parkway southbound ramps

Nashville Auto Diesel College (NADC) shall conduct traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of Douglas Avenue and Ellington Parkway southbound ramps upon the enrollment of 2,500 students, and with the updated Traffic Impact Study submitted at least every five years. Upon approval of a traffic signal by the Traffic and Parking Commission, NADC shall submit a signal plan with signal interconnect and pedestrian facilities per ADA standards and install signal upon approval.

Emmett Avenue

1. NADC shall construct the extension of Emmett Avenue from Strouse Avenue. Public roads shall be designed in accordance with the guidelines and standards of Public Works. The extension of Emmett Avenue should intersect Strouse Avenue at a 90-degree angle directly opposite the existing intersection of Strouse Avenue and Emmett Avenue. The extension of Emmett Avenue should intersect Douglas Avenue at a 90-degree angle directly opposite the existing intersection of Douglas Avenue and Emmett Avenue.

No new construction along Emmett Avenue shall be approved until Emmett Avenue is extended to Douglas Avenue, or as approved by Public Works if traffic counts indicate there is sufficient capacity to handle the development.

2. NADC shall construct the northbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Strouse Avenue to include a separate left turn lane with at least 50 feet of storage and tapers designed to AASHTO standards. Also, a stop sign should be installed on the northbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Strouse Avenue.
3. NADC shall construct the southbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Douglas Avenue to include a separate left turn lane with at least 50 feet of storage and tapers designed to AASHTO standards. Also, a stop sign should be installed on the southbound approach of Emmett Avenue at Douglas Avenue.
4. NADC shall construct a separate eastbound left turn lane and westbound left turn lane at the intersection of Douglas Avenue at Emmett Avenue Extension construction. The eastbound left turn lane on Douglas Avenue should be designed to include at least 125 feet of storage with tapers designed to AASHTO standards. The westbound left turn lane shall be design to include at least 50 feet of storage with tapers design to AASHTO standards.

Turn lane construction on Douglas Avenue shall be at time of construction of Emmett Avenue extension.

5. NADC shall conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of Emmett Avenue and Douglas Avenue upon an enrollment of 2,500 students, or at the time of parking facilities on Emmett Avenue, and submit to Metro Traffic Engineer. Upon approval of a traffic signal by the Traffic and Parking Commission, NADC shall submit a signal plan with signal interconnect and pedestrian facilities per ADA standards and install signal upon approval.

Gallatin Pike and Douglas Avenue

1. NADC shall dedicate additional right of way and construct a southbound right turn lane on Gallatin Pike at Douglas Avenue with at least 100 feet of storage at the time of development of the northwest corner of Gallatin Pike and Douglas Avenue.
2. NADC shall reserve right of way along Gallatin Pike to provide right of way for a U-4 arterial classification in accordance with Metro major street plan at the time of redevelopment of properties along Gallatin Pike.

McClurkan Ave. and Trevecca Ave. Roundabout

The master plan indicates that a roundabout is to be installed at the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Trevecca Avenue. NADC shall construct the proposed roundabout at the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Trevecca Avenue as a single-lane modern roundabout in accordance with current AASHTO and Metro Public Works Standards. This roundabout should be designed to include striping and signage in accordance with current MUTCD standards including striping and signage for pedestrians on each approach.

Site Access

1. Individual focus access studies shall be conducted as specific NADC sites are developed. Once a specific development of significant size is within the design stages, all access points shall be analyzed for levels of service and evaluated for sight distance and traffic operations.
2. Direct access to the campus from Gallatin Pike shall be reduced, subject to ownership and development patterns. The current NADC master plan indicates that no direct access points are to be provided along the east side of Gallatin Pike. Along the west side of Gallatin Pike the current Master Plan indicates that one existing access point is to remain.

3. NADC shall develop a way-finding master plan to be implemented in phases as new areas are developed and buildings constructed.
4. NADC shall retain all public street connectivity with no street privatization.

Pedestrian Facilities

1. NADC shall improve existing pedestrian facilities as well as construct new pedestrian facilities along the public roadway network, as required by Metro Zoning Ordinance 17.20.120.
2. NADC shall develop and install pedestrian way-finding system directing pedestrians to marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals.
3. NADC shall re-stripe the intersection of Gallatin Pike and McClurkan Avenue/Chester Avenue to include a crosswalk across the northbound approach of Gallatin Pike. NADC shall relocate pedestrian signals to align with the crosswalk, if necessary.
4. Developer shall submit 4-way stop analysis study for the intersection of Strouse Avenue and Emmett Avenue and the intersection of McClurkan Avenue and Emmett Avenue, and submit to Metro Traffic Engineer for approval at the time of any redevelopment or construction of facilities west of Gallatin Pike and north of Straightway Avenue.

Transit TDM

1. NADC shall pursue a school sponsored Traffic Demand Management program in the way of a partnership with MTA to allow students, faculty and staff to ride the MTA buses for a reduced rate or no charge upon approval of the master plan UDO.
2. Upon redevelopment along Gallatin Pike, NADC shall construct a bus bay at MTA bus stop locations along Gallatin Pike property frontage in accordance with MTA standards.

Parking

1. For a student population of 3,500 students and a supply-demand ratio of 85 percent, NADC shall provide a minimum of 2,363 parking spaces.

The proposed Institutional Overlay District is consistent with the areas new Institutional Policy and the old Residential Medium policy, which it was reviewed under, and which is calls for residential development; and the areas Commercial Arterial policy, which is to recognize exiting areas of “strip commercial”. The Institutional Overlay provides a long-range growth plan that is compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods, as well as the commercial areas along Gallatin Pike.”

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLATS

2. **2005S-304G-03**
 The Meadows of Fontanel
 Map 049-00, Parcels 200.01, 319, and part of 140
 Subarea 3 (2003)
 District 3 - Carolyn Baldwin Tucker

A request for preliminary plat approval to create 14 lots on the east side of Whites Creek Pike, approximately 1,100 feet north of Lloyd Road, zoned R15 and RS20, requested by Fontanel Properties, LLC, owner, Advantage Land Surveying, surveyor.

Staff Recommendation - Approve with conditions

APPLICANT REQUEST - Preliminary Plat

Request for preliminary plat approval for 14 lots abutting the east side of Whites Creek Pike, approximately 1100 feet north of Lloyd Road (37.81 acres).

ZONING

R15 District - R15 requires a minimum 15,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 3.09 dwelling units per acre including 25% duplex lots.

RS20 District - RS20 requires a minimum 20,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 1.85 dwelling units per acre.

SUBDIVISION DETAILS

Existing Structures - There are two homes existing on the site that will remain - one each on proposed lots 8 and 14. An estate home exists at the rear of the remaining tract that will later be developed as Phase II and will use the existing drive between lots 3 and 4 for access.

Floodplain - Approximately 36 acres of the subdivision are encumbered with floodplain. Approximately 12.3 acres of the floodplain (33%) have been marked as disturbed; the remaining 67% will be undisturbed. The borrow area to fill the proposed lots is located on the east side of the creek.

Greenway - A conservation easement has been shown on all of the land encumbered by floodway and the first 75 feet beyond the floodway on both sides of Whites Creek. A greenway easement has been shown in the last 25 feet along the outside edges of the conservation easement.

The Metro Parks Staff and the applicant have agreed on an acceptable design: the developer will build a 10-foot wide asphalt trail, meeting Metro Greenway standards, on both sides of Whites Creek. The public will be allowed access to the creek and the trail, the trail, and a 20 foot greenway buffer on the opposite side of the trail from the creek which will extend the length of the creek and the trail. The developer will also construct a 10-foot pedestrian easement in compliance with Section 2.6-1 G of the Subdivision Regulations from Whites Creek Pike to the greenway. On September 26, 2003, Greenways Staff and Planning Staff met with the applicant and preliminarily agreed to the trail location. All further details will be worked out prior to final plat approval.

The applicant has requested a variance from the last 25-feet of the conservation easement on the west side of the creek for the following reasons:

- The floodway is uniquely wide along Whites Creek Pike and provides more than enough room to protect the natural environment and habitat of Whites Creek.
- Under the alternative location of the greenway path agreed to by the applicant, planning and greenways staffs, the 25-feet will not be used for the location of the path.
- The applicant is constructing the greenway path on both sides of the creek at their own expense.
- By eliminating the 25-foot easement the lots along Whites Creek Pike can be enlarged to continue the rural character of Whites Creek Pike.

Staff recommends approval of the request to reduce the conservation easement by 25-feet on the west side of the Whites Creek because of the uniquely wide floodway and the alternate location of the greenway path.

Sidewalks - Sidewalks are not required on this subdivision because it is located along an existing road in the General Services District and is not a Sidewalk Priority Index Area.

Public Works Recommendation -No Exception Taken

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION - Approve

WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION - A Pressure Regulating Device will be required where static pressures exceed 100 psi and individual water and sewer lines will be required for each lot. The water main should be located within the proposed 50' ingress/egress and public utility easement.

CONDITIONS

1. All areas designated as an undisturbed conservation areas must be fenced off prior to the issuance of grading permits.
2. Comply with the recommendations from Public Works, Stormwater and Water Services as listed above.

Approved with conditions, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-050

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005S-304G-03 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. All areas designated as an undisturbed conservation areas must be fenced off prior to the issuance of grading permits.

WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION - A Pressure Regulating Device will be required where static pressures exceed 100 psi and individual water and sewer lines will be required for each lot. The water main should be located within the proposed 50' ingress/egress and public utility easement.”

**XIII. PUBLIC HEARING:
ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS**

3. **2004Z-163U-11** (Re-referred from Council)
Map 119-02, Parcel 002
Subarea 11 (1999)
District 16 - Amanda McClendon

A request to change from RS5 to SP zoning, property located at 104 Glenrose Avenue, approximately 225 feet east of Foster Avenue (0.27 acres), to permit an existing small business office, requested by Hawthorn Group, applicant/owner.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions.*

APPLICANT REQUEST - Rezone 0.27 acres from residential single-family (RS5) to Preliminary Specific Plan (SP) district, to permit an existing landscaping office, at 104 Glenrose Avenue, approximately 225 feet east of Foster Avenue.

Existing Zoning

RS5 district - RS5 requires a minimum 5,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 7.41 dwelling units per acre.

Proposed Zoning

SP district - Specific Plan is a zoning district category that provides for additional flexibility of design, including the relationship of buildings to streets, to provide the ability to implement the specific details of the General Plan.

- The SP District is a new base zoning district, not an overlay. It will be labeled on zoning maps as “SP.”
- The SP District is not subject to the traditional zoning districts’ development standards to the extent other standards or requirements are specifically stated in the plan or included as a condition by the Commission or Council. Urban design elements can be determined for the specific development and can be written into the zone change ordinance, which becomes law.
- Use of SP does not relieve the applicant of responsibility for the regulations/guidelines in historic or redevelopment districts. The more stringent regulations or guidelines control.
- Use of SP does not relieve the applicant of responsibility for subdivision regulation and/or stormwater regulations.

SUBAREA 11 PLAN

Mixed Use (MU)- MU policy is intended to encourage an integrated, diverse blend of compatible land uses ensuring unique opportunities for living, working, and shopping. Predominant uses include residential, commercial, recreational, cultural, and community facilities. Commercial uses appropriate to MU areas include offices and community, neighborhood, and convenience scale activities. Residential densities are comparable to medium, medium-high, or high density. An accompanying Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in these policy areas, to assure appropriate design and that the type of

development conforms with the intent of the policy.

Policy Conflict -As proposed the site plan is consistent with the Mixed Use policy.

Preliminary Plan Details - A zone change request to CS and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) was disapproved by the Commission in December 2004. The disapproval was based on the inconsistency of CS zoning with the Mixed Use policy called for in the area. The PUD also did not meet all of the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, including meeting landscape buffer yard and setback requirements. The Commission also recommended disapproval of those variance requests to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The current plan proposes to use the existing 911 square foot building as an office with gravel parking to the rear. An existing garage and shed is also proposed to be used.

RECENT REZONINGS - Yes. The Planning Commission approved an SP zoning district on the adjacent property at the January 12, 2006 meeting. It has not been to Metro Council yet.

There is a Council bill for this property for a PUD (2004P-038U-11) disapproved by the Commission in December 2004. The bill for the PUD will be withdrawn if this bill is approved for SP.

TRAFFIC PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION - No Exception Taken.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: RS5

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-family detached(210)	0.27	0.42	2	20	2	3

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: SP

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office(710)	0.27	--	911	11	2	2

Change in Traffic Between Typical Uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				-9	0	-1

CONDITIONS

1. The only permitted uses are Office, Building Contractor Supply, and Residential (single-family or live work). There shall be no car lots, automotive repair, fast food, or bar/nightclub permitted.
2. The existing structure is to remain and shall be maintained in good conditions, as it is now, and shall not be enclosed in another structure.
3. No more than 1,000 sq. ft. of additional floor area is allowed. Any addition must be located within the rear yard, behind the existing structure, and can be attached or detached.
4. All new development must meet the Metro Stormwater Regulations and Metro Public Works requirements.
5. Any form of outside storage is prohibited.
6. Only the eastern access point to Glenrose Avenue is allowed.
7. Parking is only allowed within the side and rear yard.
8. Setbacks are as follows from the property line:
 - Front: 20 feet
 - Rear: 3 feet
 - East: None
 - West: 15 feet
9. Existing fencing to remain in current type and location. No fence allowed along the front portion of the lot

- along Glenrose Avenue.
10. The only signage shall be one sign, no larger than 4 foot high by 6 foot long, and shall be no taller than 5 foot from the ground. No other signs or billboards shall be permitted.
 11. No cell phone or other telecommunications towers or antennas shall be allowed.
 12. The front yard of the house shall not be used for parking (except for on gravel driveways). Parking of employee vehicles and business-type vehicles will be allowed in existing parking lot.
 13. Low lux lighting shall be used and positioned so as not to shine into residences on Glenrose Avenue.
 14. No wrecked vehicles shall be allowed to sit on premises, nor any other mechanical parts that are not stored in permanent buildings.
 15. A final landscaping plan shall be submitted as part of the SP approval.
 16. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically listed above, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the MUN zoning district.
 17. Any changes on the final development plan from this preliminary site plan may require a new preliminary plan if the changes are deemed significant by planning staff.

Approved with conditions, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-051

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2004Z-163U-11 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. The only permitted uses are Office, Building Contractor Supply, and Residential (single-family or live work). There shall be no car lots, automotive repair, fast food, or bar/nightclub permitted.
2. The existing structure is to remain and shall be maintained in good conditions, as it is now, and shall not be enclosed in another structure.
3. No more than 1,000 sq. ft. of additional floor area is allowed. Any addition must be located within the rear yard, behind the existing structure, and can be attached or detached.
4. All new development must meet the Metro Stormwater Regulations and Metro Public Works requirements.
5. Any form of outside storage is prohibited.
6. Only the eastern access point to Glenrose Avenue is allowed.
7. Parking is only allowed within the side and rear yard.
8. Setbacks are as follows from the property line:
 - Front: 20 feet
 - Rear: 3 feet
 - East: None
 - West: 15 feet
9. Existing fencing to remain in current type and location. No fence allowed along the front portion of the lot along Glenrose Avenue.
10. The only signage shall be one sign, no larger than 4 foot high by 6 foot long, and shall be no taller than 5 foot from the ground. No other signs or billboards shall be permitted.
11. No cell phone or other telecommunications towers or antennas shall be allowed.
12. The front yard of the house shall not be used for parking (except for on gravel driveways). Parking of employee vehicles and business-type vehicles will be allowed in existing parking lot.

13. Low lux lighting shall be used and positioned so as not to shine into residences on Glenrose Avenue.
14. No wrecked vehicles shall be allowed to sit on premises, nor any other mechanical parts that are not stored in permanent buildings.
15. A final landscaping plan shall be submitted as part of the SP approval.
16. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically listed above, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the MUN zoning district.
17. Any changes on the final development plan from this preliminary site plan may require a new preliminary plan if the changes are deemed significant by planning staff.

The proposed SP plan is consistent with the areas Mixed Use policy, which is intended to encourage an integrated, diverse blend of compatible land uses ensuring unique opportunities for living, working, and shopping.”

4. **2005SP-099U-10**
 Map 131-02, Parcel 039, 040, 041, 042
 Subarea 10 (2005)
 District 34 - Lynn Williams

A request to rezone from R20 to SP district property to permit 8 duplex structures (a total of 16 units) located at 2201 Hobbs Road, 4207 and 4211 Stammer Place, 2200 Castleman Drive (2.34 acres), requested by Gresham, Smith & Partners, engineer, for Ruth Engel Yulman, William Gaw and Mary Buckner (Buckner Family Charitable Foundation), H.B. O'Steen, et ux, owners.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Special Policy 2005SP-099U-10 to February 23, 2006 at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

5. **2005Z-168U-10**
 Map 116-03, Parcel 106, 107, 108
 Map 116-03, Parcel 109, 110
 Subarea 10 (2005)
 District 24 - John Summers

A request to change from R10 to RM60 District property located at 110, 112A, 114, 116, and 118 Woodmont Boulevard, approximately 550 feet east of Harding Pike (1.66 acres), requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, applicant for, Wilson S. Manning et ux, owner.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions if the associated policy amendment to change the policy from RM to RH is approved, but disapprove if the policy is not changed.*

APPLICANT REQUEST - A request to change approximately 1.66 acres from residential single-family and duplex (R10) to residential multi-family (RM60) district property located at 110, 112A, 114, 116 and 118 Woodmont Boulevard.

Existing Zoning

R10 District - R10 requires a minimum 10,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 4.63 dwelling units per acre including 25% duplex lots.

Proposed Zoning

RM60 District - RM60 is intended for single-family, duplex, and multi-family dwellings at a density of 60 dwelling units per acre.

GREEN HILLS MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN

Residential Medium (RM) - RM policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range

of four to nine dwelling units per acre. A variety of housing types are appropriate. The most common types include compact, single-family detached units, town-homes, and walk-up apartments .

Residential High (RH) - RH policy is intended for new and existing residential development with densities above twenty dwelling units per acre. Any multi-family housing type is generally appropriate to achieve this density. The most common residential type will generally be mid or high-rise structures.

Policy Conflict - The proposed policy for this area is RH, which allows over 20 dwelling units per acre. However, if the policy is not changed, the majority of the property is within a RM policy, which is intended for development within a density range of four to nine dwelling units per acre. The associated PUD plan calls for approximately 15.7 dwelling units per acre. Although one parcel is within a RH policy, the entire site should be within a RH policy to be consistent with this request.

Subarea Amendment - Applicants have requested that the RM policy be amended, and that the new policy be RH. If the request is approved this application, and the associated PUD plan, will be consistent with the new policy.

Staff Recommendation - If the area policy is amended to RH, then staff recommends that the request be approved; however, if the policy is not amended, then the request should be disapproved.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. As recommended in the access study, developer shall construct a 3 lane cross section along Woodmont Blvd frontage with a 2 way center turn lane with adequate transition per AASHTO standards at the eastern property line. Widening shall accommodate existing bike lanes.
2. At the western property line Developer shall align center turn lane with westbound left turn lane on Woodmont Blvd at Harding Rd and extend this turn lane to connect with the 2 way left turn lane. Woodmont widening shall incorporate existing right turn lane on Woodmont at Harding.
3. Project driveways shall align with opposing driveways. Driveway shall be opposite Park Manor Blvd. Driveway shall be 24 ft wide for 2 way travel operation.
4. As recommended in the access study, Developer shall construct an eastbound left turn lane with 75ft of storage on Woodmont Blvd at Woodmont Circle with adequate transition per AASHTO standards. Existing Bike Lanes shall be accommodated.
5. Vehicular cross access to property along Kenner shall not be allowed.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: R10

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single Family Detached(210)	1.66	3.7	6	58	5	7

Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: RM60/PUD

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Square Footage	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Residential Condo/Townhome (230)	1.66	60	34*	258	22	25

*Based on Associated PUD

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: R10/PUD

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
---------------------	-------	---------	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------

Single Family Detached(210)	1.66	3.7	3*	30	3	4
-----------------------------	------	-----	----	----	---	---

*Based on associated PUD (3 existing lots included in the PUD)

Change in Traffic Between Typical uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				230	20	22

METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

Projected student generation* 1_Elementary 1_Middle 1_High

Schools Over/Under Capacity - Students would attend Julia Green Elementary School, Moore Middle School, and Hillsboro High School. All three schools have been identified as having capacity. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated August 2, 2005.

*** Student generation numbers are based upon the assumption of three units, at 1,000 square feet each.**

Mr. Swaggart presented Zone Change 2005Z-168U-10 and Planned Unit Development 2005P-32U-10 and stated that staff is recommended approval.

Mr. Richard Rhea, 2112 Woodlawn Drive, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Will Johnson, 187 Kenner Lane, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Johnny Morgan, 125 Kenner Lane, spoke in favor of the proposal.

Councilmember Summers submitted information to the Commission. He explained that the information lists several conditions that the developer has agreed to include in this development. He stated that the majority of the neighbors affected by this proposal are in favor of it. He requested its approval.

Mr. Loring moved and Mr. McLean seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve Zone Change 2005Z-168U-10 and Planned Unit Development 2005P-32U-10. **(8-0)**

[Note: Items #5 and #6 were discussed by the Metropolitan Planning Commission together. See Item #6 for actions and resolutions.]

- 6. 2005P-032U-10**
Woodmont/Kenner Luxury Condominiums
Map 116-03, Parcels 089, 090, 091, 106, 107, 108,
109, 110
Subarea 10 (2005)
District 24 - John Summers

A request for preliminary approval of a Residential Planned Unit Development District located at 110, 112A, 114, 116, and 118 Woodmont Boulevard, and 111, 113 and 115 Kenner Avenue, approximately 550 feet east of Harding Pike, classified in the R10 district with part being proposed to RM60 district (2.35 acres), to permit 34 multifamily units and 3 single-family lots, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, applicant for, Wilson S. Manning et ux, owners.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions if the associated policy amendment to change the policy from RM to RH is approved, but disapprove if the policy is not changed.*

APPLICANT REQUEST-Preliminary PUD

A request for preliminary approval of a Planned Unit Development overlay district located at 110, 112A, 114, 116 and 118 Woodmont Boulevard, and 111, 113 and 115 Kenner (2.35 acres), to permit 34 multi-family units and three

single-family units.

PLAN DETAILS

Site Plan - The request is for the development 34 condominiums and three single-family residences. As proposed, three new multi-story residential buildings will front Woodmont Boulevard, and the three existing single-family homes along Kenner Avenue will remain. The three new multi-story buildings will consist of a 10-story, a 6-story and a 3-story building, which will step-down from north to south.

Zoning and Density - Currently, the property is zoned R10. The parcels along Woodmont are proposed for RM60. The RM60 allows for 60 dwelling units per acre, but the plan only calls for approximately 15.7 units per acre. Although the density is more consistent with RM20, it would not allow buildings to be over 30 feet in height; therefore, the RM60 is being used, which allows buildings to be at a maximum 65 feet in height.

Parking - As proposed, 91 parking spaces are required. A total of 96 parking spaces are being provided.

Buffer Yards - Buffer yards are required to reduce the negative impact this development could have on adjacent areas in different zoning districts. The code requires a "C" class buffer yard between the RM60 and adjacent R10. The plan shows a "B-1" buffer yard.

Detention Area - As proposed the detention area is within the boundaries of the 3 single-family lots along Kenner. Typically detention areas should be within open space, and should not be counted towards lot area.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION - Approvals are subject to Public Work's review and approvals of construction plans.

As recommended in the access study, developer shall construct a 3 lane cross section along Woodmont Blvd frontage with a 2 way center turn lane with adequate transition per AASHTO standards at the eastern property line. Widening shall accommodate existing bike lanes.

At the western property line Developer shall align center turn lane with westbound left turn lane on Woodmont Blvd at Harding Rd and extend this turn lane to connect with the 2 way left turn lane. Woodmont widening shall incorporate existing right turn lane on Woodmont at Harding.

Project driveways shall align with opposing driveways. Driveway shall be opposite Park Manor Blvd. Driveway shall be 24 ft wide for 2 way travel operation.

As recommended in the access study, Developer shall construct an eastbound left turn lane with 75ft of storage on Woodmont Blvd at Woodmont Circle with adequate transition per AASHTO standards. Existing Bike Lanes shall be accommodated.

Vehicular cross access to property along Kenner shall not be allowed.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION- Detention/water quality facilities can not be located within residential lots.

WATER SERVICES - A new availability letter is required. The availability letter should reflect the total number of proposed units.

CONDITIONS

1. Buffer yards must meet buffer yards requirements as specified in Section 17.24.210 of the Metro Zoning Code.
2. Prior to final PUD approval, the detention site must be approved by Stormwater. If it is not approved, then the plan may need to be revised or possibly amended.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.

4. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
5. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits.
6. This final approval includes conditions which require correction/revision of the plans. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) copies of the corrected/revised plans have been submitted to and approved by staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
7. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require re-approval by the Planning Commission.

Loring moves for approval. McLean 2nds. Approved (8-0).

Resolution No. RS2006-052

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005Z-168U-10 is **APPROVED. (8-0)**

The proposed RM60 and associated PUD plan is consistent with the Green Hills Midtown Community Plan's Residential High policy that is for new and existing residential development with densities above 20 dwelling units per acre.”

Resolution No. RS2006-053

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005P-032U-10 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (8-0), including additional conditions as agreed to and submitted by the district councilmember at the Planning commission meeting.**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Buffer yards must meet buffer yards requirements as specified in Section 17.24.210 of the Metro Zoning Code.
2. Prior to final PUD approval, the detention site must be approved by Stormwater. If it is not approved, then the plan may need to be revised or possibly amended.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
4. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
5. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits.
6. This final approval includes conditions which require correction/revision of the plans. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) copies of the corrected/revised plans have been submitted to and approved by staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

7. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require re-approval by the Planning Commission.

Conditions of Approval at Commission:

1. The development has been reduced in size from the original 38 units to 34 units.
2. The development will be stair-stepped to minimize the height impact on the residences closest to the project.
3. Building height has been reduced from three sections of 11, 7, and 4 stories (38 units) to sections of 10, 6, and 3 stories (34 units).
4. The building design will reflect the more traditional construction in the West End area.
5. The three properties on Kenner Ave. will be renovated and sold as single family homes.
6. The immediately adjacent property owners have been given the option to sell their homes to Mr. Rhea within 30 days of the commencement of construction at appraised value; these properties will be added to the PUD as single family homes to provide additional buffer to adjoining residences; one property will remain as a buffer on Woodmont; all homes would remain on Kenner as single-family homes.
7. There will be no vehicular access from the condo development on to Kenner/Ridgelake Aves., all access will be to Woodmont Blvd.; pedestrian access to Kenner/Ridgeland Aves. would be allowed.
8. Construction access onto the site will be restricted to Woodmont Ave.
9. A ten-foot high opaque perimeter fencing will be constructed along the adjacent properties with a 3-5 foot set back from the property line.
10. Actual construction work on the site would be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday; only work of an emergency nature will be done on Saturdays; there will be no work on Sundays.
11. Construction lighting will be directed away from the adjacent properties and will be limited to the 6:00 am to 7:00 pm construction period; there will be safety/security lighting on the property during the evening hours.
12. A 500 foot survey area would be conducted prior to the commencement of any blasting; additional homeowners may have a survey conducted for \$50 per home.
13. Any claims for damages and other issues would be handled by a specific consultant hired for this project.
14. All excavation work would be completed in 90 days; estimated 9,000 cubic yards of material will be moved on the site.
15. A day's notice will be given for any blasting.
16. Blasting will occur during the hours of 9-12 am and 2-4pm.
17. Existing mature trees will remain where possible; a site plan will be provided.
18. Landscaping will be done with mature trees in excess of Metro Codes requirements. The immediate adjacent properties will be provided a \$2,5000 landscaping budget on their property.
19. Mr. Rhea will be responsible for the renovation of the property on Kenner Ave. for resale to homeowners.
20. Mr. Manning, the property owner, has offered to donate \$50,000 to a trust account to be administered and

used by the Kenner Manor neighborhood for community improvement projects.

The proposed PUD plan is consistent with the Green Hills Midtown Community Plan’s Residential High policy that is for new and existing residential development with densities above 20 dwelling units per acre; and the Residential Medium policy that is for residential development within a density range of 4-9 dwelling units per acre.”

7. 2006Z-020T
BL2006-936

A request to change Section 16.28.190 of the Metro Code relative to demolition permits for historic structures, requested by the Metro Historical Commission and Metro Codes Department.

Staff Recommendation - Approve

REQUEST-Amend Title 16 of the Metropolitan Code, section 16.28.190, to establish a process for issuing demolition permits for properties on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places or which meet the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 (demolition of residential structures).

NOTE: Although it is unusual for the Metro Planning Commission to provide recommendations on changes to Metropolitan Code *outside* Title 17 (the chapter on Zoning), the Commission was asked to consider this ordinance due to its ramifications on land use.

Amend 16.28.190 Issuance of Demolition Permits

The proposed amendment would require that:

1. For a property on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places or which meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 (demolition of residential structures), but is not included in a historic overlay district, a demolition permit cannot be issued by the Director of Codes until the Executive Director of the Historical Commission approves the permit.
2. The Executive Director of the Historical Commission must act on the demolition permit within ninety days of the filing of the application, unless a longer period is agreed to by the applicant.
3. For structures built before 1865, the applicant for the demolition permit must provide, with the demolition permit, at least two reports, each prepared by a Qualified Historic Restoration Consultant (defined in the ordinance), stating:
 - a. The name and qualifications of the person making the report,
 - b. The condition of structural elements of the building proposed to be demolished (further defined in the ordinance),
 - c. An estimated cost of repair for those item(s) identified in the structural report as damaged or decayed and which affect the structural integrity of the structure, and
 - d. A valuation from a Qualified Historic Properties Real Estate Appraiser (defined in the ordinance) of the building(s) proposed to be demolished.
4. Upon reviewing the reports, the Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission shall hold a public hearing and make the determination of whether or not the structure meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201. If the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 are met, the Historic Zoning Commission shall initiate legislation to allow the Metropolitan Council the opportunity to approve or disapprove the demolition in accordance with T.C.A. § 7-51-1201.

BACKGROUND - At its December 8, 2005, meeting, the Metro Planning Commission (MPC) approved BL2005-864 unanimously. The ordinance has since been enacted into law (January 21, 2006). BL2005-864 was one of three ordinances related to demolition of historic structures, developed by Metro Codes Department and Metro Historic Zoning Commission after the demolition of historic Evergreen Place.

BL2005-864 amended the Powers and Duties of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission (MHZC) to state that the MHZC is the entity charged with determining whether a residential structure meets the criteria in state law to require Metro Council approval for its demolition.

One companion bill created a review period of up to ninety days for demolition permits for properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or meeting the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201. The other companion bill created a process for determining if a structure to be demolished meets the criteria in T.C.A. § 7-51-1201.

Initially these companion bills were referred to the Metro Council Codes Committee for review, since they amend the Metropolitan Codes chapter on building codes and permits, not Zoning. Since that time, however, the Metro Legal Department has determined these ordinances should be reviewed by the Metro Planning Commission due to their ramifications on land use policy. These two ordinances have been combined into one ordinance (2006Z-020T), which is before the Commission today.

ANALYSIS - Tennessee Code Annotated § 7-51-1201 provides specific criteria which, if met by a residential structure, dictates that the structure is historic and stipulates that the structure cannot be demolished unless the legislative body of the county or municipality approves the demolition. The criteria are as follows:

1. The residential structure was originally constructed before 1865;
2. The residential structure is repairable at a reasonable cost; and
3. The residential structure has a historical significance besides age itself, including, but not limited to, uniqueness of architecture, occurrence of historical events, notable former residents, design by a particular architect, or construction by a particular planner.

A further section of the Tennessee Code establishes that if the legislative body of the county or municipality does not approve the demolition, then it shall proceed with a condemnation proceeding or purchase the property in question within 90 days.

BL2006-936 creates a process whereby the MHZC can determine if the structure for which a demolition permit is sought meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201. If the structure does not, then the demolition permit may be issued by the Metro Codes Department. If the structure does meet the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201, then the MHZC will initiate legislation to allow Metro Council to make the decision on the demolition of the structure.

The 90 day review period established for National Register listed or eligible properties will allow MHZC and the applicant to discuss alternatives to demolition or mitigation of the loss of the structure such as documentation of the structure's value, relocation of the structure, salvaging of materials from the structure etc.

The MHZC estimates that there are approximately 100 pre-1865 residential structures in Davidson County that, if their owners sought to demolish them, could be impacted by this ordinance.

The MHZC estimates that there are approximately 6,000 structures in Nashville/Davidson County that are listed on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places; approximately 3,000 of those properties are protected within existing zoning overlays.

Metro Planning has received letters of support from Metro Codes Department and MHZC for the original three ordinances – support which remains for the new bill before Metro Planning Commission today.

RECOMMENDATION - Approve. BL2006-936, in conjunction with BL2005-864 approved by Metro Planning Commission in December 2005, utilizes existing state law to give Metro Government the authority to weigh demolition decisions involving historic structures. Together, the two bills create a process that should facilitate public consideration and review of the future of these historic structures.

ORDINANCE NO. BL2006-936

An Ordinance amending Title 16 of the Metropolitan Code by amending section 16.28.190 relative to demolition permits for historic structures (Proposal No. 2006Z-020T).

Whereas, the Metropolitan Government established the Historical Commission pursuant to Metropolitan Code Section 2.128.010; and

Whereas, historic structures are an invaluable part of history of Nashville and Davidson County; and

Whereas, historic structures are an inherently irreplaceable, finite resource, of substantial community and public value; and

Whereas, historic structures are important to the economic well-being of Nashville and Davidson County in attracting visitors and providing unique locations for businesses; and

Whereas, historic structures provide housing for all income levels; and

Whereas, historic structures can be adapted for new uses and revitalize communities; and

Whereas, the continued use of historic structures preserves irreplaceable craftsmanship and building materials; and

Whereas, historic structures serve as visible reminders of the history and cultural heritage of the community, state and United States; and

Whereas, allowing up to ninety days before a demolition permit issues will allow the Historical Commission time to attempt mitigation of a planned demolition, including but not limited to documentation, salvage of historic materials, dismantling of historic structure for education in construction technology, relocation, or other appropriate measures; and

Whereas, T.C.A. §7-51-1201 states that no residential structure may be demolished, without Metropolitan Council approval, if it meets the following criteria:

(1) The residential structure was originally constructed before 1865;

(2) The residential structure is repairable at a reasonable cost; and

(3) The residential structure has a historical significance besides age itself, including, but not limited to, uniqueness of architecture, occurrence of historical events, notable former residents, design by a particular architect, or construction by a particular builder; and

Whereas, the Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission is uniquely qualified to make the necessary determinations under these criteria.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY:

Section 1. That chapter 16.28 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws be and the same is hereby amended by deleting Section 16.28.190 in its entirety and substituting in lieu thereof the following new Section 16.28.190:
16.28.190 Issuance.

A. If the application for a permit under this chapter and the drawings filed therewith describe work which does not conform to the requirements of this chapter or other pertinent laws or ordinances, the director of codes administration shall not issue a permit, but shall return the drawings to the applicant with his refusal to issue such permit. Such refusal shall, when requested, be in writing and shall contain the reasons therefore.

B. When the Department of Codes Administration receives an application for a demolition permit for a structure which, individually or as part of a group of structures, is listed or is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission, but is not included in a historic overlay district, the Director of Codes Administration shall not issue a demolition permit for the structure until the Executive Director of the Historical Commission approves the demolition permit. The Executive Director must take action on the demolition permit within ninety days of the permit application, unless a longer period is agreed upon by the applicant and the Executive Director.

C. The following requirements shall be satisfied prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for a structure that was originally constructed before 1865:

1. The property owner or the owner's agent applying for a demolition permit for a structure that was originally constructed before 1865 shall, with the application for the permit, present to the Director of Codes Administration and the Executive Director of the Metropolitan Historical Commission at least two reports, each prepared by a Qualified Historic Restoration Consultant, stating the following:

a. The name and qualifications of the person making the report.

b. The condition of structural elements of the building proposed to be demolished. Such report should include an assessment of damage or decay, if any, to foundations, flooring, floor supports, walls and other vertical supports, ceilings, roofs and their support systems and other horizontal elements, fireplace, chimneys, exterior cladding and other exterior elements that may affect structural integrity, windows, window frames and doors and/or any fault, defect or condition that might affect the structural integrity or the water-tightness of the building.

c. An estimated cost of repair for those item(s) identified in the structural report as damaged or decayed and which affect the structural integrity of the structure.

d. A valuation from a Qualified Historic Properties Real Estate Appraiser of the building(s) proposed to be

demolished.

2. For purposes of subsection C.1., the following definitions shall apply:

"Qualified Historic Restoration Consultant" is defined as a professionally licensed Architect or General Contractor with a specialty in historic buildings, i.e., one who has worked directly on the rehabilitation or restoration of historic buildings for a minimum of ten years and/or a minimum of fifteen long-term (lasting six months or more) historic building projects. The consultant shall provide a list of qualifying historic projects, detailing their scope, budget, the consultant's scope of involvement, specific historic issues/challenges, date of completion, and client contact information. The MHZC will determine whether the consultant meets these criteria.

"Qualified Historic Properties Real Estate Appraiser" is defined as an individual who has a minimum of five years of professional experience working as a real estate appraiser, specifically including the valuation of historic property, buildings, and their appurtenances. For these purposes, "Historic" shall be defined as 100 years old and older. The Appraiser shall provide a listing of historic properties evaluated, with accompanying date of service and client contact information. The MHZC will determine whether the consultant meets these established criteria.

3. Upon receipt of the demolition permit application, the Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission shall, at a scheduled public hearing, make the determination as to whether or not the structure meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201. If the Historic Zoning Commission determines that the structure at issue meets the criteria of T.C.A. § 7-51-1201, it shall initiate legislation to allow the Metropolitan Council the opportunity to approve or disapprove the demolition in accordance with T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 et seq.

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect from and after its passage, the welfare of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County requiring it.

Sponsored by: Pam Murray

Approved, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-054

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006Z-020T is **APPROVED (8-0)**”

8. 2006Z-022T
BL2006-937

A request to amend Section 17.04.060 of the Metro Zoning Code modifying the definition of “two-family” structure to include two detached dwelling units, requested by Councilmember David Briley.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve*

REQUEST -Amend Title 17 of the Metropolitan Code, Section 17.04.060B, to modify the definition of “two-family” structure to include two detached dwelling units.

Amend 17.04.060.B Definitions of general terms

Amend the definition of “two-family” structures by adding the following provision at the end of the definition:

“, or two detached dwelling units separated by at least ten feet, provided that the distance can be less than ten feet if the facing walls on both units are rated according to the Standard Building Code as adopted by the Metropolitan Government pursuant to Chapter 16.08 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws.”

ANALYSIS

Existing Law - The current definition of a “two-family” structure in zoning code is “two attached dwelling units forming a single structure connected by not less than eight feet of continuous floor, roof and walls.”

In the past, two-family structures were largely built as two units within one large structure. In recent years, however, more two-family structures are being built as two buildings with a connector, often referred to derisively as the “umbilical cord.” One of the most frequently heard complaints about two-family structures designed as two buildings with a connector is that they are out of character in neighborhoods with single-family homes or two-family homes designed to look like a single, unified structure.

The proposed change to the definition of “two-family” structures will allow for additional options in the design of two-family structures. Meanwhile, the proposed definition requires that the facing walls on detached two-family structures be built to the specifications of the Standard Building Code.

RECOMMENDATION - Approve. The proposed change to the definition of “two-family” structures in the zoning code will provide for additional design options property owners seeking to build two-family structures. It addresses one design complaint surrounding two-family structures while continuing to allow two-family structures to meet the housing needs of residents of Nashville/Davidson County.

Approved, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-055

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006Z-022T is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

XIV. PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLATS

- 9. 2006S-055G-06**
Travis Place
Map 126, Part of Parcel 60 and 142
Subarea 6 (2003)
District 35 - Charlie Tygard

A request for preliminary plat approval to create 140 lots located on the east side of McCrory Lane and the west side of Beautiful Valley Drive (43.70 acres), zoned RS10, requested by William and Robert Travis, owners, Civil Site Design Group, surveyor.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Preliminary Plat 2006S-055G-06 to February 23, 2006 at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

- 10. 2006S-060G-12**
Turner Farms
Map 187-00, Parcels 009, 154, 155, 178
Subarea 12 (2004)
District 31 - Parker Toler

A request for preliminary plat approval to create 151 lots located on the south side of Burkitt Road, approximately 565 feet west of Gloryland Lane (46.8 acres), zoned RS10, requested by Karen G. King, owner, C.Michael Moran, surveyor.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Preliminary Subdivision Plat to February 23, 2006 at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

XV. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS (revisions)

- 11. 2001UD-001G-12**
Lenox Village, Section 3
Map 172, Parcel Part of 90, 93, 243
Subarea 12 (2004)
District 31 - Parker Toler

A request for final approval for Section 3 of the Urban Design Overlay district located along the south side of Lenox Village Drive, and the east side of Nolensville Pike, classified MUL, to develop 36 condominiums, and 31 single family lots, requested by Batson and Associates for Lenox Village I, LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions*

APPLICANT REQUEST - Final UDO

Request for final approval for Section 3 of the Urban Design Overlay district located along the south side of Lenox Village Drive, and the east side of Nolensville Pike, classified MUL, to develop 36 condominiums, and 31 single family lots.

PLAN DETAILS

Site Plan - The plan calls for 31 single-family lots and 36 condominiums. The 31 single-family lots will be along a new street, and will have rear access. The 36 condominium units will be within three separate buildings with each building having 12 units. Condominiums will be along a new street with rear parking.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. Submit signal plan and modify signal at Lenox Village Drive upon approval.
2. Submit signal warrant analysis for Bienville / Nolensville Rd intersection upon construction of Bienville Drive. Upon approval of signal by T&P commission ,submit signal plan and install signal . Signal plan shall include ped signals and ADA facilities if sidewalks are required along Nolensville Rd.

Comply with previous conditions of approval as follow:

Along Lenox Village property frontage on Nolensville Road

1. Install 2-way left turn lane from Lord's Chapel to access #5 with transition per AASHTO standards.
2. Reserve 1/2 ROW for Nolensville Road U6 classification. (1/2 Of 132 ft)

Lord's Chapel Way, northernmost access point (access #1)

The northernmost access point (access 1) to Lenox Village has already been constructed.

1. The pavement shall be striped to provide WB left turn lane and WB right turn lane.
2. No on-street parking shall be allowed for 300 feet from intersection on the north side of access 1 in order to allow adequate storage.
3. Install 12-foot wide southbound (SB) left turn lane on Nolensville Rd with 75 feet of storage length.

Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection (access #2)

The Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection is currently signalized.

1. Re-stripe WB Lenox Village Dr for left/thru lane and a WB right lane.
2. Install NB right turn lane.
3. Install 150 ft SB left turn lane in 2-way left turn lane.
4. Provide no parking on north side of access road for 200 ft from intersection.

Project access #3, private drive for Commercial

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #3
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane

Project access #4 (Porter House Drive)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #4 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. No on street parking shall be provided for 75 ft from intersection

5. Provide adequate sight distance

Project access #5 (Bienville)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #5 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. Install signal when warranted. Traffic counts and warrant analysis shall be conducted annually and submitted to Metro traffic Engineer for signal approval. Signal plan shall include pedestrian signal and associated ADA standard facilities.
5. Provide adequate sight distance

Signal at project access #5, Bienville, to be bonded with recordation of final plat.

At project access #5, Bienville, traffic counts and signal warrant analysis shall be conducted at 80% completion of project. Upon approval by the T & P commission, Developer shall Submit signal plans to traffic engineer and install signal.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

1. Sign the EPSC note (ensure that the person signing this note has had the EPSC Level 1 class).
2. Design the silt fence per TCP - 13 (serves 1/4 acre, turn up at the ends, follow the contours, etc.).
3. Provide more detailed information on final stabilization of the site per TCP - 05.
4. Label the rock check dam with Metro's BMP detail number.
5. Specify which inlet protection will be used and ensure that the detail matches that particular inlet protection.
6. Add a note stating that detention for this section is handled in the proposed pond.
7. Submit calculations to size the temporary sediment pond (include a drainage area map for the area draining to the pond).
8. Where is the downstream information for the pond outlet and pipe 42-43?
9. Add the FEMA note to the plans.
10. Pipe 64-65 shows a total flow that is greater than the capacity. Verify that this information is correct.

CONDITIONS

1. Correct Map and Parcel numbers on plans.
2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
3. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
4. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and adequate water supply for fire protection must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. If any cul-de-sac is required to be larger than the dimensions specified by the Metropolitan Subdivision Regulations, such cul-de-sac must include a landscaped median in the middle of the turn-around, including trees.

Approved with conditions, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-056

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2001UD-001G-12 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

3. Submit signal plan and modify signal at Lenox Village Drive upon approval.
4. Submit signal warrant analysis for Bienville / Nolensville Rd intersection upon construction of Bienville Drive. Upon approval of signal by T&P commission ,submit signal plan and install signal . Signal plan shall include ped signals and ADA facilities if sidewalks are required along Nolensville Rd.

Comply with previous conditions of approval as follow:

Along Lenox Village property frontage on Nolensville Road

1. Install 2-way left turn lane from Lord's Chapel to access #5 with transition per AASHTO standards.
2. Reserve 1/2 ROW for Nolensville Road U6 classification. (1/2 Of 132 ft)

Lord's Chapel Way, northernmost access point (access #1)

The northernmost access point (access 1) to Lenox Village has already been constructed.

1. The pavement shall be striped to provide WB left turn lane and WB right turn lane.
2. No on-street parking shall be allowed for 300 feet from intersection on the north side of access 1 in order to allow adequate storage.
3. Install 12-foot wide southbound (SB) left turn lane on Nolensville Rd with 75 feet of storage length.

Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection (access #2)

The Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection is currently signalized.

1. Re-stripe WB Lenox Village Dr for left/thru lane and a WB right lane.
2. Install NB right turn lane.
3. Install 150 ft SB left turn lane in 2-way left turn lane.
4. Provide no parking on north side of access road for 200 ft from intersection.

Project access #3, private drive for Commercial

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #3
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane

Project access #4 (Porter House Drive)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #4 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. No on street parking shall be provided for 75 ft from intersection
5. Provide adequate sight distance

Project access #5 (Bienville)

6. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #5 road
7. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane

8. Install NB right turn lane
9. Install signal when warranted. Traffic counts and warrant analysis shall be conducted annually and submitted to Metro traffic Engineer for signal approval. Signal plan shall include pedestrian signal and associated ADA standard facilities.
10. Provide adequate sight distance

Signal at project access #5, Bienville, to be bonded with recordation of final plat.

At project access #5, Bienville, traffic counts and signal warrant analysis shall be conducted at 80% completion of project. Upon approval by the T & P commission, Developer shall Submit signal plans to traffic engineer and install signal.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

11. Sign the EPSC note (ensure that the person signing this note has had the EPSC Level 1 class).
12. Design the silt fence per TCP - 13 (serves 1/4 acre, turn up at the ends, follow the contours, etc.).
13. Provide more detailed information on final stabilization of the site per TCP - 05.
14. Label the rock check dam with Metro's BMP detail number.
15. Specify which inlet protection will be used and ensure that the detail matches that particular inlet protection.
16. Add a note stating that detention for this section is handled in the proposed pond.
17. Submit calculations to size the temporary sediment pond (include a drainage area map for the area draining to the pond).
18. Where is the downstream information for the pond outlet and pipe 42-43?
19. Add the FEMA note to the plans.
20. Pipe 64-65 shows a total flow that is greater than the capacity. Verify that this information is correct.

CONDITIONS

5. Correct Map and Parcel numbers on plans.
6. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
7. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
8. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and adequate water supply for fire protection must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. If any cul-de-sac is required to be larger than the dimensions specified by the Metropolitan Subdivision Regulations, such cul-de-sac must include a landscaped median in the middle of the turn-around, including trees."

12. **2001UD-001G-12**
Lenox Village, Phase D
Map 172, Parcel 244
Subarea 12 (2004)
District 31 - Parker Toler

A request to revise a portion of the approved UDO, and final approval for Phase D of the Urban Design Overlay district located along the north side of Lords Chapel Drive, east of Nolensville Pike, classified RM9, to develop 21 condominium units, requested by Batson and Associates for Lenox Village I, LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve with conditions*

APPLICANT REQUEST - Final UDO

A request to revise a portion of the approved final UDO, and for final approval for Phase D of the Urban Design Overlay district located along the north side of Lords Chapel Drive, east of Nolensville Pike, classified RM9, to develop 21 condominium units.

PLAN DETAILS

Site Plan -The plan calls for 21 condominiums. The units will be distributed amongst 5 separate buildings. Because of topographical issues, the layout has been modified from the previous approved plan. Applicants have worked with planning staff with the current plan, and the layout is consistent with the UDO document.

TRAFFIC PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. Submit signal plan and modify signal at Lenox Village Drive upon approval.
2. Submit signal warrant analysis for Bienville / Nolensville Rd intersection upon construction of Bienville Drive. Upon approval of signal by T&P commission, submit signal plan and install signal. Signal plan shall include ped signals and ADA facilities if sidewalks are required along Nolensville Rd.

Comply with previous conditions of approval as follow:

Along Lenox Village property frontage on Nolensville Road

1. Install 2-way left turn lane from Lord's Chapel to access #5 with transition per AASHTO standards.
2. Reserve 1/2 ROW for Nolensville Road U6 classification. (1/2 Of 132 ft)

Lord's Chapel Way, northernmost access point (access #1)

The northernmost access point (access 1) to Lenox Village has already been constructed.

1. The pavement shall be striped to provide WB left turn lane and WB right turn lane.
2. No on-street parking shall be allowed for 300 feet from intersection on the north side of access 1 in order to allow adequate storage.
3. Install 12-foot wide southbound (SB) left turn lane on Nolensville Rd with 75 feet of storage length.

Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection (access #2)

The Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection is currently signalized.

1. Re-stripe WB Lenox Village Dr for left/thru lane and a WB right lane.
2. Install NB right turn lane.
3. Install 150 ft SB left turn lane in 2-way left turn lane.
4. Provide no parking on north side of access road for 200 ft from intersection

Project access #3, private drive for Commercial

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #3
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane

Project access #4 (Porter House Drive)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #4 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. No on street parking shall be provided for 75 ft from intersection

5. Provide adequate sight distance

Project access #5 (Bienville)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #5 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. Install signal when warranted. Traffic counts and warrant analysis shall be conducted annually and submitted to Metro traffic Engineer for signal approval. Signal plan shall include pedestrian signal and associated ADA standard facilities.
5. Provide adequate sight distance

Signal at project access #5, Bienville, to be bonded with recordation of final plat.

At project access #5, Bienville, traffic counts and signal warrant analysis shall be conducted at 80% completion of project. Upon approval by the T & P commission, Developer shall Submit signal plans to traffic engineer and install signal.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION - Approve

CONDITIONS

1. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
3. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and adequate water supply for fire protection must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. If any cul-de-sac is required to be larger than the dimensions specified by the Metropolitan Subdivision Regulations, such cul-de-sac must include a landscaped median in the middle of the turn-around, including trees.

Approved with conditions, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-057

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2001UD-001G-12 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. Submit signal plan and modify signal at Lenox Village Drive upon approval.
2. Submit signal warrant analysis for Bienville / Nolensville Rd intersection upon construction of Bienville Drive. Upon approval of signal by T&P commission, submit signal plan and install signal. Signal plan shall include ped signals and ADA facilities if sidewalks are required along Nolensville Rd.

Comply with previous conditions of approval as follow:

Along Lenox Village property frontage on Nolensville Road

1. Install 2-way left turn lane from Lord's Chapel to access #5 with transition per AASHTO standards.
2. Reserve 1/2 ROW for Nolensville Road U6 classification. (1/2 Of 132 ft)

Lord's Chapel Way, northernmost access point (access #1)

The northernmost access point (access 1) to Lenox Village has already been constructed.

1. The pavement shall be striped to provide WB left turn lane and WB right turn lane.
2. No on-street parking shall be allowed for 300 feet from intersection on the north side of access 1 in order to allow adequate storage.
3. Install 12-foot wide southbound (SB) left turn lane on Nolensville Rd with 75 feet of storage length.

Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection (access #2)

The Bradford Hills / Lenox Village Drive and Nolensville Road intersection is currently signalized.

1. Re-stripe WB Lenox Village Dr for left/thru lane and a WB right lane.
2. Install NB right turn lane.
3. Install 150 ft SB left turn lane in 2-way left turn lane.
4. Provide no parking on north side of access road for 200 ft from intersection

Project access #3, private drive for Commercial

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #3
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane

Project access #4 (Porter House Drive)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #4 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. No on street parking shall be provided for 75 ft from intersection
5. Provide adequate sight distance

Project access #5 (Bienville)

1. Install separate 11 ft wide WB left turn and right turn lanes and 11 ft wide entering lane for access #5 road
2. Install 12 ft wide SB left turn on Nolensville RD with 75 ft of storage length in 2-way left turn lane
3. Install NB right turn lane
4. Install signal when warranted. Traffic counts and warrant analysis shall be conducted annually and submitted to Metro traffic Engineer for signal approval. Signal plan shall include pedestrian signal and associated ADA standard facilities.
5. Provide adequate sight distance

Signal at project access #5, Bienville, to be bonded with recordation of final plat.

At project access #5, Bienville, traffic counts and signal warrant analysis shall be conducted at 80% completion of project. Upon approval by the T & P commission, Developer shall Submit signal plans to traffic engineer and install signal.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION - Approve

CONDITIONS

1. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
3. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and adequate water supply for fire protection must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. If any cul-de-sac is required to be larger than the dimensions specified by the Metropolitan Subdivision Regulations, such cul-de-sac must include a landscaped median in the middle of the turn-around, including trees.

XVI. MANDATORY REFERRALS

- 13. 2005M-268U-11**
Map 106, Parcel 02
Subarea 11 (1999)
District 17 – Ronnie Greer

A request that the name of P Pool Avenue from Elm Hill Pike to Transit Ave be officially changed to "Lannie Boswell Avenue" in honor of Lannie Boswell. Requested by Councilmember J.B. Loring.

Staff Recommendation - *Approve*

APPLICANT REQUEST - Request to rename P Pool Avenue to "Lannie Boswell Avenue."

What is being requested? - Councilmember J.B. Loring has proposed to change the name of P Pool Avenue to Lannie Boswell Avenue.

Why is this being requested? - This street renaming is being proposed to honor Mr. Lannie Boswell. According to documentation provided by Public Works: "Mr. Boswell was born in Henderson, KY, on November 22, 1890. He was a supporter and influential in the starting of a Henderson business known as Boswell's Harley-Davidson in 1950. He moved with that business to Nashville in 1963. That original business is still in operation at 401 Fesslers Lane today. A spin-off company known as Boswell's Golf Cars since 1963 is also still in operation today at 111 Transit Avenue. Mr. Boswell died on July 20, 1974."

What are the procedures for a street name change? -Street names can only be changed by the Metro Council through the adoption of an ordinance. The Planning Department is required to notify all property owners on the street of the proposed name change, and to give residents the opportunity to provide written comments in support of or in opposition to the proposed name change.

What public response has been received? One letter has been received opposing the name change. The letter is from an area manufacturing company. The company is concerned about giving directions to their facilities because the current street name is a "one part name," but the new name is a "two part name." The company states that they would not oppose naming the street "Boswell Avenue."

Staff Recommendation - Councilmember Loring's original proposal was to name this street simply "Boswell Avenue." Section 13.08.015 of the Metro Code prohibits the naming of streets for the purpose of promoting a private business. Staff from Planning and Public Works sought advice from the Department of Law as to whether naming this street "Boswell Avenue" would be a violation of this Code section. It was determined that naming the street "Lannie Boswell Avenue" would appear less to promote the existing Boswell-named businesses in the area and more to honor the late Mr. Boswell.

In order to comply with the spirit of the Code provisions that prohibit naming a street to promote a private business, therefore, staff recommends approval of renaming P Pool Avenue to Lannie Boswell Avenue.

Approved, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-058

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005M-268U-11 is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

XVII. OTHER BUSINESS

14. Indefinite deferral of rehearing for PUD # 95-71-G, MetroCenter, Lot 1 (Crest Hummer Dealership). On January 26, 2006, the Commission set this item for rehearing on February 9, but the applicant has not yet obtained approval from Stormwater.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Planned Unit Development #95-71-G indefinitely at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

15. Approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Metropolitan Public Health Department in the amount of up to \$7,325.02 to provide matching funds to support the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Grant (CMAQ)."

Approved, **Consent Agenda (8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2006-059

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Metropolitan Health Department to support the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Grant (CMAQ) was **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

16. Addendum to Agenda

2006Z-017T

A request to amend various sections of the Metro Zoning Code relative to landscaping and tree protection requirements, requested by the Codes Department.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Text Amendment 2006Z-017T to February 23, 2006 at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

16. Executive Director Reports

Mr. Bernhardt announced that Councilmember Coleman had requested a rehearing on 68-86-U-13 that was heard at the January 26, 2006 meeting. He explained the Councilmember’s request to the Commission.

Mr. Lawson offered that the request did not warrant a rehearing due to the original nature of the application in relation to this the Councilmember’s request.

The commission will not rehear this proposal.

17. Legislative Update

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Chairman

Secretary

Equal Employment Opportunity Employer



The Planning Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, race, sex, color, national origin, religion or disability in access to, or operation of its programs, services, activities or in its hiring or employment practices. **ADA inquiries should be forwarded to:** Josie L. Bass, Planning Department ADA Compliance Coordinator, 730 Second Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37201, (615)862-7150. **Title VI inquires should be forwarded to:** Michelle Lane, Metro Title VI Coordinator, 222 Third Avenue North, Suite 200, Nashville, TN 37201, (615)862-6170. **All employment related inquiries should be forwarded to Metro Human Resources:** Delaine Linville at (615)862-6640.