



**Project No.  
Request**

**2007CP-07-07**  
**Request to Amend the**  
***Subarea 7 Plan: 1999 Update and the Bellevue***  
***Community Plan: 2003 Update***

**Associated Cases**  
**Council District**  
**School Districts**  
**Requested by**

None  
23 - Evans  
9- Marsha Warden  
Councilwoman Emily Evans

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Adams  
*Approve Detailed Land Use Plan with Special Policy*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Amend the *Subarea 7 Plan: 1999 Update and the Bellevue Community Plan: 2003 Update* to add Natural Conservation (NCo) policy with Special Policies to the existing land use policies of Residential Low Density (RL), Residential Low Medium Density (RLM), Residential Medium Density (RM), Residential Medium High Density (RMH), and Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) for approximately 2,100 acres located within the boundaries of I-40 to the north, Jocelyn Hollow Road to the east, Hwy 70 South to the south, and Old Hickory Boulevard to the west.**

**CURRENT POLICIES**

Residential Low (RL)

RL policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range of up to two dwelling units per acre. The predominant development type is single-family homes.

Residential Low Medium (RLM)

RLM policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range of about two to four dwellings units per acre. The predominant development type is single-family homes.

Residential Medium (RM)

RM policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range of four to nine dwelling units per acre. A mix of housing types is appropriate.

Residential Medium High (RMH)

RMH policy is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range between nine and 20 dwelling units per acre. The development type includes a variety of multi-family housing.

Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC)

CMC policy is intended to accommodate major concentrations of mixed commercial development that provide consumer goods, services, and employment. The development



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

types include medium-high to high density residential, all types of retail trade, and highway-oriented commercial services.

---

### PROPOSED LAND USE POLICY

#### Natural Conservation (NCO)

Natural Conservation policy is proposed for all areas within the study boundary that contain environmentally sensitive features (steep slopes, major ridgeline, view sheds, blue line streams, active waterfalls) as well as the historic Belle Meade Plantation Wall.

Natural Conservation land use policy is generally intended to provide protection to areas unsuitable for conventional suburban or urban development. In this case however, the area is mostly developed in a low-intensity residential pattern, with the exception of two large tracts with developable acreage and two Planned Unit Developments (PUD) that are not completely developed. Therefore, the Natural Conservation land use policy is used to provide protection from additional development with the application of special policies and detailed development guidelines.

---

### BACKGROUND

Councilwoman Emily Evans asked the Metro Planning Department to examine a plan amendment that would preserve the hillsides and other environmentally sensitive features in the area, to address excessive grading and cut and fill from development. The most prominent case of cut and fill is The Reserves - a multi-family residential PUD approved in late 1980 for 864 units, of which only 198 units have been built. Councilwoman Evans and her constituents expressed concern that continued cut and fill could negatively impact the ridgeline that currently acts as a natural buffer between the single family residential land uses near Jocelyn Hollow Road and the multi-family and commercial uses on Old Hickory Blvd.

---

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Staff held two community meetings to discuss the plan amendment, on Tuesday June 5, 2007, and Monday June 11, 2007. In total, 88 people attended the community meetings. The majority of participants were very supportive of the plan amendment to Natural Conservation Policy, with the understanding that it would still allow development in the area, but with additional development guidelines that encourage context sensitive design on hillsides and ridgelines.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

The majority of the participants were also interested in pursuing regulatory protections in the future, with additional community conversation, consensus, and Council support.

---

### ANALYSIS EXISTING POLICY GUIDANCE

The requested amendment is in keeping with the following goals and objectives of the *Subarea 7 Plan: 1999 Update*:

***Environmental:***

1. *Protect environmentally sensitive areas.*

***Land Use:***

1. *Conserve existing residential densities,*
2. *Promote infill development that is compatible with existing residential development, and*
3. *Protect residential areas from the encroachment of non-residential land uses.*

***Historic Preservation:***

1. *Identify and preserve structures and areas of historical significance.*

The requested amendment is in keeping with the following goals and objectives of the *Bellevue Community Plan: 2003 Update*:

***Community and Neighborhood Development:***

1. *Protect hills from being cut away to help keep the lovely scenic views*

---

### PROPOSED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following are goals and objectives in the plan amendment. They are an extension of the goals established during the community plan updates in 1999 and 2003. The following establishes the framework for the special policies and development guidelines associated with the plan amendment.

***Goal 1***

*Preserve major ridgelines and viewsheds for the protection of natural wildlife corridors, vegetation, and scenic views.*

***Objectives***

- a. *Identify and define major ridgelines by an elevation threshold.*
- b. *Identify important view sheds in the study area.*



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### **Goal 2**

*Minimize the physical and aesthetic impacts of excessive grading of hillsides and slopes by promoting residential design that blends with the surrounding natural environment.*

### **Objectives**

- a. *Identify an appropriate density that will allow development to occur without overwhelming the sensitive features of the land, but will also satisfy the existing development entitlements of the study area.*
- b. *Provide examples of single family residential design that is sensitive to the steep slopes and the major ridgeline.*
- c. *Provide examples of grading practices that follow the natural topography of the land.*
- d. *Provide examples of buffering using existing mature stands of trees.*

Upon establishing the goals of the plan amendment, staff completed research on the amendment area's environmentally sensitive features and drafted special policies for the following: steep slopes and hillsides, the prominent ridgeline, sensitive soils types, and view sheds. The special policies define the aforementioned features and provide design principles for each.

Comments from residents during community meetings revealed additional features that were deemed environmentally sensitive or historically significant and important to preserve including the Historic Belle Meade Plantation Wall, active water falls, and blue line streams. Special policies provide guidelines on how to address these features when they are encountered during development situations.

---

### **APPLYING NATURAL CONSERVATION POLICY**

The Natural Conservation land use policy was applied to all areas with slopes greater than 20 percent. These areas also contain the major ridgeline, and views that make up the identified view shed. Upon applying the Natural Conservation policy, it was noted that some properties may still contain land *without* 20 percent slopes where the current land use policies RL, RM, RMH, and CMC are present. These properties will have *two land use policies* applied to them – the Natural Conservation policy on areas of the property with slopes greater than 20 percent, and their existing land use policy on the remainder of the land. Where this condition occurs, the densities of the two policies (Natural Conservation and the other policy) are



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

averaged proportionately to the acreage of the property to determine the developable density of the property. The development guidelines associated with the Natural Conservation policy would still apply.

One exception was made to this process for three parcels adjacent to Old Hickory Blvd. which are currently RLM policy. For these parcels, the community agreed to keep the density at two to four dwelling units per acre. This was deemed appropriate for these parcels given their location on Old Hickory, the surrounding development pattern, and the minimal environmental constraints facing these properties.

---

### APPLYING SPECIAL POLICIES

Special policies are included within the Natural Conservation Policy to address density and form of development:

- Residential density: maintaining a low density along steep slopes and ridgelines to retain the existing development pattern of one dwelling unit per two acres in the area; and
- Building form, access and buffering: building structures and providing access in a manner that complements the natural landscape to lessen excessive grading and cut and fill practices, and encourage the buffering of structures to reduce the visual presence of buildings in identified view sheds.

The complete analysis, the *West Meade / Bellevue Plan Amendment Special Policy: Hillside Protection and Development Standards* report, including maps and graphics, is available from the Planning Department.



**Project No.  
Request**

**2007CP-13-05  
Request to Amend the  
East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update**

**Associated Cases  
Council District  
School Districts  
Requested by**

None  
7 – Cole  
5 - Porter  
Dan Heller

**Staff Reviewer  
Staff Recommendation**

Wood  
*Approve amendment from Residential Low Medium  
Density to Neighborhood Center with Special Policies;  
retain Neighborhood General on Parcel 238*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Amend the East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update  
from Residential Low-Medium Density and Neighborhood  
General to Neighborhood Center for approximately 1.48  
acres located along both sides of Riverside Drive between  
McGavock Pike and Oakhurst Drive.**

**CURRENT LAND USE  
POLICIES**

Residential Low-Medium  
Density (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.

Neighborhood General (NG)

NG is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located. 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 to the intent of the policy.

**PROPOSED LAND USE POLICY**

Neighborhood Center (NC)

NC is intended for small, intense areas that may contain multiple functions and are intended to act as local centers of activity. Ideally, a neighborhood center is a "walk-to" area within a five-minute walk of the surrounding neighborhood it serves. The key types of uses intended within NC areas are those that meet daily convenience needs and/or provide a place to gather and socialize. Appropriate uses include single- and multi-family residential, public benefit activities and small-scale office



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

and commercial uses. An 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 to the intent of the policy.

---

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

A community meeting was held on July 12, 2007, at the Inglewood Branch Library. It was attended by nine people. Support was evident for the plan amendment and an associated Specific Plan for the area, discussed below. Attendees were interested in additional goods and services for the surrounding neighborhoods and pleased with the revitalization of the center that has taken place to date. Some people did have specific concerns about the possibility of future expansions of the Neighborhood Center. These were discussed at some length and it was agreed that it would be important to establish strong transition areas from the Neighborhood Center to adjacent residential and to limit future expansions of this and other Neighborhood Centers along Riverside Drive to avoid commercialization of Riverside Drive.

---

### ANALYSIS

This plan amendment request is associated with a mixed use Specific Plan zone change proposal for the three properties on the east side of Riverside Drive. This zone change request will come before the Planning Commission on a future agenda. The properties on the west side of Riverside Drive are not being considered for rezoning at this time. The applicant initially requested that an amendment be considered for the five parcels that are adjacent to Riverside drive. Staff added the sixth parcel, on Maxey Drive, to the amendment area to analyze whether its inclusion in the Neighborhood Center was warranted, since this was not immediately evident from reviewing maps. Field review quickly revealed that the Maxey Drive parcel is strongly related to the residential neighborhood to the west and should remain part of that environment rather than be added to the Neighborhood Center.

Staff is recommending approval of the amendment to expand the Neighborhood Center at McGavock Drive and Riverside Drive because it is reasonable to expand this particular center given the large area it serves, its access via the intersection of two arterial streets, and the growing market pressure for goods and services in the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, physical characteristics of the site and its relationship to its surroundings enable a solid transition area to be established to adjacent residential



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

development. There are fewer Neighborhood Centers north of Trinity Lane than there are south of Trinity Lane, therefore larger Neighborhood Centers are warranted to the north, particularly when the Center is as accessible as this one. This is in keeping with the following Goal and Objectives of the East Nashville Community Plan:

### ***Increase commercial choices available to residents.***

#### *Objectives:*

- a. Support well-designed, conveniently located commercial services within walking distance of residential areas, especially in the Neighborhood and Center Transect categories.*
- b. Provide adequate opportunities at appropriate locations at neighborhood centers and nodes along Gallatin and Dickerson Pike for needed goods and services to develop.*
- c. Encourage local residents and merchants associations to attract needed new businesses to areas where they are lacking.*
- d. Facilitate new opportunities through such tools and resources as Detailed Neighborhood Design Plans, Planned Unit Developments, Urban Design Overlays, Specific Plan Zoning Districts, and Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency programs identifying and guiding development opportunities.*

Staff is in agreement, however, with the concern to limit future expansion of the Neighborhood Center, particularly along Riverside Drive. Riverside Drive is among the Nashville's most notable and attractive residential arterials and should be preserved as such. Therefore, staff believes it is important to establish both a land use and a physical transition area within the proposed addition to the Neighborhood Center. Thus, the following Special Policy is included as part of this amendment:

#### *Special Policy Area 24*

*This area is intended to serve as a transition from the more intense mixed uses along McGavock Pike to the residential uses further south along Riverside Drive, which is intended to retain its character as a residential boulevard with occasional compact Neighborhood Center nodes found at key intersections. To this end, uses within the Special Policy area should be more limited in scale and intensity than those to the north. To achieve this difference in scale and intensity, if rezoning of this area is*





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

*requested, the provisions of the Mixed Use Neighborhood District as it exists as of the date of the establishment of this Special Policy should be used as a guide for developing zoning for the site rather than the more intense Mixed Use Limited District that has been used elsewhere in this Neighborhood Center. Moreover, uses on the southernmost parcels (parcels 237 and 296) need to be further limited to exclude any of the Restaurant uses as well as the Bar or Nightclub use to further ensure a transition to the residential to the south.*

*A solid, well-maintained landscape buffer also needs to be established on these two southernmost parcels to further define and strengthen the transition to the adjacent residential area.*

*The completion of Oakhurst Drive to Alley #1125 and the improvement of Alley #1125 must occur in association with rezoning and future mixed use redevelopment of the properties on the west side of Riverside Drive that are within this Special Policy area. At that time, solid landscape buffering should be established between the Neighborhood center development and adjacent residential. A pedestrian and bicycle connection should be constructed to Maxey Drive and Branch Street.*



**Project No.  
Project Name**

**Zoning Text Change 2007Z-113T  
Text Amendment to Change Review of Bulk  
Standards in Historic Districts**

**Council Bill  
Requested By  
Deferral**

None  
Metro Historic Zoning Commission  
*Deferred from the June 28, 2007, Planning Commission  
meeting*

**Staff Reviewer  
Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Approve*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request to amend the Metro Zoning Code, Section 17.40.410 to permit the Historic Zoning Commission to determine, for lots within historic overlay districts, the maximum building size and buildable area within which a building can be located.**

**APPLICATION DETAILS**

Section 17.40.410 of the Zoning Ordinance provides the powers and duties of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission (MHZC). Within this section is the list of elements within historic overlay districts that MHZC has the power to review. The list currently includes the appropriateness of architectural features for new construction and additions, and the appropriateness of exterior alterations and repairs, building relocation, and demolition. This text amendment proposes the addition of “[t]he appropriateness of the maximum size of buildings and structures on a lot and the buildable area within which a building can be located, including setbacks and height.”

Within the design guidelines for an established historic overlay district are the requirements for new construction, additions, and demolition. These design guidelines, when adopted by the MHZC, are found to be in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The design guidelines for an established district include sections on height and scale, which give the MHZC contextual guidance when reviewing new construction, additions, or demolitions for compliance with the proposed text amendment.

**Metro Historic Zoning Commission  
Staff Recommendation**

The Metro Historic Zoning Commission (MHZC) staff has reviewed the attached text amendment to section 17.40.410 of the Zoning Regulations of Davidson County. The MHZC staff approves the proposed text amendment, which addresses the review of setbacks and height of new construction in historic districts, as it follows the MHZC



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Staff Recommendation

adopted design guidelines for new construction in historic overlay districts.

Because the text amendment furthers the intent of the design guidelines for established historic overlay districts, staff recommends approval.

The text in the Zoning Ordinance, with the amendment in bold, will read as follows:

17.40.410 Powers and duties.

A. Creation of Historic Overlay Districts. The historic zoning commission shall review applications calling for the designation of historic overlay districts according to the standards contained in Chapter 17.36, Article III, referring written recommendations to the metropolitan council. Establishment of an historic overlay district on the official zoning map shall be in accordance with Section 18.02 of the Metropolitan Charter and Article III of this chapter.

B. Establishment of Design Review Guidelines. The historic zoning commission shall adopt design guidelines for each historic overlay district and apply those guidelines when considering preservation permit applications. Design guidelines relating to the construction, alteration, addition and repair to, and relocation and demolition of structures and other improvements shall be consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. A public hearing following the applicable public notice requirements of Article XV of this chapter shall precede the adoption of all design review guidelines by the historic zoning commission. Testimony and evidence material to the type of historic overlay under consideration may be considered by the commission in its deliberations.

C. Design and Demolition Review. The historic zoning commission shall make the following determinations with respect to historic overlay districts:

1. The appropriateness of the exterior architectural design and features of, and appurtenances related to, any new structure or improvement;
2. The appropriateness of the exterior architectural design and features of any addition to the existing structure;
3. The appropriateness of exterior alterations and repairs to an existing structure;
4. The appropriateness of relocating any building out of, into, or within the boundaries of an historic overlay district; and

**5. The appropriateness of the maximum size of buildings and structures on a lot and the buildable area within which a building can be located, including setbacks and height; and**

6. The appropriateness of demolishing any structure or other improvement. As a condition of any permission to demolish a structure or other improvement, the historic zoning commission may require historical documentation in the manner of interior and exterior photographs, architectural measured drawings of the exterior, or other notations of architectural features, all at the expense of the commission;

7. The historic zoning commission may take into consideration the historical or architectural significance of the subject structure or improvement; and the impact of the proposed undertaking on the historic character and integrity of the district as a whole.

D. Right of Entry Upon Land. In performance of its duties, the commission and its staff may access the grounds of any land within its jurisdiction to make examinations and surveys or post public notices as required by this zoning code; however, this code does not empower right of entry into a building without the consent of the owner.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

E. Use of Land. The use of property located within an historic overlay district shall be governed solely by the associated base zoning district or an approved PUD master development plan.

F. Compliance with T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 et seq. For the purposes of complying with T.C.A. § 7-51-1201 et seq., the Historic Zoning Commission shall make the determination of whether a structure for which a demolition permit has been applied for 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.





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Lot Frontage (Section 3-4.2.b)

Section 3-4.2.b of the Metro Subdivision Regulations stipulates that new lots have frontage on a public street, or where permitted, on a private street. All lots with the exception of lots 1 and 2 will front directly onto a public roadway. While lots 1 and 2 will not front directly onto a roadway they will indirectly front onto Monticello Drive and will be accessed by a rear alley. The original layout had lots backing towards Monticello, which was not appropriate since no other lots in the area backed towards Monticello Drive. The applicant worked with planning staff and modified the layout to include all homes whether directly or indirectly fronting onto Monticello Drive. Since the lots will have adequate access then staff recommends that a variance to Section 3-4.2.b of the Metro Subdivision Regulations be approved.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the concept plat be approved with conditions including a variance to Section 3-4.2.b of the Metro Subdivision Regulations.

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

Approve with conditions:

1. A Hydrologic Determination Certificate must be executed.

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
2. Construct turnaround at terminus of dead-end alley, or provide for connectivity of alley.
3. Provide adequate intersection and stopping sight distance at the project access drive onto Monticello Drive, per AASHTO standards.

### CONDITIONS (if approved)

1. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for 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,



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

including trees. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter.

2. Pursuant to 2-3.4.e of the Metro Subdivision Regulations, if this application receives conditional approval from the Planning Commission, that approval shall expire unless revised plans showing the conditions on the face of the plans are submitted prior to any application for a final plat, and in no event more than 30 days after the effective date of the Commission's conditional approval vote.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**  
**Deferral**

**Subdivision 2007S-144G-14**  
**Earhart Road Subdivision**  
12 – Gotto  
4 - Glover  
Wanda C. Baker, owner, Dale & Associates, surveyor  
*Deferred from the June 28, 2007, Planning Commission meeting*

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Approve with conditions*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Concept Plan**

**A request for concept plan approval to create 142 lots on property located at Earhart Road (unnumbered), approximately 2,330 feet north of Hessey Road, zoned Single-Family Residential (RS15), (69.76 acres).**

**ZONING**

RS15 District

RS15 requires a minimum 15,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 2.47 dwelling units per acre.

**PLAN DETAILS**

The concept plan proposes 142 single-family lots. This application is proposing to use the cluster lot option, which allows lots to be reduced in size by two base zone districts. Since the zoning is RS15, 7,500 sq. ft. lots are allowed if the plan meets all requirements of the cluster lot option policy.

Site Access

Access is proposed from the existing Earhart Road. Eight future connections are provided, six of which end in temporary turnarounds. Sidewalks are provided on all new streets.

Open Space

There is 16.36% usable open space proposed, which meets the 15% requirement for the cluster lot option. The Commission’s cluster lot policy requires common open space to have “use and enjoyment” value to the residents including recreational value, scenic value, or passive use value. Residual land with no “use or enjoyment” value, including required buffers and stormwater facilities, has not been counted towards the open space requirements. The total amount of open space is 37.98%.

Landscape buffer yards (Standard “C”- 20 feet) are required and proposed along the perimeter of the property since the lots are under the base zoning and the adjacent zoning is RS15.





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Staff Recommendation

As the concept plan meets the requirements of a cluster lot subdivision and connectivity has been provided, staff recommends approval with conditions.

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.

Document sight distance at project entrance, and if adequate site distance is available per AASHTO for the posted speed limit.

Submit geotechnical report evaluating proposed roadway location, with the submittal of construction plan.

Earhart Court permanent cul-de-sac per ST-331.

### NES RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Developer to provide high voltage layout for underground conduit system and proposed transformer locations for NES review and approval
- 2) Metro to inform NES and Developer as to what type high voltage service is to be installed
- 3) Developer to provide construction drawings and a digital .dwg file @ state plane coordinates that contains the civil site information (after approval by Metro Planning)
- 4) 20-foot easement required adjacent to all public right of way
- 5) NES can meet with developer/engineer upon request to determine electrical service options
- 6) NES needs any drawings that will cover any road improvements to Earhart Rd that Metro PW might require
- 7) Developer should work with Metro PW on street lighting required future location(s) due to Metro's requirements
- 8) NES follows the National Fire Protection Association rules; Refer to NFPA 70 article 450-27; and NESC Section 15 - 152.A.2 for complete rules
- 9) Need bridge details to determine conduit route for NES, Comcast, ATT.

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

Approved



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

---

### WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION

The Concept Plan submitted is acceptable to the Development Services Division. At this time, we have not yet received water and sewer plans.

---

### FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION

No Comment

---

### CONDITIONS

1. Submit a geotechnical report with the development plan.
2. Final plat must show a 20-foot easement adjacent to all public right of way.
3. Confirm calculations in Site Data and Data Table.
4. Right-of-way and pavement shall extend to property lines.
5. Final plat must meet all requirements in the Metro Zoning Ordinance.
6. Provide for Planning Department review and approval, all proposed transformer locations prior to final approval by NES.
7. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for 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. The required turnaround may be up to 120 feet diameter.
8. Pursuant to 2-3.4.e of the Metro Subdivision Regulations, if this application receives conditional approval from the Planning Commission, that approval shall expire unless revised plans showing the conditions on the face of the plans are submitted prior to any application for a final plat, and in no event more than 30 days after the effective date of the Commission's conditional approval vote.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**

**Planned Unit Development 94-83-G-06**  
**Williamsport Subdivision, Section II (Sidewalk Removal)**

**Council District**  
**School Board District**  
**Requested By**

22 - Crafton  
9 - Warden  
Barry Construction Company, applicant, for various owners

**Deferral**

*Deferred from the June 14, 2007, Planning Commission meeting*

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Disapprove*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Revise Preliminary & Final PUD**

**A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval of a Planned Unit Development located on the east side of Sawyer Brown Road, (12.9 acres), to remove the approved sidewalk along one side of Briksberry Court, and Huntwood Place, zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R20).**

**PLAN DETAILS**

The plan is consistent with the PUD plan approved in 1993, except that the sidewalks are removed from one side of Briksberry Court and Huntwood Court.

There are 24 lots on the two cul-de-sacs. The applicant was required to obtain the signatures of all of the property owners in order to submit this application. The mailboxes and driveways of the property owners would be affected by the installation of sidewalks. The only items that would be affected, however, are those located within the public right-of-way.

At the time of the PUD approval, sidewalks were required by the Subdivision Regulations on one side of the street. Additionally, since the sidewalks are shown on the PUD plan, they are a requirement of the approved PUD. Even though the sidewalks are shown on one side of each street in the approved PUD plans, they are not shown on the final plat. Failure to show the sidewalks on the final plat does not relieve the applicant from the requirement of obtaining variance from the Subdivision Regulations.

The applicant constructed the streets and sold the lots without constructing the required sidewalks. The applicant has not identified any hardship that would justify granting a variance and removing the sidewalk. The property does not have extreme topography and staff has



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

determined that the sidewalk can be built with minimal destruction of landscaping. During discussions with Public Works, the applicant was offered the option of putting the sidewalk on either side of the street, not just the side on which it was shown in the approved plan.

If the Commission chooses to remove the requirement by revising the PUD *and* granting a variance to the subdivision regulations, staff recommends requiring a contribution equivalent to the cost of the required sidewalk as a condition for removal, and that the contribution be applied to sidewalk and related needs in the same pedestrian impact zone, as determined by Public Works.

### Staff Recommendation

If this sidewalk is constructed it will lead to an existing sidewalk along Williamsport Court. Because this revision does not promote a walkable community and removes a requirement of the Subdivision Regulations *and* the approved PUD without justification, staff recommends disapproval. If the Commission chooses to approve the request, staff recommends a condition requiring a contribution equivalent to the cost of the required sidewalk as determined by Public Works.

---

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

Exception Taken  
Construct sidewalks, or make payment in-lieu of construction of sidewalks.

---

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

Approve if curb and gutter is in-place and operable.

---

### CONDITIONS (if approved)

1. A contribution equivalent to the cost of the required sidewalk as a condition for removal, and that the contribution would be applied to sidewalk and related needs in the same pedestrian impact zone, as determined by Public Works.
2. 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.
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



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

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. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter.

4. If 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.
5. 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 reapproval by the Planning Commission.
6. Within 30 days, submit a revised plan with lot lines that match the recorded plat.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Zone Change 2006Z-058U-14</b>
<b>Council Bill</b>	None
<b>Council District</b>	15 - Loring
<b>School District</b>	4 - Glover
<b>Requested by</b>	Regent Land LLC, owner.
<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Swaggart
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request to change approximately 1.5 acres from Commercial Service (CS) zoning to Mixed Use Limited (MUL) zoning, property located at 1515 Lebanon Pike.**

**Existing Zoning**  
CS District

Commercial Service is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, office, self-storage, light manufacturing and small warehouse uses.

**Proposed Zoning**  
MUL District

Mixed Use Limited is intended for a moderate intensity mixture of residential, retail, restaurant, and office uses.

**DONELSON-OLD HICKORY-HERMITAGE COMMUNITY PLAN POLICY**

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.

**Consistent with Policy?**

Yes. The proposed Mixed Use Limited zoning district is consistent with the area’s Commercial Arterial Existing policy.

**Staff Recommendation**

Since the requested MUL is consistent with the area’s CAE policy, staff recommends that the request be approved.

**RECENT REZONINGS**

None

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

No Exception Taken



# Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: CS

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	1.5	0.198	12,937	143	21	20

### Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: MUL

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Gas Station with Convenience Market (945)	1.5	0.057	3,724	NA	289	359

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

				Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				NA	268	339

### Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: CS

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Convenience Market (852)	1.5	0.12*	7,841	NA	244	272

\*Max based on typical sq. ft. for this type of use.

### Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: MUL

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Gas Station with Convenience Market (945)	1.5	0.12*	7,841	NA	609	756

\*Max based on typical sq. ft. for this type of use.

### Change in Traffic Between Maximum Uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

		--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				NA	365	484

## METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

**Projected student generation\***

**3 Elementary    2 Middle    3 High**

Schools Over/Under Capacity

Students would attend McGavock Elementary School, Two Rivers Middle School, and McGavock High School. McGavock Elementary and McGavock High School are over capacity. There is capacity within the cluster for additional elementary students and within an adjacent



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

cluster for high school students. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated May 2007.

\*Total number of units based on assumed 1,200 sq. ft. units.





**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council Bill**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

**Zone Change 2006SP-075U-08**  
**Taylor Place Specific Plan**  
BL2006-1162  
19 - Wallace  
1 - Thompson  
Wilbur Smith Associates for Ed Swinger, owner

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Leeman  
*Disapprove as submitted; approve with three lots, including one single-family or one two-family dwelling on the corner lot.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Preliminary SP**

**Rezone 0.18 acres from One and Two-Family Residential (R6) to Specific Plan (SP) zoning property located at 1329 7th Avenue North, along the southwest corner of 7th Avenue North and Taylor Street to permit 4 single-family lots.**

**Existing Zoning**  
R6 District

R6 requires a minimum 6,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 7.72 dwelling units per acre including 25% duplex lots.

**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.

---

**NORTH NASHVILLE**  
**COMMUNITY PLAN POLICY**  
Neighborhood Urban (NU)

NU policy is intended for fairly intense, expansive areas that are intended to contain a significant amount of residential development, but are planned to be mixed use in character. Predominant uses in these areas include a variety of housing, public benefit uses, commercial activities and mixed-use development. An accompanying SP, 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 to the intent of the policy.

*Germantown Detailed*  
*Neighborhood Design Plan*  
Mixed Live/Work

MLW is intended for primarily residential uses, while providing opportunities for small commercial



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

establishments, mostly home-run professional or retail services.

### History

This request was previously disapproved by the Planning Commission on August 10, 2006, for the following reasons: **“The proposed SP district is not consistent with the North Nashville Community Plan’s Neighborhood Urban structure plan, and the areas Mixed Live/Work detail plan. Both policies are intended for a mixture of residential and small commercial type uses. The proposed SP also does not provide adequate information.”**

The Metro Council deferred this item indefinitely on November 21, 2006, and referred it back to the Planning Commission. A new plan was not submitted by the applicant until June 2007, but the issues remain the same. The current request reduces the proposed number of lots from five lots to four lots, with the option that the corner lot (Lot D) may be amended by Council at a later date to allow either mixed-use or live/work development, or that the residential development be developed with setbacks consistent with the setbacks along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North (as per the MDHA Design review comments.)

Staff recommends disapproval of the plan, as submitted. Lot D cannot be approved for live-work or mixed-use development since the current council bill does not include these uses, and cannot be amended to include these uses. The proposed plan would, in effect, create a reserve parcel dependent on a future rezoning, which may never occur. Staff does not support a plan that is dependent on a future rezoning since it would leave three parcels with single-family use, and a corner lot that cannot be built until the SP district is amended by Council.

Staff also recommends disapproval of single-family residential on the corner lot (Lot D) as currently proposed since the lot is not large enough to allow the setbacks necessary to be consistent with the other setbacks along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. The MDHA design review committee recommended that if Lot D remains single-family that it meet the current setbacks of the homes along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, which are approximately 30 feet.

Staff would recommend approval of three total lots, including one single-family or duplex lot on the corner of Taylor Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North (4 total units). If



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Consistent with Policy?

approved as three lots, architectural elevations must be submitted with any final site plan, including a corner unit(s) that fronts on both streets.

While the proposed single-family lot could be consistent with the policy, the proposed SP plan does not allow enough lot area for Lot D to provide an adequate building envelope and meet the existing setbacks along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. Although the Germantown DNDP calls for a mixture of residential and office uses, the site plan proposes all residential uses with an option to allow mixed-use or live-work if Lot D is amended by Council in the future. Since there is currently a council bill pending at the Metro Council, with only single-family residential uses, the mixed-use proposal cannot be considered with this re-referral from council.

---

### PLAN DETAILS

The plan proposes four single-family homes with access, and four parking spaces, from an existing alley and two on-street spaces along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. The frontage of the development is proposed along Taylor Street. The plan proposes a density of 22 units per acre, including three lots containing 1,568 sq. ft. and one lot containing 1,960 sq. ft.

### Building Elevations

If approved, building architectural elevations must be submitted prior to or in conjunction with the final site plans.

### MDHA Recommendation

The MDHA Design Review Committee has reviewed this case and recommended approval with residential setbacks along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue North consistent with the existing setbacks along that street, or including mixed-use or live/work on the corner lot. If developed as mixed-use or live/work, the building on the corner lot must be brought to the corner.

### Staff Recommendation

Disapprove as submitted; approve with three lots, including one single-family or one two-family dwelling on the corner lot.

---

### RECENT REZONINGS

Yes. The Planning Commission recommended disapproval of a similar proposal with 5 lots on August 10, 2006.

---

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.

Identify plans for solid waste collection and disposal.  
Identify storage location.

Construct Alley along property frontage per Public Works' standards and specifications.

Plan proposes required parking on-street. Remove first parking space on 7th Avenue at Taylor Street. Provide minimum thirty feet separation from a crosswalk at an intersection.

### Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: R6

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-family detached (210)	0.18	6.18	1	10	1	2

### Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: SP

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-Family detached (210)	0.18	n/a	4	39	3	5

### Change in Traffic Between Maximum Uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--			+3	29	2	3

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

No Exception Taken

### METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

#### Projected student generation

0 Elementary    0 Middle    0 High

#### Schools Over/Under Capacity

Students would attend Brookmeade Elementary School, Hill Middle School or Hillwood High School. All schools have been identified as having capacity by the Metro School Board. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated April 2007.

### CONDITIONS (if approved)

- As a part of the final SP plan approval, a separate, detailed landscaping plan and architectural elevations must be submitted for review and approval.
- For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

and/or included as a condition of Commission or Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the MUL zoning district, which must be shown on the plan.

3. 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.
4. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
5. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access utilizing the approved design and adequate water supply for fire protection must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits.
6. Minor adjustments to the site plan may be approved by the planning commission or its designee based upon final architectural, engineering or site design and actual site conditions. All adjustments shall be consistent with the principles and further the objectives of the approved plan. Adjustments shall not be permitted, except through an ordinance approved by Metro Council that increase the permitted density or intensity, add uses not otherwise permitted, eliminate specific conditions or requirements contained in the plan as adopted through this enacting ordinance, or add vehicular access points not currently present or approved.
7. Within 120 days of Planning Commission approval of this preliminary SP plan, and in any event prior to any additional development applications for this property, including submission of a final SP site plan, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a final corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan for filing and recording with the Davidson County Register of Deeds. Failure to submit a final corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission.



**Project No.  
Project Name**

**Zoning Text Change 2007Z-071T  
Text Amendment to Require Recreation  
Facilities in Cluster Lot PUDs**

**Council Bill  
Requested By**

BL2007-1449  
Councilmember Walter Hunt

**Staff Reviewer  
Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Disapprove as filed, approve with amendments*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request to amend Section 17.36.070 of the Metro Zoning Code to require developers clustering single-family and two-family lots within a planned unit development (PUD) district to construct recreational facilities on a portion of the designated common open space.**

**ANALYSIS  
Existing Law**

Section 17.36.070 of the Zoning Code regulates cluster lot subdivisions within Planned Unit Development (PUD) districts while Section 17.12.090 regulates such subdivisions outside of a PUD. The provisions require 15% of the gross land area within each phase to be designated for common open space.

The designated 15% open space may not include landscape buffer yards, stormwater management devices, grassy or landscaped medians/islands, or planting strips per the Subdivision Regulations and Planning Department policy. There is no requirement for such open space areas to be improved with active or passive recreational uses.

**Proposed Bill**

The proposed bill would require a developer, who elects to use the PUD cluster lot provisions of the Zoning Code, to provide active recreational facilities at the rate of one facility per every 50 residential lots. The bill specifically identifies such facilities as tennis courts, basketball courts, playgrounds, baseball/softball diamonds, or volleyball courts and, for developments marketed as senior citizen housing, park benches, swings, gazebos, and similar types of alternative equipment.

**History**

A request to amend Section 17.12.090, for cluster lot subdivisions outside of PUDs, was heard by the Planning Commission on February 22, 2007. The request was approved with amendments and the bill was amended at Council. The current request, to amend Section 17.36.070, for cluster lot subdivisions within PUDs, has not yet been



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

heard by the Planning Commission. Both bills will come before Metro Council for third reading in August.

In February, staff recommended the following amendments:

1. An amendment that states that the recreation facilities required under this bill shall be located within usable open space areas and prohibited from being located in natural areas with slope greater than 15%, floodplain, sinkholes, or areas that would impact cultural resources.
2. An amendment to add that the requirement for recreation facilities also applies to cluster-lot subdivisions within a PUD.

In addition, staff recommends that the Council consider:

3. Whether some flexibility in the type of recreational facilities might be appropriate for developments that may serve more diverse or limited age groups
4. Use of a sliding scale as to the number of facilities within larger developments.

This request, to amend Section 17.36.070, was created in response to the second amendment in the above list. The other three amendments were addressed in the bill for Section 17.12.090. The bill for the current request was amended to reflect the changes recommended by staff for the bill for Section 17.12.090.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval with amendments. The bills provide much needed facilities in residential cluster lot developments. Active recreational facilities are needed for children and adults to maintain a healthy lifestyle.

*Both* bills, however, should be amended to address two issues. Language has been provided to the sponsoring Councilmember for amendments to both bills. Staff recommends the following amendments:

1. Recreational facilities should be more broadly defined.
2. The scale determining the number of required recreational facilities should be 1 recreational facility per 100 units. Developments under 25 units should still be exempt.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

The text in the Zoning Ordinance, with the amendments to the bill shown in bold, will read as follows:

### Section 17.36.070

#### A. Clustering Single-Family and Two-Family Lots.

1. Residential lots within a PUD district may be clustered to a greater extent than allowed by the cluster lot provisions of Section 17.12.080 in return for extraordinary protection of environmentally sensitive areas in a natural state. With proper environmental protection, a PUD master development plan may recapture up to one hundred percent of the average density achievable by similarly zoned land with no environmental constraints. The actual achievable density for any given master development plan may be less depending upon the extent of environmentally sensitive areas to be protected and the minimum lot requirements established below.

#### 2. Recreational facilities.

a. Any property owner or developer of a subdivision clustering single-family and two-family lots within a PUD district as provided in subsection A.1. of this section shall install and/or construct recreational facilities on a portion of the required undeveloped common open space. For purposes of this section, **"recreation facilities" mean active play facilities (including but not limited to tennis courts, basketball courts, swimming pools, playgrounds, baseball/softball diamonds or volleyball courts) and passive amenities (including but not limited to walking trails, picnic shelters or gazebos, shared docks, and similar passive recreation amenities). Proposed recreation facilities shall be defined on the Master Development Plan and shall be demonstrated appropriate to the intended demographics of the single-family and two-family portion of a PUD.**

b. Recreational facilities required pursuant to this subsection shall be located within usable open space areas and shall not be constructed within the following areas:

- a. Natural areas with slope greater than fifteen percent (15%);
- b. Within the floodplain;
- c. Within a sinkhole; or
- d. Within areas that would impact cultural resources.

c. At a minimum, recreational facilities shall be constructed and/or installed in accordance with the following schedule:

1. Residential developments containing fewer than 25 units shall be exempt from the requirement to install recreation facilities.

**2. One recreational facility shall be installed for developments containing between 25 and 99 total residential units, plus an additional recreational facility for every 100 residential units in excess of the first 99 units.**

### Section 17.12.090, Cluster Lot Option

#### G. Recreational facilities.

1. Any property owner or developer of a subdivision utilizing the cluster lot option shall install and/or construct recreational facilities on a portion of the common open space required pursuant to the provisions of this section. For purposes of this section, **"recreation facilities" mean active**





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

**play facilities (including but not limited to tennis courts, basketball courts, swimming pools, playgrounds, baseball/softball diamonds or volleyball courts) and passive amenities (including but not limited to walking trails, picnic shelters or gazebos, shared docks, and similar passive recreation amenities). Proposed recreation facilities shall be defined on the concept plan of a subdivision and shall be demonstrated appropriate to the intended demographics of the cluster lot option subdivision.**

2. Recreational facilities required pursuant to this subsection shall be located within usable open space areas and shall not be constructed within the following areas:

- a. Natural areas with slope greater than fifteen percent (15%);
- b. Within the floodplain;
- c. Within a sinkhole; or
- d. Within areas that would impact cultural resources.

3. At a minimum, recreational facilities shall be constructed and/or installed in accordance with the following schedule:

a. Residential developments containing fewer than 25 units shall be exempt from the requirement to install recreation facilities.

**b. One recreational facility shall be installed for developments containing between 25 and 99 total residential units, plus an additional recreational facility for every 100 residential units in excess of the first 99 units.**



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

**Zone Change 2007Z-126U-11**  
None  
16 - Page  
7 - Kindall  
Dennis Ray Austin, owner

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Leeman  
*Disapprove*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request to change 0.34 acres from Office and Residential (OR20) to Commercial Service (CS) zoning property located at 429 Veritas Street.**

**Existing Zoning**  
**OR20 District**

Office/Residential is intended for office and/or multi-family residential units at up to 20 dwelling units per acre.

**Proposed Zoning**  
**CS District**

Commercial Service is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, office, self-storage, light manufacturing and small warehouse uses.

---

**SOUTH NASHVILLE**  
**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, townhomes, and walk-up apartments.

Office Transition (OT)

OT policy is intended for small offices intended to serve as a transition between lower and higher intensity uses where there are no suitable natural features that can be used as buffers. Generally, transitional offices are used between residential and commercial areas. The predominant land use in OT areas is low-rise, low intensity offices.

**Consistent with Policy?**

No. The existing OR20 zoning is appropriate and consistent with policy. The (CS) Commercial Service district is inconsistent with the Office Transition policy, which is intended to provide transition and buffering at the interface of residential and incompatible nonresidential uses to either prevent or mitigate land use conflicts. In this case, the OT policy provides a transition between the industrial uses to the south along Allied Drive and the residential uses north of Veritas Street. Commercial uses are not appropriate at this location and would set a bad



# Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

precedent. Veritas Street should not include commercial uses due to the proximity to the residential areas.

The South Nashville Community Plan states: "This plan strongly recommends that the north side of Veritas Street remain in strictly residential uses and that small office type uses compatible in scale with single-family homes be encouraged to locate on the south side of the street" (page 58).

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends disapproval because the Commercial Services district is inconsistent with policy and would allow uses inconsistent with the OT buffer area.

## RECENT REZONINGS

None

## PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

No Exceptions Taken

### Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: OR20

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	0.34	0.230	3,406	38	6	6

### Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: CS

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	0.34	0.230	3,406	38	6	6

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

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				0	0	0



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: OR20

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Drive in Bank (912)	0.34	0.08*	1,185	293	15	55

\*adjusted as per use

### Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: CS

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Square Feet	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Convenience Market (852)	0.34	0.11*	1,629	NA	51	57

- Adjusted as per use

### Change in Traffic Between Maximum Uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

		--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--				NA	36	2



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Zone Change 2007Z-144U-13</b>
<b>Council Bill</b>	None
<b>Council District</b>	33 – Duvall
<b>School District</b>	6 - Johnson
<b>Requested by</b>	Jay Nelson, applicant, for Elijah and Joy Nacionales Trustee, owners
<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Sexton
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request to change from Agricultural/Residential (AR2a) to Multi-Family Residential (RM9) zoning properties located at 1402 Rural Hill Road, approximately 930 feet north of Mt. View Road (4.15 acres).**

**Existing Zoning**  
AR2a District

AR2a requires a minimum lot size of 2 acres and intended for uses that generally occur in rural areas, including single-family, two-family and mobile homes at a density of one dwelling unit per 2 acres. The AR2a district is intended to implement the natural conservation or interim nonurban land use policies of the general plan. The existing zoning would permit 2 lots on this property

**Proposed Zoning**  
RM9 District

RM9 is intended for single-family, duplex, and multi-family dwellings at a density of 9 dwelling units per acre. The proposed zoning would permit 37 multi-family units on this property.

**ANTIOCH-PRIEST LAKE COMMUNITY PLAN**

Residential Medium High (RMH)

RMH policy is intended for existing and future residential areas characterized by densities of nine to twenty dwelling units per acre. A variety of multi-family housing types are appropriate. The most common types include attached townhomes and walk-up apartments.

**Consistent with Policy?**

Yes. The RM9 zoning district complies with the Antioch-Priest Lake Community Plan’s Residential Medium-High policy of 9 to 20 dwelling units per acres.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval because the request is consistent with policy. The RM9 zoning district would permit uses that are compatible with the existing residential development within the area.



# Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

## PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

No Exceptions Taken

### Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: AR2a

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Lots	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-family detached (210)	4.15	0.5	2	20	2	3

### Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: RM9

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	Density	Total Number of Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Residential Condo/townhome (230)	4.15	9	37	276	24	27

### Change in Traffic Between Maximum Uses in Existing and Proposed Zoning District

		--		Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
--			+35	256	22	24

## METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

**Projected student generation**

**3 Elementary    2 Middle    2 High**

**Schools Over/Under Capacity**

Students would attend J.E. Moss Elementary School, Apollo Middle School, and Antioch High School. J.E. Moss Elementary School and Antioch High School are identified as overcrowded by the Metro School Board.

There is capacity at Lakeview Elementary School within the Antioch school cluster. Antioch High School is also overcrowded; however, there is capacity at Glencliff High School within the adjacent Glencliff school cluster. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated April 2007.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 2007S-170G-14**  
**Hickory Falls**  
 12 – Gotto  
 4 - Glover  
 Eva Richardson, owner

Jones  
*Disapprove or defer unless a recommendation of approval is received from Stormwater prior to the Planning Commission meeting and until a traffic impact study has been submitted by the applicant and reviewed and approved by Metro Public Works.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Concept Plan**

**ZONING**  
 R10 District

**A request for concept plan approval to create 183 lots, including 154 single-family lots and 29 duplex lots on properties located at Chandler Road (unnumbered), approximately 2,450 feet east of Tulip Grove Road (107.44 acres).**

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.

**SUBDIVISION DETAILS**

Critical Lots

Floodway/Floodplain

The concept plan proposes to subdivide 107.44 acres into 183 residential lots. The development consists of 154 single family lots and 29 duplex lots for a total of 212 units. The proposed plat has an overall density of 1.97 dwelling units per acre. Single-family lots range in size from 10,000 square feet to 18,179 square feet, while the duplex lots range in size from 12,393 square feet to 32,904 square feet. The proposed plan is not a cluster lot subdivision.

Section 17.28.030 of the Metro Zoning Code specifies that for single and two-family lots of less than one acre, any natural slopes equal to or greater than 25% shall be platted outside of the building envelope and preserved to the greatest extent possible in a natural state. Approximately 25 lots have been designated as critical lots on the concept plan.

Section 17.28.040 of the Metro Zoning Code specifies that development on property encumbered by natural floodplain or floodway shall leave a minimum of 50% of



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Open Space

the natural floodplain area, including all floodway area undisturbed and in its natural state. Approximately 17.4 percent of the site contains floodplain. The concept plan shows little to no development in these areas. The plan should designate a conservation greenway public access trail easement area to include the floodway, the floodway buffer plus an additional 75 feet on each side of the floodway.

The concept plan proposes to leave 38 percent of the site as open space. The open space areas labeled on the concept plan contain areas of steep slope and floodplain that are to remain undisturbed.

### Access/Street Connectivity

The concept plan shows access to the site via street connections through Hidden Hills Subdivision to the west and Hermitage Hills Subdivision to the north. The plan also proposes 6 foot wide sidewalks to provide pedestrian access throughout the development.

### Staff Recommendation

Disapprove or defer until a traffic impact study has been submitted by the applicant, and reviewed and approved by Metro Public Works. A preliminary grading plan must also be submitted showing compliance with the Hillside Development Standards of the Metro Zoning Code for all lots designated as critical.

---

### **PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

1. The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
  2. Proposed roadways Leesa Ann Lane, Hidden Hills Drive, Lady Nashville Drive, Hickory Falls Driver, per ST-252
  3. Proposed roadways Shadowlawn Drive, Hidden Hickory Lane section can be reduced to ST-251
  4. Plan proposes 6' wide sidewalks. Dedicate right of way to accommodate sidewalk construction.
  5. Permanent cul-de-sac per ST-331.
  6. Provide proof of easement of right of way acquisition for Lady Nashville Drive northwest property corner.
  7. A traffic impact study is required for a development of this size.
-





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

1. A channel is present to the north of lots 18-24. As such, show and label the channel tops of bank.
2. Show and label a 30' Water Quality Buffer from the tops of bank as noted in comment #2 above. Lots cannot reside in the buffer.
3. Metro GIS indicates the presence of a channel entering the northern portion of the property. It appears that this off-site water will affect the layout of lots 6-10, as a drainage easement will be required on the final plat. Building envelopes should not be placed on top of drainage easements.
4. A majority of the lots are not being treated for water quality. The lots currently being served by the water quality ponds are 63-64, 104-131, 135-143, and 168-172. All other lots require a water quality concept. Appropriate correction is required. Furthermore, under the newly adopted Stormwater regulations a dry pond will not count towards water quality purposes unless it is in concert with another water quality measure. Wet ponds do not require additional WQ measures.
5. Metro GIS shows the presence of a stream on the southeast portion of the property. As a point of reference, the stream cuts through lot 109, 113, 121, and 136-137. As such show and label the respect stream tops of bank.
6. Show and label a 30' Water Quality Buffer from the tops of bank as noted in comment #6 above. The buffer will affect lot layout. Lots cannot reside in the buffer.
7. Show and label a 75 Floodway Buffer; additionally, show and label the two zones comprising said Buffer. Zone 1 is 50', and Zone 2 is 25'.

---

### CONDITIONS

(if approved)

Prior to the recording of the final plat:

1. Add a note to the plat that a minimum of 50 percent of the natural floodplain area shall remain undisturbed and in its natural state.
2. Identify a greenway easement as "Conservation Greenway Public Access Trail Easement Area" and include the area located in the floodway, plus an additional 75 feet on each side of the floodway on Sheets 6 and 7.
3. Pursuant to 2-3.4.e of the Metro Subdivision Regulations, if this application receives conditional approval from the Planning Commission, that approval



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

shall expire unless revised plans showing the conditions on the face of the plans are submitted prior to any application for a final plat, and in no event more than 30 days after the effective date of the Commission's conditional approval vote.

4. Duplexes should be located on corner lots and must be dispersed evenly throughout the development and not concentrated in any one area or along any one street.
5. Right of way widths along Lady Nashville Court, Hickory Falls Drive, Hickory Falls Lane and any cul-de-sac or eyebrow street shall be reduced from the 50' street cross-section to the 46' street cross-section.
6. 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.
7. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested By**

**Subdivision 2007S-191U-03**  
**The Woods of Monticello**  
2 - Isabel  
1 - Thompson  
Metropolitan Development and Housing Authority,  
owners, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, surveyor

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Approve with conditions*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Concept Plan**

**A request for concept plan approval to create 45 lots on properties located at 437 Monticello Street, Monticello Street (unnumbered), and W. Trinity Lane (unnumbered), on the south side of Monticello Drive (10.94 acres).**

**ZONING**  
RS7.5 District

RS7.5 requires a minimum 7,500 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 4.94 dwelling units per acre.

**PLAN DETAILS**

The concept plan proposes 45 single-family lots ranging in size from 4,000 sq. ft. to 6,893 sq. ft. This application is proposing to use the cluster lot option, which allows lots to be reduced in size by two base zone districts. Since the zoning is RS7.5, 3,750 sq. ft. lots are appropriate if the plan meets all requirements of the cluster lot option policy.

Site Access

Access is proposed from Monticello Drive. The lots are arranged on three new roads, including a connection to the existing portion of Monticello Street and a stub street to the east to provide for a future connection. Sidewalks are proposed for all new streets and for the existing portions of Monticello Drive and Monticello Street.

Open Space

There is 33% usable open space proposed, which meets the 15% requirement for cluster lot option policy. The Commission’s cluster lot policy requires common open space to have “use and enjoyment” value to the residents including recreational value, scenic value, or passive use value. Residual land with no “use or enjoyment” value, including required buffers and stormwater facilities, has not been counted towards the open space requirements.

Landscape Buffer Yards

Section 17.12.090 of the Metro Zoning Ordinance states that perimeter lots in a cluster lot subdivision may only drop one zoning district with the installation of a standard



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

---

**Staff Recommendation**

B landscape buffer yard. This buffer is required and shown along the western property line.

Staff recommends approval with conditions.

---

**PUBLIC WORKS  
RECOMMENDATION**

The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.

---

**STORMWATER  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

---

**CONDITIONS**

1. Revise purpose note. There are 45 lots.
2. Add a note stating that access for Lot 20 will be from Monticello Street and that no access from Monticello Drive for Lots 17-20 will be permitted.
3. The stub street to the south must be named, which requires approval by Public Works.
4. Show sidewalks to property lines.
5. Pursuant to 2-3.4.e of the Metro Subdivision Regulations, if this application receives conditional approval from the Planning Commission, that approval shall expire unless revised plans showing the conditions on the face of the plans are submitted prior to any application for a final plat, and in no event more than 30 days after the effective date of the Commission's conditional approval vote.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Subdivision 2007S-148U-11</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Complete Auto Sales Consolidation Plat</b>
<b>Council District</b>	16 - Page
<b>School District</b>	7 – Kindall
<b>Requested by</b>	JMM, LLC and Mark and Mehran Janbakhsh, owners, Michael Williams, surveyor

<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Logan
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve with conditions</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request for final plat approval to consolidate six parcels into one lot for properties located at 314 and 318 Natchez Court, 3707 and 3715 N. Natchez Court, N. Natchez Court (unnumbered) and Nolensville Pike (unnumbered), at the northwest corner of Natchez Court and N. Natchez Court (2.45 acres), zoned Commercial Service (CS).**

**ZONING**  
CS District

Commercial Service is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, office, self-storage, light manufacturing and small warehouse uses.

**PLAN DETAILS**

This subdivision proposes to consolidate six parcels into one lot. While this type of request can normally be done administratively, in this case, parcel 262 is a reserve parcel. Because the recorded plat does not state the reason for reservation, the reserve status must be removed by the Commission. This parcel is located in South Nashville, east of Nolensville Pike. Staff is not aware of any reason for the reserve status to remain on this parcel.

<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	Staff recommends removing the reserve status on parcel 262 and consolidating the six parcels into one lot.
-----------------------------	--

**PUBLIC WORKS  
RECOMMENDATION**

No Exception Taken

**STORMWATER  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

**WATER SERVICES  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

**CONDITIONS**  
(if approved)

Prior to recording the final plat, the following revisions need to be made:



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

1. Add new parcel number- Map 133-6 Parcel 153.04
2. Add owner name under signature line in owner certificate.
3. Screen back old lot and parcel numbers.
4. Correct subdivision number is 2007S-148U-11
5. Label buffer along northern property line as "Standard C buffer See Note 13"



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**

**Subdivision 2007S-176G-12**  
**Greenwood Subdivision, Resubdivision Lots 18 and 19**

**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

31 - Toler  
2 - Brannon  
Various owners, Delle Land Surveying, surveyor

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Logan  
*Disapprove*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request for final plat approval to close Green Trails Drive right-of-way and create common area for properties located at 2320 and 2328 Green Trails Court, on the north side of Green Trails Court (0.34 acres), zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R10) and located within a Planned Unit Development.**

**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.

**PLAN DETAILS**

This subdivision proposes to create common area where there is currently right-of-way for an extension of Green Trails Drive. The connection, which is between Lots 18 and 19, was approved with the final PUD for Greenwood Subdivision in 1997. The roads for Greenwood Subdivision were constructed without building this stub street. In 1999, there was a request to amend the PUD to eliminate this connection. At that time, staff recommended disapproval and the Planning Commission unanimously disapproved the request. The request was never heard by Metro Council.

The current approved PUD shows this connection. Final plat approval eliminating this connection can only be granted after the PUD is amended. The Planning Commission has not approved that request.

Staff would not support a PUD amendment to eliminate this connection. There is a church on the lot north of this property, but it is positioned in such a way that the connection is not blocked. North of the church is approximately 5.17 acres of property that is currently zoned Agricultural/Residential (AR2a). While some of this property is encumbered by floodway and floodplain, the policy is Neighborhood General, which would allow



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

residential development of this property. Neighborhood General is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located. An 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 to the intent of the policy.

An element of the required design plan would be connectivity to the surrounding developments, namely Green Trails Drive. There is another stub street to the west, Cedarview Drive. This street stubs into the open space for Greenwood Subdivision and would require a stream crossing. Therefore, Cedarview Drive is much less likely to connect, which makes the availability of the connection to Green Trails Drive even more important.

### **Bonds**

The Planning Commission is still holding a bond for this subdivision. It has been reduced and extended twice, most recently in 2005. If the current request is disapproved by the Planning Commission, staff will request that the developer construct the stub street. If the stub street is not constructed, the bond will be called for default.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends disapproval of the request because it is inconsistent with the approved PUD and will decrease connectivity. If disapproved by the Planning Commission, staff will require the developer to construct the stub street. In the event that the street is not constructed in a timely manner, the bond will be called.

---

### **PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

No Exceptions Taken

---

### **STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

Approved





<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Subdivision 2007S-177G-12</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Winfield Park, Phase 2, Section 2, Revision 1</b>
<b>Council District</b>	31 - Toler
<b>School District</b>	2 – Brannon
<b>Requested by</b>	Various owners, Duclos Survey & Design, Inc., surveyor

<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Logan
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request for final plat approval to relocate a sidewalk shown on a previously recorded plat from the east to west side of Wexford Downs Lane for various properties north of Winfield Drive, zoned Single-Family Residential (RS10).**

**ZONING**  
RS10 District

RS10 requires a minimum of 10,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 3.7 dwelling units per acre.

**PLAN DETAILS**

This final plat proposes to relocate a sidewalk previously shown on the east side of Wexford Downs Lane to the west side. The sidewalk was erroneously constructed on the west side. Staff has determined that a sidewalk constructed on either side of Wexford Downs Lane would comply with the intent of the preliminary plat. All of the property owners have signed the plat.

**Staff Recommendation**

Because the sidewalk, as constructed, complies with the intent of the preliminary plat, staff recommends approval of the final plat.

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

No Exceptions Taken

**STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

Approved



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 2007S-178G-10**  
**Franey's Subdivision**  
 34 - Williams  
 8 - Fox  
 Mark Donlon, surveyor for Eleanor Franey, owner.

Swaggart  
*Approve with conditions, including an exception to lot comparability and a variance to Section 3-4.2.1 of the Subdivision Regulations.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Final Plat**

**ZONING**  
 RS40 District

**A request to subdivide approximately 3.5 acres into 2 lots on property located at 1126 Oman Drive, approximately 925 feet east of Granny White Pike and for a variance from Section 3-4.2.a of the Subdivision Regulations that requires lot lines to be at right angles to street lines.**

RS40 requires a minimum 40,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of .93 dwelling units per acre.

**PLAN DETAILS**

Lot Comparability

This subdivision proposes to subdivide one parcel into two lots. As proposed both lots will be accessed from individual private drive ways off of Oman Drive. Lot 1 will be approximately 88,032 square feet (2.02 acres), and Lot 2 will be approximately 58,016 square feet (1.33 acres).

Section 3-5 of the Subdivision Regulations stipulates that new lots in areas previously subdivided and predominantly developed are to be generally in keeping with the lot frontage and lot size of the existing surrounding lots.

Lot comparability analysis was performed and yielded the following information:

Lot Comparability Analysis		
Street:	Requirements:	
	Minimum lot size (sq.ft):	Minimum lot frontage (linear ft.):
<b>Oman Drive</b>	68,824	180.0



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Lot Comparability Exception

As proposed, the two new lots will have the following areas and street frontages:

- Lot 1: 88,032 sq. ft., (2.02 acres), with 178 linear ft. of frontage.
- Lot 2: 58,016 sq. ft., (1.33 acres), with 178 linear ft. of frontage.

Both lots fail for frontage and Lot 2 fails for area.

A lot comparability exception can be granted if the lot does not meet the minimum requirements of the lot comparability analysis (is smaller in lot frontage and/or size) if the new lots would be consistent with the General Plan and or meets one or more criteria. The Planning Commission has discretion whether or not to grant a lot comparability exception.

The proposed lots meet **one** of the qualifying criteria of the exception to lot comparability:

- The proposed lots are consistent with the adopted land use policy that applies to the property. The lots are located in the Residential Low Density land use policy. RL policy is intended to conserve large areas of established, low density (one to two dwelling units per acre) residential development. The predominant development type is single-family homes.

As proposed the density will be approximately 1.7 units per acre and is within the 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre envisioned with the RL policy. A previous exception was granted to property on the northeast corner of Oman Drive and Granny White Pike which also met the RL policy. Because the request is consistent with the area's RL policy, staff recommends that an exception be granted.

### Section 3-4.2.a

Section 3-4.2.a of the Subdivision Regulations requires that residential lot lines be at right angles to street lines (or radial to curving lines). As proposed the new lot line will not be perpendicular to Oman Drive. The new lot line has been drawn this way to accommodate the existing home and to create new lots that are comparable to the surrounding area.

### Staff Recommendation

While the proposed lots do not meet comparability, neither new lot is significantly out of character with surrounding lots. Staff is recommending that an exception be granted to



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

the lot comparability requirements for both lots. Since the new lot line will adequately accommodate the existing residents while maintaining the area's overall development pattern, staff recommends that a variance be granted to Section 3-4.2.a.

Staff recommends that the request be approved with conditions including an exception to lot comparability and a variance to the Subdivision Regulations.

---

**PUBLIC WORKS  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

---

**STORMWATER  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

---

**WATER SERVICES  
RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

---

**CONDITIONS**

Prior to recording the final plat, the following revisions need to be made:

1. The paved drive shall be labeled "existing drive – to be removed".
2. New access points for each lot shall be identified and labeled on the plat.
3. Applicant shall provide information verifying the recording number for restrictive covenants.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Subdivision 2007S-179U-07</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Pilot Corporation Consolidation Plat</b>
<b>Council District</b>	20 - Williams
<b>School Board District</b>	1 – Thompson III
<b>Requested By</b>	Randall White Land Surveyors, applicant, for JRBR Holdings, LLC, owners
<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Sexton
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Final Plat**

**A request to consolidate 2 lots into 1 for property located at 6420 Centennial Boulevard (unnumbered), at the northeast corner of Centennial Boulevard and Briley Parkway (6.32), zoned Industrial Restrictive (IR).**

**Existing Zoning**  
IR District

IR is intended for a wide range of light manufacturing uses at moderate intensities within enclosed structures.

**PLAN DETAILS**

Reserve Parcel

The existing fenced industrial site is 6.32 acres. There is currently an industrial building on one of the existing lots and truck trailer storage on the second lot. The second lot is identified on the plat as “Reserve Parcel A.”

While the consolidation of two lots into one lot is usually handled administratively, Section 2-9.1.b of the Subdivision Regulations requires that, except under certain conditions, the removal of a reserve parcel status be approved by the Planning Commission.

*b. Reserve parcels may be converted to building sites by submittal of a plat drawing as described in Section 2-5. Removal of the reserve status shall require Planning Commission approval except when the parcel is in reserve pending an action by a public utility to provide service availability as noted on the face of the approved subdivision plat that created the reserve parcel.*

The note on the plat creating Reserve Parcel A stated that it was “not to be used as an individual building site unless approved by the Metropolitan Planning Commission.” This plat was originally approved on April 15, 1974. Staff investigated the note, including a review of the Planning Commission action approving the plat, but was unable to determine the original purpose for the reserve parcel.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Due to the proximity of the site to a Briley Parkway interchange, it is possible that the reserve status was placed to accommodate future on/off ramp expansions. The ramps are in place to the west of this property and the eastern portion of the property, where the reserve parcel was placed would not be needed for this purpose.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval.

---

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

No Exceptions Taken

---

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATIONS

Approved



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
Requested by

**Subdivision 2007S-187U-13**  
**Smith Springs Subdivision**  
29 - Wilhoite  
6 - Jonhson  
Gonzalo Amaya, owner, E. Roberts Alley & Associates, surveyor

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Sexton  
*Approval with conditions, including a lot comparability exception and variance to section 3-4.2.f of the Metro Subdivision Regulations.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**A request for final plat approval to create 2 lots on property located at 2331 Smith Springs Road, approximately 920 feet west of Ned Shelton Road (4.94 acres), zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R10).**

**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.

**PLAN DETAILS**

This subdivision proposes to create two single-family lots.

Existing Conditions

The site proposed for the two lot creation contains two single family houses with driveway access. A barn is located on the back of lot 1 with driveway access as well.

Lot Comparability

Section 3-5 of the Subdivision Regulations states that new lots in areas that are predominantly developed are to be generally in keeping with the lot frontage and lot size of the existing surrounding lots.

Lot comparability analysis was performed and yielded the following information:

Lot Comparability				
	Area		Frontage	
	Required	Proposed	Required	Proposed
<b>Lot 1</b>	48,803	187,052	113	90
<b>Lot 2</b>	48,803	47,264	113	165

Lot 1 does not meet the minimum requirements under the lot comparability analysis for frontage and lot 2 does not meet the minimum requirements for area.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Lot Comparability Exception

A lot comparability exception can be granted if the lot does not meet the minimum requirements of the lot comparability analysis (is smaller in lot frontage and/or size) if the new lots would be consistent with the General Plan. The Planning Commission has discretion whether or not to grant a lot comparability exception.

The proposed lots could meet **one** of the qualifying criteria of the exception to lot comparability:

- The proposed lots are consistent with the adopted land use policy that applies to the property.

The lots are located in the Neighborhood General land use policy. NG is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located.

### Section 3-4.2.f

Lot 1 has a frontage of 165 feet and a depth of 872 square feet. The frontage of lot 1 is only 19% of the average lot depth. Section 3-4.2.f of the Subdivision Regulations requires that lot frontage be not less than 25% of the average lot depth, also known as the 4:1 rule.

### Variance to Section 3-4.2.f

Section 1-11.1 of the Subdivision Regulations allows the Planning Commission to grant variances to the regulations if it finds that extraordinary hardships or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with the regulations. In this case, due to the fact that there are two existing single family homes located on the northern edge of the property fronting onto Smith Springs Road and the configuration of the lot, there is no practical way to subdivide the lots and avoid at least one lot having a frontage less than 25% of the lot depth. In addition, the request to subdivide will result in lots consistent with the zoning code. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission grant this variance.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval with conditions, including a lot comparability exception and variance to section 3-4.2.f of the Metro Subdivision Regulations.

---

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATIONS

- Show and dimension right of way along Smith Springs Road. Label and dedicate 5' of right of way (30 feet from centerline). Label and show 12' reserve strip for future right of way (42 feet from centerline to property boundary), consistent with





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

the approved major street plan (U4 - 84' ROW).

---

### WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION

- Please add 8" sanitary sewer line and 18" sanitary sewer force main as shown on the plat

---

### CONDITIONS

Prior to recording the final plat, the following revisions need to be made:

1. Show and dimension right of way along Smith Springs Road. Label and dedicate 5' of right of way (30 feet from centerline). Label and show 12' reserve strip for future right of way (42 feet from centerline to property boundary), consistent with the approved major street plan (U4 – 84' ROW).
2. Please add 8" sanitary sewer line and 18" sanitary sewer force main as shown on the plat.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Planned Unit Development 94-71-G-06</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Bellevue Mall Sign Variance</b>
<b>Council Bill</b>	None
<b>Council District</b>	22 – Crafton
<b>School Board District</b>	9 – Warden
<b>Requested By</b>	Scotty Anderson of Joslin Signs, for Bellevue Parcel II, LLC, owner
<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Jones
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Disapprove</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

A request for a variance to Sections 17.32.070 and 17.32.130 of the Zoning Code for property (.05 acres) within a Commercial Planned Unit Development district located along the south side of Interstate 40, north of Highway 70S, classified Mixed Use Limited (MUL) to allow an 70' foot tall, 1,250 square foot sign.

**PLAN DETAILS**

**History**

The Bellevue Center PUD consists of 102.60 acres. The PUD was amended in 2005 to permit a 212,305 square foot retail use on approximately 11.95 acres. At that time, a condition was established to allow only a monument sign not to exceed 7 feet in height and 14 feet in width at this location. Presently, signage for this PUD is located along Highway 70 South. Most recently, a request to rezone the property to Single Family Residential (RS40) and to cancel the PUD overlay was disapproved by the Planning Commission on April 12, 2007. The site is currently vacant.

**Proposed Plan**

No proposed plan was submitted with this request.

**Sign Details**

A sign for Bellevue Landing is proposed on parcel 170 of tax map 128. The sign has an overall height of 70 feet and a total area of 1,250 square feet. The Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum sign height of 50 feet, a maximum sign area of 480 square feet, and requires a 25-foot side yard setback for a highway oriented sign. There is already a large sign for this PUD along Highway 70S.

**Variance to the Sign Requirements**

This request does not comply with the minimum requirements for a variance outlined in the Metro Zoning Ordinance Section 17.40.370.A and B. These Sections deal with the physical characteristics of the property and unique characteristics of the property.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Physical Characteristics of the Property. **There are no exceptional or extraordinary physical characteristics of the property that would result in undue hardship to the property owner by strict application of the sign requirements.**

Unique Characteristics. **The applicant has provided no information as to any unique characteristics of the subject property that are not prevalent to other properties in the general area, as well.**

Since this is within a PUD, the Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to The Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to approve or disapprove the variance request. The BZA will make the final determination regarding the variance request.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends disapproval of the variance. The applicant has not provided proof of any hardship to warrant a variance in height and area. The proposed sign at 70 feet in height and 1,250 square feet in area exceeds the maximum allowable height and area for a sign. The proposed sign dimensions resemble that of a large interstate billboard and, if allowed to front Interstate 40, would appear as a billboard, which is an undesirable use within Planned Unit Developments. This request should not be considered independent of an overall re-development plan for the mall. Instead, it should only be considered in context with new development plans for the mall, which would require a PUD revision or an amendment.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School Board District**  
**Requested By**

**Planned Unit Development 101-82-U-13**  
**Hanover Ridge, Phase 1**  
33 - Duvall  
6 - Johnson  
Land Development Solutions, applicant for Hanover Ridge, LLC, owner

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Swaggart  
*Approve with conditions*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Revise Preliminary PUD**  
**& Approve Final PUD**

**A request to revise the preliminary and for final approval for a portion of a Planned Unit Development located at Mt. View Parkway (unnumbered), at the northwest corner of Mt. View Road and Baby Ruth Lane, zoned R8 (12.06 acres), to permit the development of 72 multi-family units on a portion of a site where 156 multi-family units are approved.**

**PLAN DETAILS**

Site Plan

The plan identifies 4 multi-family building foot prints and a building foot print for a club house. A total of 72 units are proposed with this phase. Buildings 1 – 3 will contain 20 units each and Building 4 will contain 12 units.

Access

Access is proposed from Baby Ruth Lane. The development does not have frontage along Baby Ruth Lane and access is proposed through an access easement. The easement has been previously recorded and allows for this development to cross the adjacent property for access to Baby Ruth Lane. While the property has frontage along Mt. View Road the preliminary plan was not approved with any direct access onto Mt. View Road.

Parking

As proposed a total of 137 parking spaces are required. The plan identifies a total 137 parking spaces and is in compliance with Metro parking requirements.

Sidewalks

This plan was approved under the old zoning regulations and did not require sidewalks. A request for a revision to an approved plan must be in compliance with the current sidewalk requirements. As the property is located within the Urban Services District, sidewalks are required. A Sidewalk should be provided along the frontage area for this phase on Mt. View Road. Additional sidewalks along Mt. View Road will be required with the development of the next phase. Sidewalks are also shown within the development and should provide adequate movement for



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Greenway Easement

pedestrians. A sidewalk should be provided along the access drive to Baby Ruth Lane. A sidewalk connection to Mt. View Road should be provided with the next phase.

A stream crosses the property along the western property line, and the area's long range plan identifies a greenway along this stream. To meet the long range plan for the area, and to accommodate any future greenway, a greenway easement should be provided along this stream.

### Preliminary Plan

This PUD was originally approved in 1982 and has been revised several times in the past. The last amendment that was approved by Council was approved for a total of 156 units in 1995. As proposed, the plan is consistent with the intent of the last approved preliminary plan and does not require approval from Council.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the request be approved with conditions.

---

### **PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

1. The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
2. Along Mt. View Road dimension right of way from centerline to property boundary. Label and dedicate right of way 30 feet from centerline, consistent with the approved major street plan (U2 - 60' ROW).
3. Align project access with access on opposite side of Baby Ruth Lane.
4. Traffic study is required and has been scoped for this development but has not been received.

---

### **STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

Approve with the following conditions:

1. Provide a copy of NOC letter and place permit number on the plans.
2. Provide Stormwater Detention Maintenance agreement and fees.
3. Construction Entrance/Exit is required to be 100 feet in length.
4. Reference correct TCP # from Volume 4 of Stormwater Management Manual for erosion control details.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

5. Provide drainage area map showing sub-area flowing to each stormwater structure. Provide area, Tc, C/CN, flow capacity and actual for each pipe/structure.
6. Control structure orifice size is listed as 3" on plans and 2.6 inches in model. The riser elevation is shown at elevation 558.00' in the model but shown as 560.00' on the detail. Please correct.
7. Pond shape ratio minimum must be 3:1 (inlet to outlet). Revise configuration or place baffle to prevent short circuiting of pond.
8. Provide detailed plans and calculations for Proprietary Water Quality Unit.
9. Provide information for next 2 downstream structures, including drainage basin size, size and material of structure, actual and capacity of flow.
10. Provide drainage area of creek and drainage area map of creek flowing adjacent to site. Size of d.a. may affect size and type of buffer required. If creek has d.a. of over 1 square mile, then additional analysis will be required.

---

### **NASHVILLE ELECTRIC SERVICE (NES) RECOMMENDATION**

Prior to the issuance of any permits for this development a plan approved by NES must be submitted. If the approved NES plan is not consistent with the Commission approved plan then permits may not be issued, and the plan may require additional review by Metro Departments and reapproval from the Planning Commission.

---

### **CONDITIONS**

1. Existing driveway to Mt. View Road to be removed.
2. A greenway easement shall be provided along the stream located along the western property line as identified in the area's long range plan and shall be labeled "Dedicated Conservation Greenway Public Access Trail Easement Area". The easement shall be shown on all appropriate sheets.
3. A sidewalk shall be shown and identified along Mt. View Road for this phase.
4. A sidewalk shall be provided along the access drive to Baby Ruth Lane. This sidewalk must adequately connect to the development's internal sidewalk system.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

5. A sidewalk connection will be required to Mt. View Road with the next phase of this development.
6. Prior to the issuance of any permits for this development a NES approved plan shall be submitted. If the approved NES plan is not consistent with the Commission approved plan then permits may not be issued, and the plan may require additional review by Metro Departments and reapproval from the Planning Commission.
7. 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.
8. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
9. 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.
10. 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. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter.
11. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

12. 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 reapproval by the Planning Commission.
13. If 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/revise plans have been submitted to and approved by staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission for filing and recordation with the Davidson County Register of Deeds.





<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Planned Unit Development 2005P-008G-06</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Harpeth Village, Section II (Townhomes)</b>
<b>Council District</b>	35 - Tygard
<b>School District</b>	9 - Warden
<b>Requested By</b>	Batson Engineering, applicant for Biltmore Development, LLC, owner

<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Sexton
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve with conditions</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
Final PUD

**A request for final approval for a portion of a Planned Unit Development located at Temple Road (unnumbered), at the northeast corner of Old Harding Pike and Temple Road, classified Multi-Family Residential (RM6) and located within a Planned Unit Development (7.23 acres), to permit the development of 59 multi-family units.**

**PLAN DETAILS**

The Council-approved preliminary PUD plan included 74 townhouse units. On December 14, 2006, Metro Planning Commission approved a revision to the preliminary PUD reducing the number of townhomes to 59 units. The units will front on to Temple Road, and are consistent with the original plan. The PUD revision brings the units closer to Temple Road and creates a consistent street edge that better supports the commercial center. The proposed final plan is consistent with the revised preliminary plan, which was approved by the Metro Planning Commission on December 14, 2006.

Building Form	The final plan proposes 11 buildings each containing between four to six townhomes, with a total of 59 townhomes. The townhomes are two and three stories, with access from private drives.
---------------	---

Parking	The final plan proposes 118 garage parking spaces (2 per townhome) and 21 regular parking spaces totaling 139 parking spaces. The proposed parking does meet the Metropolitan Zoning Ordinance.
---------	---

Access	There is one primary access point for Harpeth Village Townhomes located off of Temple Road.
--------	---

Setback Variance on Old Harding Pike	The setback on Old Harding Pike shown on the Council Approved PUD plan did not comply with the required setback of 82 feet from the centerline of Old
--------------------------------------	---



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Staff Recommendation

Harding Pike. The Council approved preliminary plan setback of 55 feet from the centerline. The applicant was granted a variance for the setback from the Board of Zoning Appeals on February 1, 2007. The reduced setback creates more of a "town center" character and a more pedestrian orientation along Temple Road.

Staff recommends approval with conditions as the final proposed plan is consistent with the revised preliminary plan approved by the Metro Planning Commission on December 14, 2006.

### FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION

1. Need building construction types
2. Fire Hydrant flow data will be needed

### PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. Provide four dumpster pad locations for solid waste collection and disposal, or as approved by the solid waste division.
2. Bond the proposed traffic signal at the intersection of Old Harding Road and Temple Road.

### CONDITIONS

1. Use and occupancy permits shall not be issued until completion of all intersection roadway and signal improvements at Highway 100 and Temple Road.
2. Developer shall modify the traffic signal at Highway 100 & Temple Road. A signal plan shall be provided to the Metro Traffic Engineer for approval.
3. Driveway shall provide a minimum of 2 exit lanes, to provide a separate left turn lane with 50 feet of storage, and 1 entering lane.
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.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

5. 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. The required turnaround may be up to 150 feet diameter.
6. Prior to any additional development applications for this property, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a final corrected copy of the Final Plan for filing and recording with the Davidson County Register of Deeds.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Planned Unit Development 84-85-P-06</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Biltmore PUD (Road Alignment Revision)</b>
<b>Council District</b>	35 - Tygard
<b>School Board District</b>	9 – Warden
<b>Requested By</b>	Ragan-Smith & Associates, applicant, for Nashville Biltmore, L.P., owner

<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Logan
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve with conditions</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Revise Preliminary & Final PUD**

**A request to revise the preliminary to decrease the approved amount of square footage of office uses from 236,500 square feet to 189,000 square feet and for final approval to revise the alignment and reconstruct McCrory Lane for a portion of a Planned Unit Development located at McCrory Lane (unnumbered), south of Interstate 40 (9.0 acres), zoned Shopping Center Regional (SCR) and Mixed Use Limited (MUL).**

**PLAN DETAILS**

The plan is consistent with the PUD plan approved by the Planning Commission on May 26, 2005, and by the Metro Council on July 19, 2005. This plan revises the preliminary plan to decrease the square footage of office uses from 236,500 sq. ft. to 189,000 sq. ft. and make minor layout changes for the commercial/retail portions impacted by the realignment of McCrory Lane.

Phases A, B, C, D, F, G, and K of the PUD are impacted by the realignment. Building placement has changed slightly in these sections. Development in Section E has been eliminated due to the presence of floodplain. With the exception of Section E, the arrangement of uses is identical and the revised plan has the same number of access points to McCrory Lane. This revision is consistent with the Council approved PUD plan in terms of uses, access points, building form, and connectivity. The changes in building orientation and parking layout provide better accessibility and make the plan function better.

The request for final PUD applies only to the realignment of McCrory Lane. Final PUD approval for each individual building site will still be necessary. The realignment of McCrory Lane was a condition of the approved PUD plan.

<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	Staff recommends approval with conditions.
-----------------------------	--

**PUBLIC WORKS**



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### RECOMMENDATION

The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.

All previous conditions apply.

### STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

Approve with conditions

1. Provide a copy of NOC letter and place permit number on the plans.
2. Provide sinkhole and drainage well permit from TDEC. Label these areas on the plan sheets.
3. Provide ARAP and Section 404 permits for proposed stream crossings.
4. The HEC-22 reports and drainage calculations are missing for inlets 10-50 and the associated drainage areas and pipes.

### CONDITIONS

1. 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.
2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
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



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

of the turn-around, including trees. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter.

5. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
6. 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 reapproval by the Planning Commission.
7. If 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 for filing and recordation with the Davidson County Register of Deeds.

These following conditions were required by the 2005 PUD amendment and are still required:

8. The PUD plans shall show a class "C" perimeter landscape buffer along the southern boundary of the PUD, within the proposed RS40 single family area. The PUD plans shall show the required landscape buffers between the single family (RS40) and the Mixed Use (MUL) zoning (class "A" buffer), or the multifamily (RM2) and the Mixed Use (MUL) zoning (class "A" buffer "A"), and the SCR and the RM6 zoning (class "D" buffer).
9. Single family lots that abut the southern perimeter of the PUD must meet the size requirements of the Metro Zoning Ordinance regarding cluster lots.
10. All critical lots shall be noted on the plans as per the Metro Zoning Ordinance, including the critical lot note. All lots on between 20 and 25% slopes must be designated as critical lots, and lots greater than 25% must be platted as common open space. Though the PUD provisions allow the Planning Commission to authorize the creation of lots ranging up to 25% slope,



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

- some lots may be lost if the proposed lot configuration involves substantial grading on slopes of 25% or more.
11. The applicant shall attempt to minimize stream disturbances. The preliminary PUD plans may need to be revised prior to final PUD approval. The proposed lot layout may have to be reworked and lot number and/or lot sizes reduced.
  12. At the final PUD stage, midblock traffic calming devices may be required for any cul-de-sac longer than 750 feet, where such devices shall be planned and coordinated with the Metro Planning Department and Public Works Departments.
  13. On the private drives (cul-de-sacs) that serve townhomes, combined driveways shall be used to reduce the amount of curb cuts.
  14. All cul-de-sacs that extend to the PUD district limits shall be labeled as "temporary turnarounds."
  15. 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. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter. The number of lots may be reduced from the preliminary (amended) PUD plans to comply with this requirement.
  16. Fire hydrants should flow at least 1,500 GPMs at 40 psi. Water calculations shall be submitted to the Fire Marshal's Office for approval before the final PUD can be approved.
  17. Prior to final PUD approval, the area outlined as open space immediately south of McCrory Lane and north of the western townhome units is being offered as a donation to the Metro Parks Department for use as a passive park. Should Metro accept this donation, the area will be deeded to Metro for that use. If not accepted, the area will remain open space for the PUD and its maintenance will be the responsibility of the owner's association.
  18. Note that to comply with the above Stormwater requirements, it is required for the applicant to put the following notes on the PUD plans:
  19. "Any intermittent stream or waters of the state, as identified by TDEC, shall have a 25 foot buffer from the top of the bank on each side of the stream bank."



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

20. "Buffer disturbance is ONLY permitted by Stormwater Management Committee variance # \_\_\_\_\_ and ARAP Permit # \_\_\_\_\_."
21. In order to determine specific laneage, queuing, signalized locations, and secondary driveway locations, focused TIS reports shall be submitted for the individual tracts prior to any transfer of land in phase 1 or phase 2.
22. All improvements within I-40 or Highway 100 right of way shall be reviewed and approved by the Tennessee Department of Transportation prior to construction. Loop ramp proposal may require an Interchange Modification Study approved by the Federal Highway Administration. Improvements on Highway 100 should be consistent with the APR prepared for the State by Neel-Schaffer.

### PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

23. Phase 1 development includes the following land uses: 114,000 square feet of office uses, 240,750 square feet of retail uses, 213 hotel rooms, 9250 square feet of restaurant uses, 192 apartments, 288 town homes, and 220 single family.

The total trips allowed for phase 1 are 827 a.m. peak hour and 1473 p.m. peak hour. Trips which exceed the above a.m. peak, or p.m. peak trips will trigger the roadway improvements for phase 2.

The following roadway improvements shall be required.

McCrorry Lane from the I-40 eastbound ramps to the eastern PUD boundary

24. Developer shall re-align and construct McCrorry Lane from the I-40 eastbound ramps to the eastern PUD boundary as a 4 lane arterial with a minimum of 100 ft of right of way with a 27 ft wide median and transition to existing McCrorry Lane lanes at eastern edge of property. Along the eastern portion of McCrorry lane, a section of required right of way is currently not under the control of the developer. The road widening in this location shall be bonded and the road constructed prior to phase 2 development. The construction of 110 residential town homes in section O shall be delayed until the road is widened in this vicinity.





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

25. The applicant shall continue to work with Public Works and Planning on the cross-section and appropriate Right-of-way for the main road that goes through the single-family area. The agreed-upon road standard will have to come back before the Planning Commission for final PUD approval.
26. McCrory lane shall be designed with a minimum 45 mph speed limit and shall be constructed to provide adequate sight distance.
27. Roadways containing a median shall be constructed with median cut spacing at least 600 ft. Left turn lanes shall be constructed at all median cuts. Signal locations and specific turn lane design shall be determined with a Focused TIS. Optimum signal spacing will be established at 1250 ft to 1500 ft.
28. Traffic signals shall be installed by the developer at intersections determined by the focused TIS for specific sites upon approval by the Metro Traffic Engineer and Traffic and Parking Commission.

### McCrory Lane at I-40 Westbound Ramps

29. At McCrory Lane / I-40 Westbound Ramps intersection, Developer shall conduct traffic counts and submit signal warrant analysis after issuance of use and occupancy permits at 50%, 75%, and 100% completion of phase 1 development, or as required by the Metro Traffic Engineer. Upon signal approval by Metro Traffic engineer, developer shall submit signal plans and install a signal at the westbound ramps and McCrory Lane.
30. Developer shall Widen McCrory Lane to a 3 lane cross section and install a northbound left turn lane with a minimum of 100 ft of storage on McCrory Lane at the I-40 westbound ramp by relocating guardrails.

### McCrory Lane at I-40 Eastbound Ramps

31. Developer shall conduct traffic counts and submit signal warrant analysis at 25%, 50 %, 75% and 100% completion of phase 1 development, or as required by the Metro Traffic Engineer. Upon signal approval by Metro Traffic engineer and Traffic and Parking Commission, the developer shall submit signal plans and install a signal at the relocated eastbound ramps and McCrory Lane.
32. Developer shall relocate the I-40 east bound ramp to the proposed alignment of the relocated McCrory lane.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

The ramp intersection shall be located a minimum of 300 ft south of the I-40 overpass on McCrory Lane. The east bound off- Ramp shall be constructed with separate left and right turn lanes. The right turn lane shall be channelized and provide free -flow operation by continuing southbound on realigned McCrory Lane.

33. Developer shall widen McCrory Lane to a 3 lane cross-section under the overhead bridge structure between the existing I-40 ramp intersections by relocating guardrails. Southbound dual left turn lanes shall be constructed on McCrory lane at the Eastbound on-ramps with a minimum of 200 ft of storage before tapering to one left turn lane under the I-40 bridge.
34. The eastbound I-40 on-ramp shall be widened to 2 lanes to accommodate the southbound dual left turn lanes on McCrory Lane.
35. Developer shall construct 1 northbound through lane and a separate northbound right turn lane on McCrory Lane at the intersection with the eastbound on ramp.
36. McCrory Lane widening and I-40 ramp reconstruction shall occur in conjunction with the re-alignment and widening of McCrory lane to a 4 lane arterial.
37. All modifications to the I-40 ramps and McCrory Lane in this vicinity shall be approved by the Tennessee Department of Transportation.

### McCrory Lane and Poplar Creek Road

38. As recommended in the TIS addendum dated 5/17/05, At 75% and 100% completion of phase 1 development, Developer shall conduct traffic counts at McCrory Lane and Poplar Creek Road intersection, and submit signal warrant analysis for signal approval. Developer shall submit signal plans and install signal when approved by Metro Traffic Engineer and Traffic and Parking Commission.
39. In coordination with signal installation, Developer shall construct a southbound left turn lane on McCrory Lane with 75 feet of storage with transition per AASHTO Standards if adequate right-of -way is available. Adequate site distance shall be provided.

### State Route 100 (HWY 100) at McCrory Lane

40. At Highway 100 / McCrory Lane intersection, Developer shall conduct traffic counts and submit signal warrant analysis at 50%, 75% and 100% completion of phase 1 development for signal



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

approval, or as required by Metro Traffic Engineer. Developer shall submit signal plans and install signal when approved by Metro Traffic Engineer and Traffic and Parking Commission. Currently, the Tennessee Department of Transportation has plans to improve this intersection. However, improvements have not been funded. Improvements at Highway 100 shall be coordinated with and approved by the Tennessee Department of Transportation.

### PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS:

41. At project completion, it is estimated that the total a.m. peak hour trips will be 1586; p.m. peak hour trips will be 2568. Roadway improvements for Phase 2 development will require right of way acquisition that is not controlled by the developer. Roadway Improvements to the I-40 interchange will need to be coordinated with and approved by the Tennessee Department of Transportation.
42. In accordance with the TIS and submitted TIS addendums, the following improvements as identified on a feasibility plan submitted on 5/13/05 shall be constructed for phase 2 development.

### McCrorry Lane at I-40 Westbound Ramp / Newsom Station Road

43. In order to accommodate westbound off-ramp traffic traveling south on McCrorry Lane, a loop off ramp shall be constructed in the northwest corner of the interchange. This lane shall pass under the western span of the I-40 bridge before merging into 2 southbound lanes on McCrorry Lane at the relocated intersection of McCrorry Lane and I-40 eastbound ramps.
44. The existing westbound on-ramp shall be relocated to the new Newsom Station Road location. Developer shall modify the existing signal at this location to accommodate a 4th leg.
45. Intersection shall be re-designed to accommodate adequate truck turning movements and provide adequate sight distance.
46. Developer shall install a northbound left turn lane with 200 ft of storage on McCrorry Lane at the recently relocated Newsom Station Road, in order to permit storage of vehicles entering I-40 westbound.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

47. The existing I-40 westbound off-ramp shall be modified in order to permit right turn only at McCrory Lane. Developer shall construct an additional northbound through lane on McCrory Lane between this ramp and Newsom Station Road.
48. Developer shall construct an additional southbound through lane on McCrory Lane from Newsom Station Road to align with the 4 lane cross section of McCrory lane constructed in Phase 1.

### Newsom Station Road

49. Developer shall construct an additional left turn lane to permit 1 through / right lane and dual left turn lanes with a minimum of 150 ft of storage on Newsom Station Rd at McCrory Lane.
50. Additional right of way shall be reserved for a commercial collector road along the commercial portion of the PUD. A focused TIS shall be submitted to determine roadway laneage requirements, traffic control, and driveway locations for Newsom Station Road along the frontage of this commercial portion of the Biltmore PUD.

### McCrory Lane and Poplar Creek Road

51. If this intersection has not been signalized, prior to phase 2 development, developer shall conduct traffic counts at McCrory Lane and Poplar Creek Road intersection, and submit signal warrant analysis for signal approval. Developer shall submit signal plans and install signal when approved by Metro Traffic Engineer and Traffic and Parking Commission.
52. In coordination with signal installation, Developer shall construct a southbound left turn lane on McCrory Lane with 75 feet of storage with transition per AASHTO standards if adequate right of way is available. Adequate site distance shall be provided. State Route 100 (HWY 100) at McCrory Lane. Currently, the Tennessee Department of Transportation has plans to improve this intersection. However, improvements have not been funded. As discussed in the TIS this intersection will operate with major delays at completion of the phase 2 development without roadway improvements. Therefore, prior to commencing phase 2 development, Phase 1 signalization improvements shall be installed and the following road widening is required.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

- Developer shall construct an eastbound left turn lane on Highway 100 with 250 feet of storage and a westbound right turn lane on Highway 100 with 275 feet of storage and transitions per AASHTO Standards.
53. Developer shall construct an additional southbound lane with adequate storage length on McCrory Lane at the intersection with Highway 100. Southbound lanes shall be striped for separate left and right turn lanes.
  54. Approvals are subject to Public Works' review and approval of construction plans. Roadways to be designed in accordance with all applicable Public Works' details and specifications. Conditions and approvals are subject to Public Works' review and approval of construction plans.
  55. Streets to have sufficient radii to allow SU-30 vehicle to maneuver w/ cars parked on one side. Some short loop streets appear inadequate for SU-30 design vehicle movements.
  56. Show and identify existing contour intervals.
  57. No private street shall be constructed which will permit access or connection between two (2) public streets. Eliminate connection of public residential street to private multi-family street located at TVA lines.
  58. Provide a minimum of two outlets to McCrory Lane from single-family residential.
  59. The applicant shall continue to work with Public Works and Planning on the cross-section and appropriate Right-of-way for the main road that goes through the single-family area. The agreed-upon road standard will have to come back before the Planning Commission for final PUD approval.
  60. Label streets on overall plan by name or letter designation, and proposed street cross section, especially sheet 1A. Additional comments may be forthcoming after proposed street cross sections are identified.
  61. Retaining walls must be located outside the right of way at a distance to not impact the roadway if wall failure occurs.
  62. 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.
  63. Subsequent to enactment of this planned unit development overlay district by the Metropolitan



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Council, and prior to any consideration by the Metropolitan Planning Commission for final site development plan approval, a paper print of the final boundary plat for all property within the overlay district must be submitted, complete with owners signatures, to the Planning Commission staff for review.

64. 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.
65. This preliminary plan approval for the residential portion of the master plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council District**  
**School Board District**  
**Requested By**

**Planned Unit Development 89P-003G-06**  
**Still Springs Ridge, Phase 3**  
22 - Crafton  
9 - Warden  
Dewaal and Associates, applicant for Greater Middle Tennessee Development, owner

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Swaggart  
*Approve with conditions*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Revise Preliminary PUD**

**A request to revise the preliminary plan for a portion of a Planned Unit Development located at Still Spring Hollow Drive (unnumbered), approximately 1,825 feet north of Hicks Road, zoned Single-Family Residential (RS20) (20.74 acres), to permit the development of 27 single-family lots.**

**PLAN DETAILS**  
Site Plan

The plan identifies 27 new single-family residential lots. Twenty-three lots will be located along the extension of Still Springs Hollow Drive and four lots will be located at the northern terminus of Still Springs Hollow Court.

Preliminary Plan

This PUD was originally approved in 1989. In 1995, the Still Springs Ridge PUD was amended to absorb the Hicks Road PUD. At that time a plan was approved for 100 single-family lots and a 10,000 square foot private recreation facility. As proposed, the plan is consistent with the last approved preliminary plan. The only minor changes include narrower street widths which will reduce the total area to be graded.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the request be approved with conditions.

**PUBLIC WORKS**  
**RECOMMENDATION**

The developer's construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.

**STORMWATER**  
**RECOMMENDATION**

Approved



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### CONDITIONS

1. All changes required by Metro Public Works and Stormwater shall be required.
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.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
4. Subsequent to enactment of this planned unit development overlay district by the Metropolitan Council, and prior to any consideration by the Metropolitan Planning Commission for final site development plan approval, a paper print of the final boundary plat for all property within the overlay district must be submitted, complete with owners signatures, to the Planning Commission staff for review.
5. 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.
6. 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. The required turnaround may be up to 100 feet diameter.





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

7. This preliminary plan approval for the residential portion of the master plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage.
8. Prior to any additional development applications for this property, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a final corrected copy of the PUD plan for filing and recording with the Davidson County Register of Deeds.



<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Urban Design Overlay 2005UD-003G-12</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Carothers Crossing, Phase 3</b>
<b>Council District</b>	31- Toler
<b>School District</b>	2- Brannon
<b>Requested by</b>	Wood Ridge Development LLC, applicant/owner
<b>Staff Reviewer</b>	Leeman
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve with conditions</i>

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Final UDO**

**A request for final site plan approval for a phase of the Urban Design Overlay district on Carothers Road, east of Battle Road, to permit the development of a maximum of 295 residential units and 17,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses.**

**PLAN DETAILS**

The proposed plan is consistent with the overall design intent of the Carothers Crossing UDO. The plan provides a connected street system along the Neighborhood Edge and Neighborhood General portion of the plan, as outlined in the regulating plan. The plan provides for a maximum of 71 single-family attached units, 165 single-family detached units and 59 multi-family units. The plan also includes 17,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses with 64.8% open space in Phase 3 of the plan.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval since the plan is consistent with the proposed regulating plan for this phase and the approved UDO standards.

**PUBLIC WORKS  
RECOMMENDATION**

All Public Works' design standards shall be met prior to any final approvals and permit issuance. Any approval is subject to Public Works' approval of the construction plans. Final design and improvements may vary based on field conditions.

Street System - It is difficult to determine the appropriate street cross-section in the multi-family (including town home and single family attached) areas that would be required to accommodate the expected on street parking without knowing the number of multifamily units, bedrooms, the onsite design, and on site parking provided. Should there be anticipated any more than casual intermittent parking on-street, or if any of the required parking is to utilize street spaces, eight foot wide parking aisles should be provided on both sides of the street if the ST 251 narrow cross section is used.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

Solid Waste Collection - There is insufficient design data presented to evaluate the solid waste collection plan. Dumpsters will be required for the multi-family units if adequate room for carts is not provided. Cart service is not available at curbside where on street (or alley) parking is provided.

### **STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

Approve with conditions:

1. Provide a copy of NOC letter.
2. Provide fees for the stormwater detention maintenance agreement.
3. Provide the Stormwater Appeals Variance for the proposed utility crossing (as indicated in the transmittal letter dated May 31, 2007).
4. Remove the silt fences and rip rap aprons out of the stream water quality buffers or provide variance from Stormwater Appeals.
5. Provide a drainage area map for the blue lined streams to determine width of stream buffer.
  1. D.A. < 100 acres = 30 feet from top of bank
  2. D.A. > 100 acres = 30 feet from top of bank + 20 feet managed buffer.
6. Label areas with slopes of 3:1 or greater and provide a detail showing what type of erosion control matting will be used.
7. Provide the effective FEMA map and panel number dated April 20, 2001 on the FEMA note on Sheet C3.1.
8. Provide a construction schedule if expected to last more than 12 months.
9. Provide a note on the erosion control plan requiring the contractor to provide an area for concrete wash down and equipment fueling in accordance with Metro CP-10 and CP-13, respectively. Contractor to coordinate exact location with NPDES department during precon meeting.
10. Reduce the lengths of the 15" stormwater pipes to 50' segments or upsize to 18" RCP.
11. Upsize all cross drains to a minimum of 18" RCP.
12. According to the drainage area map provided, the runoff from the sales center, Phase 1, and Phase 2 will bypass Pond 3 via the existing stream. Provide a map showing how this runoff will be directed into the pond.
13. Provide a drainage map with supporting stormwater calculations showing that Section 1 of Phase 3 was included with the Phase 2 stormwater network.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

14. Provide hydrologic soil group information supporting the CN used in the pre vs. post runoff calculations.
15. Show the 36" outlet pipe on the bioretention pond outlet detail with elevations listed.
16. The pond 3 outlet detail shows a 7' x 7' riser but the pond routing calculations show a 24' crest length. Please revise or explain usage.
17. Revise the emergency spillway elevation on the pond 3 detail to match the elevation shown in the routing calculations (650.00').
18. Provide a detail for the grass channel/swale used as pretreatment for the bioretention ponds.
19. PTP-03 states that bioretention areas can only treat drainage areas up to 5 acres. The two ponds shown in this design have drainage areas much greater than 5 acres. Please revise water quality treatment design accordingly.
20. Show the "natural conservation areas" used in the water quality treatment calculations on the grading plan. These areas must be dedicated as such and recorded.
21. Include the underground water quality unit detail on the design plan sheets.

---

### CONDITIONS

1. 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.
2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
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.
4. 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 reapproval by the Planning Commission.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

5. If 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 five (5) copies of the corrected/revised plans have been submitted to and approved by staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission for filing and recordation with the Davidson County Register of Deeds.



**Project No.**  
**Name**  
**Council Bill**  
**Council District**  
**School District**  
**Requested by**

**Mandatory Referral 2007M-078**  
**Rental Inspection Districts**  
BL2007-1550  
Countywide  
N/A  
Councilmember Hausser-Pepper and others

**Staff Reviewer**  
**Staff Recommendation**

Kleinfelter  
*Approve*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**An Ordinance Amending Title 16 Of The Metropolitan Code Of Laws To Add A New Chapter 16.33 Entitled Rental Inspections And Designating Areas Within Metropolitan Nashville And Davidson County As Rental Inspection Districts.**

**DESCRIPTION**

This ordinance authorizes a rental inspection program in accordance with state law, and designates certain areas within Davidson County as rental inspection districts. The ordinance was drafted by the Metro Legal Department, and Metro Planning Department staff worked with the Legal Department to identify the areas identified as “rental inspection districts” pursuant to the provisions set out in the state law.

A copy of the proposed ordinance is included with the Commissioner’s Staff Report packets and can be viewed online at

**[www.nashville.gov/mc/ordinances/bl2007\\_1550.html](http://www.nashville.gov/mc/ordinances/bl2007_1550.html)**

**ANALYSIS:**

In 2006, the Tennessee legislature passed an act allowing local governments to adopt local rental inspection programs. The state law authorizes local legislative bodies to adopt a residential rental dwelling inspection ordinance to address properties within designated areas that are deteriorated or in the process of deteriorating. The purpose of the ordinance is to prevent further deterioration of these properties and to protect the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants.

The proposed ordinance authorizes the Metro Codes Department to inspect residential rental units within the rental inspection districts that are deteriorated or in the process of deteriorating. The ordinance defines “deteriorated” as any structure that (1) because of physical condition, use or occupancy, is a public nuisance or an attractive nuisance; (2) is a fire hazard or otherwise is unsafe; (3) has had the utilities removed or disconnected



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

so that the property is unfit for human habitation; or (4) because of neglect or lack of maintenance, has become a place for the accumulation of trash or a haven for rodents.

The rental inspection districts established by the ordinance are to remain in effect for 10 years, but may be extended by the Council. The Director of the Codes Department is to make reasonable efforts to notify rental property owners within the designated rental inspection districts of the enactment of this ordinance and of the requirement that the property owner notify the Codes Department if they are maintaining a dwelling unit used for rental purposes. There is no penalty for the failure to register unless the Codes Department has given the property owner actual or written notice to do so. There is no registration fee or inspection fee charged to property owners for implementation of the proposed ordinance.

The ordinance authorizes the Codes Department to inspect any property they deem to be deteriorating to ensure that the dwelling units are in compliance with applicable housing, building, plumbing, electrical, fire and health codes. The Codes Department can require follow-up inspections as necessary. Codes inspectors may only enter the property with the consent of the occupants or with a valid search warrant. If, after inspection, the property is found to be in compliance with the applicable codes, the property owner gets a four-year exemption from future inspections. This exemption can be revoked, however, if the property becomes in violation of the applicable codes.

The ordinance establishes the following areas as rental inspection districts:

- a. Urbandale - Nations
- b. Sylvan Heights
- c. Hadley Washington - Meharry
- d. North Nashville - Buena Vista - Metrocenter
- e. Napier - Trimble - Wedgewood / Houston
- f. Airport - Murfreesboro Pike
- g. Edgefield - Shelby Hills
- h. Cleveland Park - McFerrin Park
- g. Greenwood – Eastwood
- h. Vanderbilt – 21st
- i. Hermitage
- j. South Madison
- k. Madison Park
- l. Edenwold



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 7/26/2007

### Staff Recommendation

The ordinance provides that the Codes Department may schedule a phased implementation of this ordinance for the above districts over a three year period.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed ordinance.