



**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT
OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

Planning Department
Metro Office Building
800 Second Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37201

**Minutes
of the
Metropolitan Planning Commission**

8/14/2008

4:00 PM

*Metro Southeast at Genesco Park
1417 Murfreesboro Road*

PLANNING COMMISSION:

James McLean, Chairman
Phil Ponder, Vice Chairman
Stewart Clifton
Judy Cummings
Derrick Dalton
Tonya Jones
Hunter Gee
Victor Tyler
Councilmember Jim Gotto
Andrée LeQuire, representing Mayor Karl Dean

Staff Present:

Rick Bernhardt, Executive Director
Ann Hammond, Asst. Executive Director
David Kleinfelter, Planning Mgr. II
Ted Morrissey, Legal Counsel
Jason Swaggart, Planner I
Bob Leeman, Planner III
Trish Brooks, Admin. Svcs Officer 3
Carrie Logan, Planner I
Craig Owensby, Communications Officer
Brenda Bernards, Planner III
Nedra Jones, Planner II
Brian Sexton, Planner I
Jonathon Honeycutt, Public Works
Steve Mishu, Metro Water
Anita McCaig, Planner III
Cynthia Wood, Planner III
Tifinie Adams, Planner I
Jennifer Carlat, Planning Mgr. 2
Greg Johnson, Planner II
Scott Adams, Planner I
Jennifer Carlat, Planning Mgr. 2

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Hammond announced there were no changes to the agenda.

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Clifton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to adopt the agenda as presented. **(8-0)**

III. APPROVAL OF JULY 24, 2008, MINUTES

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Gotto seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve the July 24, 2008, minutes as presented. (8-0)

IV. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Garrett addressed the Commission on Item #1, 2008CP-07G-03, Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan. He briefly spoke of the issues regarding the proposal and requested that the Commission support the recommendation being made by Councilmember Matthews.

Mr. Tyler arrived at 4:05 pm

Councilmember Matthews addressed the Commission on the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detail Design Plan and the alternative development area. He spoke of the issues and concerns associated with the proposal and requested that the Commission defer the Alternative Development Area for one year and approve the Detailed Design Plan. He then offered various reasons for his request to defer the Alternative Development Area in relation to economics, the environment, the need for additional information, as well as the vision of the community members affected by the development area.

Councilmember Cole thanked the Commission for their service to the City. He stated he was at the meeting in support of Councilmember Matthews in relation to the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detail Design Plan. He requested that the Commission approve the Detailed Design Plan and defer any consideration on the alternative development plan to a later date. He acknowledged the importance of the decision and its impact on both the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Community and the entire city. He briefly explained his views on the development plan and the need for additional discussions on the proposal.

Councilmember Durbin stated he was at the meeting in support of Councilmember Matthews and his recommendation on the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan. He spoke of the many unanswered questions surrounding the development and mentioned the need for additional time to analyze the proposal. He requested that the Commission defer the Alternative Development Area for one year.

Councilmember Evans spoke in favor of Item #2, 2008CP-020-01, Community Character Manual and requested its approval. She offered information on the many community meetings held and spoke of its anticipated use on the West Nashville Community Plan Update. She suggested that additional review or amendments could be made to the manual after it use on the West Nashville Plan update.

Councilmember Evans then addressed the Commission on Item #1, 2008CP-07G-03, Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan. She stated she was in support of Councilmember Matthews' recommendation to approve the Detailed Design plan and to defer the Alternative Development Area. She explained the many unanswered questions associated with the development area, however spoke in favor of the rest of the detailed design plan. She then recommended that the Commission update the General Plan by incorporating some economic principles that can be used to guide any future development.

Ms. Cummings arrived a 4:15 p.m.

Councilmember Holleman spoke in favor of Item #2, 2008CP-020-01, Community Character Manual. He commended the staff for their work on the manual and the spoke of the meetings in which the importance and effectiveness of the Community Character Manual was discussed. He too mentioned the importance of its use on updating the West Nashville Community Plan and requested that this process not be delayed.

Councilmember Holleman also spoke on Item #1, 2008CP-07G-03, Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan. He reiterated his concerns of traffic impacts and the lack of infrastructure and how this development area would affect his district. He stated that the plan needs additional time to further study its impacts and expressed his support for the deferral

Councilmember Barry spoke in favor of approving the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan and requested the deferment of the May Town Center component. She briefly spoke on the importance of the need for additional

studies on how a rural community of Nashville can contribute to smart, economic and environmental growth. She reiterated her support for Councilmember's Matthews recommendation.

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

6. 2008S-125U-10 A request for final plat approval to create 2 lots and a variance from the lot comparability requirement of the Subdivision Regulations on property located at 1705 Beechwood Avenue, and located within the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Overlay – deferred to August 28, 2008, at the request of the applicant.

Mr. Clifton moved and Mr. Ponder seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve the Deferred and Withdrawn items as presented. **(10-0)**

Ms. Hammond announced, "As information for our audience, if you are not satisfied with a decision made by the Planning Commission today, you may appeal the decision by petitioning for a writ of cert with the Davidson County Chancery or Circuit Court. Your appeal must be filed within 60 days of the date of the entry of the Planning Commission's decision. To ensure that your appeal is filed in a timely manner, and that all procedural requirements have been met, please be advised that you should contact independent legal counsel."

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: CONSENT AGENDA
SPECIFIC PLANS

3. 2006SP-162G-04 A request to amend the development plan for the Myatt Drive Thornton's Specific Plan – Commercial (SP-C) located at the southeast corner of Anderson Lane and Myatt Drive, approved for a 3,740 square foot automobile convenience market with 7 gas pumps, and to permit a 3,755 square foot automobile convenience market with 8 gas pumps. -Approve w/conditions

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

4. 2008Z-065G-14 A request to rezone from CL to OL zoning property located at Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 600 feet south of I-40. (see also associated case 90-85-P-14). -Approve
5. 90-85-P-14 A request to cancel the Hermitage Exit Property Planned Unit Development District Overlay on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 600 feet south of I-40, approved for 204,000 square feet of office/retail uses. -Approve

FINAL PLANS

7. 2008S-131G-06 A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into 2 lots on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 760 feet south of Highway 70S. -Approve

REVISIONS AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

8. 2006IN-001U-10 A request revise a portion of the preliminary master plan and for final site plan approval for the David Lipscomb University Institutional Overlay district located at 4108 Belmont Boulevard, to retain the current campus entry drive opposite Green Hills Drive. -Approve
9. 89P-022U-10 A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Melrose Planned Unit Development located at 2625 Gale Lane, to permit 7,505 square feet of retail, restaurant and financial service uses where 3,050 square feet of restaurant uses were previously approved. -Approve w/conditions

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Gotto seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. (10-0)

VII. COMMUNITY PLANS

- 1. 2008CP-07G-03**
Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan
Subarea 3
Council District 1 – Lonell R. Matthews Jr.

A request to adopt the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan* as an amendment to the *Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update* to provide more detailed guidance on planning for preservation and growth for the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - Adopt the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan* as an amendment to the *Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update* to provide more detailed guidance on planning for preservation and growth for the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community.

Public Hearing - The Planning Commission closed the public hearing at its July 24, 2008, with the intention of discussing the merits of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan at a future meeting.

SCOTTSBORO/BELLS BEND DETAILED DESIGN PLAN HIGHLIGHTS

Community Participation - The detailed design plan was initiated at the request of Scottsboro/Bells Bend community members, with the community members' goal of assisting the community in preserving the area's rural character. Staff conducted nine meetings in the Scottsboro/ Bells Bend community from October of 2007 through June of 2008 to create the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan*.

Notification of community meetings as well as the July 24 public hearing were published in newspapers and posted on the Planning Department's website. Four separate flyers announcing the community meetings were sent to property owners throughout the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community and surrounding area. Additionally, email was periodically sent to an expanding list of participants. An estimated 300 individuals participated in the detailed design planning process.

Vision for Scottsboro/Bells Bend Scottsboro/Bells Bend is a rural portion of Davidson County located to the north and west of Downtown. The Scottsboro/Bells Bend area has a variety of stakeholders. Community meetings revealed that a significant majority of stakeholders identify the rural character of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend area as a valuable attribute of Davidson County which should be preserved.

Basic qualities which define the rural character of the community and which should be preserved include natural resources, natural landscape, abundant wildlife, green space, open space, outdoor recreational opportunities, peace and quiet, privacy, sustainable resource use, low population density, and private property rights.

A stakeholder group, which controls a significant portion of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend area proposed a different vision for their property – the creation of an intense mixed use town center with adjacent corporate campuses.

To suggest, however, that there were only two visions for Scottsboro/Bells Bend, belies the fact that there are many property owners interested in varying degrees of development opportunity for their properties.

Several questions arose from this process. To what extent are the rural features and qualities preserved? What tools are available to preserve rural features and qualities? How can development occur in a manner that preserves the qualities of the rural character? It is the goal of this detailed design plan to balance the preservation of rural character while allowing development opportunities in appropriate areas.

The Study Area The Scottsboro/Bells Bend study area is comprised of approximately 13,407 acres that includes Beaman Park as the northern boundary and continues south to the Cumberland River, a distance of approximately 9 miles. The study area is characterized by steep slopes, ridgelines, floodplains, streams, wildlife, woodlands and farmland. Scottsboro/Bells Bend has remained rural due to its location in a bend of the Cumberland River that has not been bridged and its combination of floodway/floodplain and steep topography. These factors contribute to the current low population density mixed with agricultural uses.

Land Use Policy The detailed design plan proposes land use special policies for the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community. These land use policies are tailored to respond to the community's unique environmental features and emphasize preservation of the rural and natural character of the community. Each special policy has its own policy intent, general characteristics, appropriate land uses, main objectives, and design principles and development guidelines.

The design principles and development guidelines include addressing access, preserving significant environmental features, preserving archeological features/cemeteries, building form, building location, block length, connectivity, appropriate density, development arrangement, landscaping, lighting, and parking.

In addition, special policies have been added to address the identified prime viewsheds. These policies call for minimal impact from development of any kind. The land use policies also emphasize preserving historic sites, archeological sites, and farmland.

In each of the nine special policy categories discussed below, a focus remains on preserving rural character and sensitive environmental features.

- Natural Conservation Policy The largest land use policy category is Natural Conservation, which is used to preserve the area's environmentally sensitive features such as steep slopes, ridgetops, unstable soils, floodways/floodplains, woodlands, waterways, viewsheds, and wildlife habitat. Natural Conservation policy is proposed for 58 percent of the study area.

Land use options in Natural Conservation policy include:

- Maintain the land in its natural state;
- Small-scale farming if environmental constraints of the land allow; and/or
- One dwelling unit per five acres if environmental constraints of the land allow.

Natural Conservation policy also encourages land owners to use additional tools, such as conservation easements or purchase of development rights, to permanently preserve land.

The proposed density of one dwelling unit per five acres in Natural Conservation areas is less density than the land is zoned for today (AR2a zoning, which allows one dwelling unit per two acres). This is done to acknowledge that that existing environmentally sensitive features are ill-suited for higher density, and that it would be difficult to achieve that density today, despite the zoning.

- Rural Parks/Open Space Policy The study area contains two of Nashville's largest parks, Beaman Park and Bells Bend Park. These comprise almost 2,500 acres or 19 percent of the study area. Both Beaman Park and Bells Bend Park have nature centers in addition to miles of trails and a focus on sharing the natural and rural aspects of the community with visitors. The parks are placed in Rural Parks and Open Space policy.

The detailed design plan encourages constructing a multi-use path for pedestrians and cyclists along Old Hickory Boulevard to connect the two parks.

Added together, the Rural Parks and Open Space policy and the Natural Conservation policy area – 77 percent of the study area is in one of these two conservation-focused policies.

- Rural Residential Policy Rural Residential policy covers almost 15 percent of the study area. This policy is located along the flatter portions of the community where the majority of homes are already located. The goal of

Rural Residential policy is to preserve the rural and natural character of the area while allowing limited residential development opportunities that contribute to the rural character.

In rural areas throughout Davidson County, typical land uses include low-impact agricultural and related accessory uses, low density residential, and civic/public benefit uses. In the study area, Rural Residential policy land use options include:

- Maintain the land in its natural state;
- Small-scale farming;
- Large-scale farming if environmental constraints of the land allow;
- One dwelling unit per five acres;
- One dwelling unit per two acres if environmental constraints of the land allow; and/or
- In some selected areas, well-designed layouts of homes grouped together to preserve surrounding environmental features may be possible by working with the Planning Department on designs that preserve the rural character of the landscape. Any proposal requires a rezoning to Specific Plan zoning.

Areas with the potential for unstable soils are also referenced and require a geotechnical report before any development is undertaken.

The majority of the study area, 98.5 percent, is zoned AR2a which already allows one dwelling unit per 2 acres. The application of the Rural Residential policy, which would also allow one dwelling unit per two acres, acknowledges this zoning. However, Rural Residential policy offers opportunities to move away from that lot and land use pattern and encourages larger lots, agricultural uses, and siting homes so that significant environmental features are preserved. The Rural Residential policy also allows one dwelling unit per five acres. If property owners and/or the Council member wanted to rezone to a lower density that is more rural in character, this policy would support that rezoning.

- Village Center Policy Village Center policy encompasses land in the previously adopted Neighborhood Center policy (in the *Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update*) and additional surrounding property that is currently zoned commercial. This area totals 27 acres, less than 1 percent of the study area, and includes the former Wade School. The goal of Village Center policy is to create a pedestrian-friendly, mixed use, rural center that serves as the community hub for daily gathering and activity.

In the Village Center, stakeholders have expressed a desire to see uses similar to those found in Leipers Fork, such as a small grocery, restaurant, music venue, hardware store, café, farmers market, or coffee shop. Appropriate land uses include:

- Commercial
- Civic or Public Benefit
- Office
- Mixed Use

Village Center policy also encourages the use of pedestrian crosswalks, signage and medians to make the area more safe and comfortable for pedestrians, especially at the prominent intersection of Old Hickory Boulevard and Ashland City Highway.

- Village Residential Policy Village Residential policy is comprised of existing residential uses along Old Hydes Ferry Road, much of it already zoned RS20. A total of 54 acres is placed in this policy, less than 1 percent of the study area. The goal of Village Residential policy is to create a residential area that complements and supports the Village Center while also providing housing choice for community residents.

Since this area already has a pattern of smaller lots, the Village Residential policy allows for a mixture of rural housing styles that supports the nearby businesses in the Village Center. Appropriate land uses include:

- Residential (limited to single-family and two-family houses, accessory units and cottages)
- Civic or Public Benefit

- District Impact Policy District Impact policy applies to the Harpeth Valley Utility District in the southern portion of Bells Bend, which comprises 3 percent of the study area.

- Guidance for Rural Corridors The plan also calls for preserving existing rural corridors and, when appropriate, creating new rural roads that maintain the rural character that currently exists in the study area. Structures along the corridor, such as along Old Hickory Boulevard, should contribute to the rural character with irregular setbacks from the road that follow the environmental constraints of the land, instead of using established setbacks. Spacing and orientation of homes should also follow the environmental constraints of the land, including preserving open space and viewsheds. Corridors should utilize cross sections with swales, instead of curb and gutter, and reflective striping and signage for safety, instead of lighting.

- Alternate Development Area Policy As noted above, an alternate vision was offered for one portion of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community. An Alternate Development Area policy is applied to this area, which is comprised of approximately 1,500 acres or 11 percent of the study area.

Two alternate visions – representing two worthy public policy goals – have been proposed for the Alternate Development Area, comprised of property owned by the May family.

One vision calls for this area to be preserved in a natural or rural state with the rest of the study area. This could be accomplished by including this land in the Natural Conservation and Rural Residential policy categories.

An alternate vision for this area proposes that the site be redeveloped as a compact mixed use pedestrian friendly town center surrounded by a zone of preserved rural transition uses. The center would provide for a joint corporate headquarters location and regional center with retail, office, commercial and residential components, while preserving environmental features and important community characteristics such as prime farmland, ridgetops, steep slopes, viewsheds, woodlands, streams and wetlands. This vision concentrates development onto approximately one-third of the property while permanently preserving at least 900 acres in a natural/rural state, including a defined edge to delineate and buffer the center from the surrounding rural area and Old Hickory Boulevard.

To ensure the alternative vision supports the remainder of the policies of the study area, there are additional goals and conditions necessary for the ADA.

First, there are goals and conditions that must be met for the Alternate Development Area to be *eligible* for Regional Center and Corporate Campus policies (that would replace the Natural Conservation and Rural Residential policies). These are titled “Conditions that Trigger the Special Policy.”

Second, there are general goals and conditions that describe how the Alternate Development Area (if it is eligible for Regional Center and Corporate Campuses development) is to interact with the rest of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community. These are titled “Conditions for Balancing Economic Development and Rural Preservation.”

Finally, there are the goals specific to the Regional Center policy and the Corporate Campus policy.

Conditions that Trigger the Special Policy The provisions and conditions of the Alternate Development Area balance allowing specifically designed economic development while preserving the rural character. These conditions include building a bridge as primary access to the site and submitting a master plan for the site that illustrates:

- Designing a unique development concept in a manner so that site and building design meet high standards of sustainability;
- Providing true transportation options for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles, and transit;
- No extension of commercial, office or higher intensity residential development to the north of the southernmost defined ridgeline;
- Tying development of the Alternate Development Area to preservation to the north of the area to permanently preserve the natural/rural character of the remainder of Scottsboro/Bells Bend;
- Including significant protection of environmentally sensitive features and a defined buffer to create a firm edge around the proposed development (at least 900 acres will be permanently preserved);
- Completing an archeological survey for the entire site, except for those portions left undisturbed, and preserving significant sites, cemeteries, and other features;
- Preserving at least 200 acres of prime farmland for farming;
- Buffering development from the existing Bells Bend Park and Nature Center; and

- Applying for inclusion in the Urban Services District.

Any proposed development in the Alternate Development Area will be implemented through zoning that includes a site plan, such as Specific Plan zoning, to provide assurance that the development will occur as approved.

- Conditions for Balancing Economic Development and Rural Preservation

The purpose of these goals and conditions is to balance economic development and rural preservation. The conditions address development of the Alternate Development Area, but also address how this defined area relates to the remainder of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community. To address how the Alternate Development Area interacts with the rest of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community, conditions are levied that include:

- Preserving viewsheds from Old Hickory Blvd.;
- Preserving buffers between the Alternate Development Area and the rest of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community;
- Limiting development and instituting a land preservation program to assist in maintaining Old Hickory Blvd. as a rural corridor and prevent “strip development” from occurring;
- Requiring access from the south or east via a bridge, with guidance on preserving Old Hickory Blvd. as a rural corridor; and
- Requiring sustainable design of the site layout and buildings, per standards established by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design – Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) program.

- Regional Center Policy The goal of Regional Center policy is to create an intense, mixed use, multi-modal center area that forms a unique sustainable and walkable community. The Regional Center policy provides additional guidance through design principles and development guidelines, including addressing access to and within the site, preserving significant environmental features, block length, building form, connectivity, appropriate density, landscaping, lighting, parking, signage, and transit. These include specifying how buildings interact with each other, with their unique setting, and with the surrounding rural area.

- Corporate Campus Policy The goal of Corporate Campus policy is to create employment and office centers that are uniquely integrated into the adjacent mixed use center, served by multi-modal transportation systems, and uniquely designed to complement the existing rural setting and preserve environmental features. The Corporate Campus policy provides additional guidance through design principles and development guidelines, including addressing access to and within the site, preserving significant environmental features, building form, connectivity, appropriate density, landscaping, lighting, parking, signage, and transit. These include specifying how the campuses are sited and how they interact with each other and with the Regional Center.

Implementation Tools/Ideas The detailed design plan also includes a chapter on implementation tools, ideas and examples to assist the community in achieving its vision of preserving rural character. These tools include conservation easements, transfer/purchase of development rights, cultural heritage tourism, eco-tourism, recreational tourism, agri-tourism, sustainable agriculture, a sustainable agricultural institute, community supported agriculture, organic farming co-ops, conservation subdivisions, including preservation as an important aspect of development, and the Adirondack Park model.

Recommendation The community planning process involves seeking the input of all community stakeholders. It also requires Planning staff to provide professional recommendations to ensure that each community and neighborhood meets the goals of Nashville/Davidson County’s General Plan, the County’s commitment to sustainable development. In doing so, the preservation and development of each community and neighborhood is considered in light of its role in Davidson County and in the Middle Tennessee region.

In the case of the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan*, two important public policy goals – rural preservation and economic development through the creation of sustainable development and corporate campuses – must be weighed.

Whenever a community plan or detailed design plan is undertaken, stakeholders are asked to compromise in their visions – to accommodate competing visions and to accommodate the needs of the overall County. The *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan* is unique, however, in that the final product represents significant compromise for stakeholders of the area, and includes significant guidance from Planning staff, on how the

Scottsboro/Bells Bend community can meet two equally valid public policy goals – rural preservation and economic development of a unique corporate campus/regional center product.

Planning staff recommends adoption of the plan as presented. Correctly implemented, the detailed policy guidance can allow a unique economic development opportunity in Nashville/Davidson County, along with new businesses, jobs, and increased revenues. At the same time, the detailed design plan calls for significant rural preservation throughout the Scottsboro/Bells Bend area, including significant preservation of the Alternate Development Area – at least 900 acres, to be permanently preserved in a natural/rural state that can contribute to the rural character not only in appearance, but can provide certain community amenities such as hiking trails, equestrian trails, greenways, farming opportunities, and local food production. The preservation of this land provides a viable option for preservation. Since over 2,500 acres of the study area are already part of the Metro parks system, it seems unlikely that Metro would acquire this property as parkland due to priorities for parkland in other areas of the County and current financial constraints.

The plan also provides a viable option for development of land that is currently zoned AR2a and could be developed as numerous single-family homes today, which could also negatively impact the rural character of the community. A subdivision of this magnitude also could result in pressure to change the rural character of Old Hickory Boulevard since it would likely not include a provision for building a bridge across the Cumberland River.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends adoption of the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan*.

Mr. Gee read a statement into the record which contained his views on the proposed plan. He acknowledged the attempt made by staff to balance conservation with economic development for this area. He further spoke of the extraordinary plan submitted for the alternative development area as it was compact, high-density, walkable, contained mixed use communities with sensitive approaches to the environment with gracious open space and had multi-modal transportation.

Mr. Gee then mentioned various aspects of the plan in which he had expressed various concerns. He spoke of a market related concern with respect that the alternative development area would draw executives and corporations from downtown Nashville. He then spoke of traffic impacts, the need for additional bridges to support the project and the lack of infrastructure. He stated that the 40 percent reductions utilized in the traffic study may be unreasonable for this location and proposed development program. Mr. Gee spoke on the issue of corporate relocations as discussed by the Chamber of Commerce for recruiting businesses to the Nashville area and the fact that school systems were not mentioned and whether Nashville could compete with surrounding school systems. He also spoke of surface parking as it was mentioned as reason for campus and corporate site selections, while the proposed development offered structured parking, not surface lots. He spoke of infrastructure maintenance and the need for the city to focus land use where there is infrastructure, and the need to intensify those areas that have the capacity. He spoke of corporate campuses and how the trends change over time that support such land uses. He mentioned the affects of the economy and the importance of progressively improving and reinforcing the assets of Nashville and the last remaining agricultural and natural areas. As he closed, Mr. Gee stated he could not support the major change in policy with this many unanswered questions. He stated that if the proposal was deferred, he would request a copy of the traffic study, and that a fiscal impact analysis, along with a thorough market study, be developed by a independent third party. In addition to this request, he suggested that Nashville's General Plan have a fiscal impact/economic development component that could assist communities in making economically sustainable land use policy decisions.

Mr. Tyler requested clarification on the future vision of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend community regarding the existing commercial development located on Old Hickory Boulevard and Ashland City Highway as a rural type setting in relation to the overall General Plan for the area.

Ms. McCaig explained the village center policy and the expectation for this area by community.

Mr. Tyler questioned whether this type of policy would attract the type of businesses wanted by the residents.

Mr. Tyler then requested clarification on whether additional residential components could exist in the Scottsboro/Bells Bend area.

Ms. McCaig stated that there were areas that could be zoned residential however, due to the topography of the land, these areas were limited.

Mr. Tyler requested clarification on any traffic impacts that would be encountered by the southern area of Bells Bend in relation to those traveling from the northern area to the alternative development area.

Ms. McCaig offered explanation of these traffic impacts.

Mr. Tyler then requested additional information on the potential of widening Old Hickory Boulevard which is located within the Bells Bend area.

Ms. McCaig stated that the proposed plan does not allow for the widening of Old Hickory Boulevard as the community would like to maintain its rural character.

Mr. Tyler questioned whether a traffic impact study was submitted for review.

Ms. McCaig explained that staff was currently studying policies for the area and that traffic impact studies and details for the alternative development area would be submitted with the zone change.

Mr. Tyler then expressed concerns with the lack of transition that the alternative development area has in relation to the rural parts of the community.

Mr. Bernhardt offered that the policy for this development requires that there be 900 acres of preserved open space around the core of the development. He further stated that the development would be considered T5, surrounded by T1 and T2 levels of preserved open space. He then explained the policies and triggers that are in place that would need to be addressed prior to moving forward on any rezoning application.

Mr. Tyler further explained his concerns with the alternative development area and its impacts on traffic, the rural character of the area, maintenance of infrastructure, location of infrastructure, etc. He stated he was in favor of the plan, however, that there was a need for additional discussions on the design character of the alternative development area.

Mr. Clifton stated he was able to review the materials from the Public Hearing on this proposal and would participate in the discussion. He further acknowledged that the developer for the alternative development area would be deferring the zone change submittal and that he would be commenting only the detailed design plan. He acknowledged the work of the staff and the community on the plan and spoke in favor of its approval. He also mentioned that the detailed design plan could be amended in the future, if necessary. Mr. Clifton then questioned whether the applicant for the rezoning specified a deferral time on the rezoning.

Mr. Bernhardt stated he was unaware of the deferral time on the rezoning. He then offered that the Commission's decision on the policy amendment will affect how the rezoning would move forward.

Mr. Clifton stated that it was staff's recommendation to adopt the detailed design plan, except for the policies associated with the alternative design plan. He then offered that information which normally accompanies zone change requests, and which is associated with plan amendments, is normally discussed when the zone change is submitted for discussion.

Mr. Gotto acknowledged the many unanswered questions associated with the proposal. He offered that there were two factors that need consideration when making the final decision on the alternative development area; which were the residents affected by the proposal and the potential risk to the City, and to the taxpayers. He agreed that the discussions regarding the detailed design plan should be separated from the alternative development area. He then spoke on the issue of deferring the alternative development area for a year; and suggested that it be deferred indefinitely, as the indefinite deferral would leave many options open as additional information is obtained on the alternative development area.

Mr. Ponder acknowledged and commended the residents of Nashville for their interest in the proposal as well as the alternative development area. He noted the importance of value and vision placed on the proposal and that the two values could possibly co-exist. He too agreed that the detailed design plan should be adopted and that additional time should be taken to further study the alternative development area and its impact on the city. He acknowledged the importance of greenways and open space that was expressed by both parties and commended all for their environmental concerns. Mr. Ponder agreed with the recommendation to defer the alternative development indefinitely, or for one year, and to approve the detailed design plan.

Ms. Cummings commended the staff for their willingness and work to make the City a great place to work and live. She commended the stakeholders of the May Town Center for their ability to create a city from a blank slate. She then thanked the residents for all of their communications to the Planning Commission members regarding this proposed development. Ms. Cummings offered her views on the issue of corporate relocations and the City of Nashville as mentioned by the Chamber of Commerce and stated she did not agree with the information. She offered that if the proper time and attention were given to existing sites within the City there could be an attraction for large businesses to relocate to Nashville. She spoke of the issue of having to place support on both the downtown area as well as the May Town Center. She stated she had read many of the economic impacts the center may bring, however, her main concern was with the environmental impact. She offered that additional time be taken to study whether the purpose of the development area was to attract big businesses, or if its purpose was to provide a quality of life for all of Nashville. She spoke on the lack of transition associated with the alternative development area, as well as the time and effort put into preserving the Bells Bend area, as displayed by the Bells Bend Park. As she closed, she stated she was in support of approving the Detailed Design Plan and an indefinite deferral to allow additional time for the stakeholders to come together to create a plan that will keep the City of Nashville a great place to work and live.

Ms. Jones acknowledged and thanked Hunter Gee for his comments regarding this proposed development. She acknowledged both the pros and cons that been presented for the alternative development area and the difficult nature of each side. She mentioned the two parks located in the Bells Bend area and requested that they be part of any future discussions involving any development in the area. She spoke of Nashville being an urban county and the close proximity of the alternative development area and the issue of separating the two. She then acknowledged the additional communication received since the public hearing in which constituents waited to voice their concerns and requested that the entire proposal be deferred. She then confirmed with staff that the detailed design plan was separate from the alternative development area and that it could be approved as proposed to the Commission. As she closed, she stated she was in favor of approving the detailed design plan, and that the alternative development area would need additional time to sort through all of the outstanding issues.

Mr. Dalton acknowledged the great plan of the May Town Center as submitted by the developers. He then focused on the magnitude of the plan which caused him concern that the development would detract from the city and the intentions to improve Nashville. He stated that a plan such as the May Town Center should complement the downtown area as opposed to take away from it. He asked that information be provided to the Commission that would show how the development would not affect or draw from the downtown area. He too agreed with the many issues mentioned by Commissioner Hunter that need additional studies prior to approving the alternative development plan.

Ms. LeQuire requested additional information pertaining to the alternative development area; information on economic realities, how the project will be funded, the number of bridges and how the bridges would impact the 900 acres of undeveloped land. She too agreed with Mr. Gotto on the risks that would be taken by City if the development would not reach projections. She acknowledged that projected revenues were provided, but stated she had not received any information on the total true costs. Ms. LeQuire then acknowledged all of the work that was put into the detailed design plan by the community, as it contained their vision, as well as the necessary tools needed to shape their community as they envisioned it. She spoke of the need for all communities to utilize detailed design plans to improve not only their neighborhoods but to improve the entire City, as each plan contains important components that can improve the quality of life for all.

Ms. LeQuire moved, and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion, to adopt the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan as an amendment to the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update and to defer the alternative development area indefinitely.

Mr. Ponder questioned whether the Commission should have a task force created in an effort to provide the requested information pertaining to the alternative development area.

Mr. Bernhardt offered that the Commission may want to include a minimum time of deferral in their motion to determine who would be responsible for defining when the plan should return to the Commission.

Mr. Kleinfelter explained the overall process for indefinite deferrals to the Commission.

Mr. Bernhardt acknowledged that the applicant for this proposal was the department and that, as the applicant, the Metro Planning Department staff could recommend to the Commission that the policies for the alternate development area could be put on the agenda in the future when the Commission's general questions had been addressed. He then offered information pertaining to the applicant that requested the rezoning for the alternative development area and the options available to them under the current plan. Mr. Bernhardt then explained the need to place a time limit on the deferral in relation to Council Public Hearings.

Mr. Clifton offered that the Commission should handle this request uniformly as any request for a rezoning.

Mr. Bernhardt acknowledged the concern mentioned by Mr. Clifton and stated that enough concerns have been raised that will cause additional time prior to the plan returning to the Commission. He then offered that the applicant has a right to file their own plan amendment to accompany their rezoning or accept the timing of the plan as recommended by the Commission.

Mr. Gee mentioned the request for a fiscal impact analysis on the project and concerns of how this would be handled.

Mr. Bernhardt briefly explained that the policies included in the plan include many triggers that have to be met prior to moving forward on the rezoning application.

Mr. McLean offered that the Commission review the meeting in an effort to collect all of the information they have requested of the applicant and the alternative development area and possibly hold an information work session sometime in October to see if all of the outstanding issues have been addressed.

Ms. LeQuire moved, and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion, to adopt the Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan as an amendment to the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update and to defer indefinitely the policies associated with the Alternative Development Area. **(10-0)**

Resolution No. RS2008-167

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008CP-07G-03 is **APPROVED ADOPTION OF THE SCOTTSBORO/BELLS BEND DETAILED DESIGN PLAN AND DEFER INDEFINITELY THE ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA POLICIES. (10-0)”**

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING: COMMUNITY PLANS

2. 2008CP-020-01
Community Character Manual

A request to adopt the Community Character Manual, an update of the Land Use Policy Application (LUPA), as a part of the General Plan in accordance with Section 11.504(e) of the Charter of Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - A request to adopt the Community Character Manual (CCM), an update of the Land

Use Policy Application (LUPA), as a part of the General Plan in accordance with Section 11.504(e) of the Charter of Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION - Staff began the process of creating the Community Character Manual by hosting focus groups to discuss the strengths and challenges of the Land Use Policy Application (LUPA), the LUPA update process and to gather feedback on specific changes that were needed to create the Community Character Manual (CCM), the successor of LUPA.

The focus groups were followed by creation of a task force intended to provide specific technical guidance. The task force and focus groups consisted of 32 development professionals, 27 neighborhood leaders, 4 council members and 5 Metro Nashville Government agency representatives.

Staff also hosted four community meetings for feedback from the general community. Three community meetings were held in August 2007, upon the completion of the first draft of the Community Character Manual (CCM). The fourth and final community meeting was on June 24th, 2008, where an open house and formal presentation was given on the final draft of the CCM.

A public comment period followed from June 9th through July 9th 2008. The CCM was posted online and comments were from the community were taken via email.

Throughout the creation of the CCM, Planning staff relied on its Neighborhood Associations email list (300+ emails), its Development Professionals email list (700+ emails), as well as email to the Metro Council and Planning Commission to alert the community to the update and how to be involved.

BACKGROUND The CCM explains the Community Character Policies (CCPs), which are derived from the general policies as outlined in the General Plan and are applied to all land in Davidson County to create the Community Plans. The CCM will replace LUPA, and over time as all Community Plans are updated, all *land use polices* defined in LUPA will be replaced with *community character polices* that are defined in the CCM.

Unlike LUPA, the CCM fully integrates the Transect Planning Model – a system used to categorize and describe the development pattern of a region from the most natural to the most urban areas – into the community character policies. Further, where LUPA focused primarily on density and land use, the CCM focus is on the creation of community character and development form.

Creating community character and appropriate development form surfaced as the most appealing function of the new CCM among the task force and focus group members. Development professionals from both the task force and focus groups cited rising land costs and the need for infill development as a reason to better define community character and development form – to determine up front what character, density and land use is anticipated, to create infill development that complements existing development. Similarly, community leaders from both the task force and focus groups emphasized the importance of creating infill development that is compatible with existing development and wanted the CCM to be very specific in defining community character.

All groups, including staff, requested that the CCM be more functional and user-friendly by adding graphics and images to enhance the corresponding text, placing related information in proximity to each other in the text (versus in appendices), and making the guidance specific yet general enough for additional flexibility when needed.

CCM HIGHLIGHTS The highlights of the Community Character Manual (CCM) include:

The Transect is Used as the Over-arching Structure of the Document: The Transect is a system for categorizing and describing a region from the most natural to the most urban. The use of the Transect calls for all elements of the natural and built environment to be consistent with the character of the Transect Category in which they are located. There are seven Transect categories:

- T1 – Natural
- T2 – Rural
- T3 – Suburban
- T4 – Urban

T5 – Center
T6 – Downtown
D – District

The CCM is structured so that the reader is first introduced to the Transect Category covered in each chapter. The Transect Category describes for the reader the appropriate character and form of development. The Transect Category also helps define the Community Character Policies as well as appropriate land uses, appropriate building types and zoning districts.

Community Elements Create Complete Communities: Each chapter addresses a specific Transect Category. Within each chapter, the reader is introduced to the Community Elements.

The Community Elements – open space, neighborhoods, centers, and corridors – are the building blocks of a complete community. When combined within a Transect Category, the Community Elements create a specific community character. Meaning, open space, neighborhoods, centers and corridors will have a different character in a T2 Rural Transect Category than in a T4 Urban Transect Category.

The Community Elements are ordered in a similar fashion to the Transect Model – least developed to the most developed. *Open space* is the least developed element and is described as publicly or privately protected open space or parks, and as open spaced related to civic and public benefit land uses.

Following is the community element *Neighborhoods*. Neighborhoods describe areas that provide a variety of housing options for a community. Neighborhoods can contained very low levels of development or may have very intense levels of development depending on the Transect Category in which they are located.

Centers are generally the most developed Community Element and contain higher intensity mixed use, commercial, civic and public benefit and sometimes, residential land uses. Centers may be developed with very low intensity non-residential development, or very intense non-residential development.

Finally, the *Corridor* is a Community Element that may be very intensely developed or may not contain any development, but will link all Community Elements together either by a street or roadway. Corridors may be developed as mixed use or primarily residential.

In each Transect Category chapter, there is a Community Character Policy for each Community Element.

Community Character Polices are intended to Preserve, Enhance, or Create Community Character: After being introduced to the Transect Category and the Community Element, the reader is then introduced to the Community Character *Policy Intent*. The Community Character Policy Intent describes what the policy is intended to do when it is applied to the land.

In the development of the CCM, the examination of existing communities and their Community Elements (open space, neighborhoods, centers, and corridors) revealed the need to acknowledge the varying development patterns across Nashville/ Davidson County. There are some communities where the existence of stable Community Elements requires the *preservation* of those areas. Alternately, there are some communities whereby one or more of the Community Elements are somewhat stable and may require changes or some *enhancement* overtime. Lastly, some communities have one or more Community Elements that either do not exist or are unstable and will need to be *created*.

The Community Character Policies reflect the intent to Preserve, Enhance, or Create the community character as defined by the Transect and the Community Element.

Design Principles Define Community Character in each Community Element in each Transect Category: To create community character, the design of each Community Element is taken into consideration, and is guided by Design Principles. The Design Principles include: access, block length, building form, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, vehicular connectivity, density and intensity, landscaping, lighting, parking, service area, and signage.

Each Design Principle is written to reflect the Transect Category, the Community Element, and the Policy Intent. The design principles are used collectively to create community character; one design principle is generally not considered without the others.

The Community Character Policies: Below is a summary of the Community character policies contained within the CCM. Recall that while these policies are categorized here by *Community Element*, that there are actually several Open Space policies across Transect Categories, several Neighborhood policies across Transect Categories, etc., and that these each vary in form and character per the Transect Category in which they are located.

Community Character Policies that apply to Open Space:

Open Space Community Character Policies are typically intended to preserve publicly or privately protected open space areas or areas associated with civic and public benefit land uses. Open Space Community Character Policies are found in all Transect categories from T1- Natural through to T6 - Downtown. Open Space Community Character Policy is not found in the D – District Transect Category.

Community Character Policies that apply to Neighborhoods:

Neighborhood Community Character Policies are applied to areas that have or are intended to have residential development. Neighborhood Community Character Policies intended to preserve and enhance areas dedicated to providing housing choice in a community will be defined by the community character policy as Maintenance neighborhoods (neighborhoods intended to be preserved) or Evolving neighborhoods (neighborhoods intended to be enhanced).

There are some areas where the neighborhood community element is not stable and on rare occasion does not exist. In this case the community character policy applied would have the intent of creating neighborhoods in these areas.

In all cases, the Neighborhood Community Character Policies encourage the creation of housing choice by encouraging a variety of building types, the accommodation of multiple modes of travel, and the full integration of appropriate housing with other community elements.

Neighborhood Community Character Policies are found in all Transect categories from T2 - Rural to T6- Downtown and are not found in T1- Natural and D - Districts.

Community Character Policies that apply to Centers:

Center Community Character Policies are applied to areas where there is concentration of non-residential and civic and public benefit land uses. Center Community Character Policies are typically intended to create new centers or enhance existing centers. These areas are either created or enhanced to develop into intense, mixed use areas of activity, that serve either a single neighborhood or an entire community, and that accommodate multiple modes of travel.

Center Community Character Policies are found in all Transect categories from T2 - Rural to T5 - Center and are not found in T1- Natural, T6 - Downtown and D - Districts.

Community Character Policies that apply to Corridors:

Corridor Community Character Policies are applied to streets or roadways that link open space, neighborhoods, and centers together. Corridors Community Character Policies are typically intended to preserve, create or enhance corridors that are envisioned to contain either primarily residential land uses or mixed-use land uses.

In all cases, where Corridor Community Character Policies are applied, there is an emphasis on creating corridors that accommodate multiple modes of travel, that concentrate higher intensity non-residential land uses at major intersections, and that contain a greater mixture of non-residential land uses and residential land uses between major intersections encouraging a mixed use and pedestrian friendly development pattern.

Corridor Community character Polices are found in Transect categories T3 – Suburban, T4-Urban, and T6 - Downtown.

Community Character Policies that apply to Districts:

D- District is the Transect Category that accommodates concentrations of singular land uses. The four districts that are found in Davidson County include Industrial, Impact, Major Institutional, and Office Concentration.

Industrial and Impact districts are encouraged to be designed and located as to not be a nuisance to lower intensity adjacent land uses. Major Institutional and Office Concentration districts are encouraged, however, to be woven into the fabric of a complete community. Therefore the Design Principles included in the D-District Transect Category chapter are written specifically for the successful operation of the district while being flexible enough for the district to be designed with respect to adjacent Transect Categories and Community Elements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the adoption of the *Community Character Manual* as proposed.

Ms. Adams presented and stated that staff is recommending approval.

Ms. Wood presented and stated that staff is recommending approval with changes noted in the presentation and with conditions, including the condition to review and make amendments to the Community Character Manual upon the completion of Madison Community Plan Update and the West Nashville Community Plan Update.

Mr. Roy Dale, 1657 Stokley Lane, expressed concerns with the proposed community character manual.

Ms. Ruth Crouch, 4106 Dorman Drive, expressed issues with the proposed community character manual.

Ms. Ashley Smith, 633 Brook Hollow, expressed issues with the proposed community character manual.

Mr. Gotto expressed concerns with the CCM. He acknowledged the need to have a tool that contained necessary guidelines to assist with development, however, stated that the manual may prove too restrictive to any future developments that are submitted for consideration.

Mr. Gee commended the staff for their work on the CCM. He acknowledged the importance of having such a tool that will assist with shaping the City of Nashville into a great place to live. He agreed with staff recommendation to review the CCM after it is used on the West Nashville and Madison Community Plan Updates. He suggested that while the updates were taking place, that staff also hold training sessions with various other neighborhood associations as another way to receive feedback on the CCM.

Mr. Tyler spoke in favor of the CCM and its presentation for use by the communities. He requested clarification on the term "character" and how it is defined.

Mr. Bernhardt explained that the policies contained in the CCM will be used and incorporated throughout individual communities. He explained that there has been significant involvement of residents in the community planning process and that the character is defined by the individual communities. He noted too that many residents have a better understanding of the CCM than the current land use policy application manual. Mr. Bernhardt also spoke of the notification process used by the department and agreed that after the CCM is used to update the West Nashville and Madison Community Plans it will be necessary to review the document for additional amendments.

Ms. Cummings commended the staff for their work on the CCM. She acknowledged the thoroughness of its contents and its user-friendly layout that will assist in making the community planning process easier. She acknowledged the concern mentioned that not everyone was aware of the CCM and suggested that staff continue to market the tool and explained to the audience, that the CCM was a work-in-progress and will continue to be reviewed and amended as necessary. Ms. Cummings questioned whether landscape buffers were defined in the CCM.

Ms. Adams explained that the manual only contains policy and that the zoning code would continue to define the details of individual plans. Ms. Adams then explained how the department is committed on educating the communities about the CCM.

Mr. Clifton spoke in favor of the CCM. He did however, acknowledge the concern mentioned by the constituents that the CCM may be construed as restrictive on uses and addressed this concern. He also spoke of the need to have the CCM and policies in place to assist with quality development for the City. He too agreed that after it is used, it should be re-evaluated and amended as necessary.

Mr. Ponder spoke in favor of the CCM. He too acknowledged the concerns mentioned, however stated that the CCM should be considered as a guide to assist with future development in the City.

Ms. Jones agreed that the CCM should be considered a guide to be used for development. She commented on the importance of marketing the CCM to the communities and suggested that builders and developers also be included, as they are asked to execute the policies contained in the CCM. Ms. Jones expressed concern with some of the content of the CCM and how it increases costs for the development community which ultimately affects affordable housing. She asked too that consideration be given to how the CCM would be implemented on new development in which there are no communities to envision character. Ms. Jones agreed that the review process for the CCM remain open to allow additional comments and amendments to be made by all stakeholders affected by the CCM.

Mr. Dalton spoke in favor of the CCM. He spoke of the user-friendliness of the document and agreed that all stakeholders should be included in its review in an effort to express their concerns of the document.

Ms. LeQuire commended the staff on the CCM and offered additional edits to the document. She then suggested that the CCM be reviewed annually, by a task force, in an effort to address all the concerns that are raised as the manual is utilized. Ms. LeQuire then suggested that a large meeting be held to review the CCM, and that the invitation list be comprised of neighborhood associations and developers as a way to bring all parties together to allow equal voices on the document. She then recognized the concern that the Commission should begin including economic feasibility components as they update their plans. Ms. LeQuire then spoke on the overall intent of the CCM and the importance of its use to develop sustainable communities.

Mr. Ponder moved approval of the CCM.

Ms. LeQuire suggested another motion to include that the CCM undergo an annual review.

Mr. Gotto then offered an additional motion which would include a condition that a large meeting be held by all stakeholders, including the development community, to review the manual and then have it returned to the Commission for final adoption.

Mr. McLean suggested that the Commission act on the current motion to approve the CCM as moved by Mr. Ponder.

Mr. Bernhardt offered that staff would utilize the CCM for the next two community plan updates and then return it to the Commission prior to any additional plan updates.

Mr. Gotto reiterated his request that a large meeting, comprised of all stakeholders including the development community be held to review the CCM.

Mr. Bernhardt offered that staff has sent notification of the CCM to over 300 neighborhood associations in addition to over 700 developers. He also mentioned that staff met with industry leaders on the document earlier in the week.

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Clifton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve with changes and conditions, including the condition to review and make any needed amendments to the Community Character Manual upon the completion of Madison Community Plan Update and the West Nashville Community Plan Update and to bring the Community Character Manual back to the Commission prior to subsequent Community Plan Updates. **(10-0)**

Resolution No. RS2008-168

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008CP-020-01 is APPROVED WITH CHANGES AND CONDITIONS TO REVIEW AND MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNITY

IX. PUBLIC HEARING: SPECIFIC PLANS

3. 2006SP-162G-04

Myatt Drive Thornton’s SP
Map: 043-07 Parcels: 069, 070
Subarea 4
Council District 9 – Jim Forkum

A request to amend the development plan for the Myatt Drive Thornton’s Specific Plan – Commercial (SP-C) located at the southeast corner of Anderson Lane and Myatt Drive (1.87 acres), approved for a 3,740 square foot automobile convenience market with 7 gas pumps, and to permit a 3,755 square foot automobile convenience market with 8 gas pumps, requested by Thornton’s Inc., applicant, for MAT Real Estate LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions

APPLICANT REQUEST - A request to amend the development plan for the Myatt Amend Development Plan

Drive Thornton’s Specific Plan – Commercial (SP-C) located at the southeast corner of Anderson Lane and Myatt Drive (1.87 acres), approved for a 3,740 square foot automobile convenience market with 7 gas pumps, and to permit a 3,755 square foot automobile convenience market with 8 gas pumps.

Existing Zoning

SP-C District - Specific Plan-Commercial is a zoning District category that provides for additional flexibility of design, including the relationship of streets to buildings, to provide the ability to implement the specific details of the General Plan. This Specific Plan includes commercial uses.

PLAN DETAILS The Myatt Drive Thornton’s SP was approved by Metro Council in 2007. After the plan was approved it was determined that the sale of beer was prohibited because the convenience market building was located within 100 feet of a residential structure. To allow for the sale of beer, the applicants have requested the plan be changed. Currently, both properties that make up the SP district are vacant.

Preliminary Plan The Council approved SP was approved for a 3,740 square foot automobile convenience market with a covered fueling area and seven free standing pumps offering 14 fueling stations. The building was located along the eastern property line closer to Anderson Lane and the fueling area was located along Myatt Drive.

Site PlanThe revised plan calls for a 3,755 square foot automobile convenience market with a covered fueling area eight free standing pumps offering 16 fueling stations.

Access will be provided from Anderson Lane and from Myatt Drive. To enhance pedestrian access to and around the site the revised plan includes decorative paving along both entrances and from both Myatt Drive and Anderson Lane to the store.

Landscaping A Standard B-2 Landscape Buffer Yard is shown along the southern and eastern property line except for approximately 200 feet along the eastern property line beginning at Anderson Lane. A solid seven foot tall decorative fence is provided along this section of the property line. A two foot high, masonry knee wall will run along a portion of the western property line abutting Myatt Drive with landscaping at the corner of Myatt Drive and Anderson Lane. Street trees are proposed in the furnishing zone. As there is a NES line over this area, the trees need to be appropriately sized to be below the power line. These trees need to be spaced a maximum of 25 feet along the length of the knee wall.

The Urban Forester has identified a number of concerns with the landscape plan including tree protection, proposed tree species, location of lighting, and missing details regarding proposed tree caliper and height. All of these issues must be addressed as a condition of approval of this amendment to the SP.

Elevations and Signage Building elevations and a signage plan have been provided and are consistent with the approved SP.

Analysis The proposed layout for the final site plan is not consistent with the Council approved preliminary plan; however, the changes do not alter the basic concept of the approved preliminary plan. While the building is to be relocated, adequate pedestrian access from both Anderson Lane and Myatt Drive to the proposed market and buffering to the adjacent residential properties to the east remains.

The proposed concept plan is consistent with the previously adopted SP plan and the revised layout would not, on its own, require Council approval. The proposed plan also includes a second revision, however, to increase the number of pumps. The original SP was approved for seven pumps with 14 stations and the revised plan calls for eight pumps and 16 stations. The effect of additional fuel pumps is increased traffic that increases the overall intensity of the SP. Any change that increases the overall intensity of the SP requires approval from Council.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved with conditions:

1. A revised Grading Plan is required prior to Final Site approval.

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.

URBAN FORESTER RECOMMENDATION

- Provide details of tree protection plan.
- Provide caliper and height details for all trees.
- Delete Pyrus Calleryana "Cleveland Select" from the plant list.
- Parking lot lights must be kept out of the tree islands.
- Remove the staking from the planting details.
- Substitute the Red Maple shown in the furnishing zone with a tree that is more appropriate for under a power line.
- Trees in the furnishing zone need to be spaced a maximum of every 25 feet along the length of the knee wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions of this amendment to the Myatt Drive Thornton's SP

CONDITIONS

1. Permitted uses include automobile convenience. All other uses are prohibited.
2. Free standing signs shall be monument signs and shall have a maximum sign area of 48 square feet, and shall not exceed six (6) feet in height or three (3) feet in height of any portion of the sign located within 15 feet of a driveway.
3. The corrected copy of the development plan shall comply with the requirements of the Urban Forester.
4. Street trees shall be required within the furnishing zone and shall be identified on the final site plan subject to approval of the Urban Forester and Metro Public Works.
5. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Commission or Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the CS zoning district as of the date of the applicable request or application.

6. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission and Council shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the filing of any additional development applications for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the effective date of the enacting ordinance. If a corrected copy of the SP plan incorporating the conditions therein is not provided to the Planning Department within 120 days of the effective date of the enacting ordinance, then the corrected copy of the SP plan shall be presented to the Metro Council as an amendment to this SP ordinance prior to approval of any grading, clearing, grubbing, final site plan, or any other development application for the property.
7. Minor modifications to the preliminary SP plan may be approved by the Planning Commission or its designee based upon final architectural, engineering or site design and actual site conditions. All modifications shall be consistent with the principles and further the objectives of the approved plan. Modifications shall not be permitted, except through an ordinance approved by Metro Council that increase the permitted density or floor area, 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.
8. The requirements of the Metro 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.

Approved with conditions, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-169

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006SP-162G-04 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (10-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Permitted uses include automobile convenience. All other uses are prohibited.
2. Free standing signs shall be monument signs and shall have a maximum sign area of 48 square feet, and shall not exceed six (6) feet in height or three (3) feet in height of any portion of the sign located within 15 feet of a driveway.
3. The corrected copy of the development plan shall comply with the requirements of the Urban Forester.
4. Street trees shall be required within the furnishing zone and shall be identified on the final site plan subject to approval of the Urban Forester and Metro Public Works.
5. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Commission or Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the CS zoning district as of the date of the applicable request or application.
6. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission and Council shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the filing of any additional development applications for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the effective date of the enacting ordinance. If a corrected copy of the SP plan incorporating the conditions therein is not provided to the Planning Department within 120 days of the effective date of the enacting ordinance, then the corrected copy of the SP plan shall be presented to the Metro Council as an amendment to this SP ordinance prior to approval of any grading, clearing, grubbing, final site plan, or any other development application for the property.
7. Minor modifications to the preliminary SP plan may be approved by the Planning Commission or its designee based upon final architectural, engineering or site design and actual site conditions. All modifications shall be consistent with the principles and further the objectives of the approved plan.

Modifications shall not be permitted, except through an ordinance approved by Metro Council that increase the permitted density or floor area, 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.

8. The requirements of the Metro 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.

The proposed amendment to the SP –C district is consistent with the Madison Community Plan’s Mixed Use policies, which is intended for a mixture of uses including commercial/retail, office and residential.”

X. PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

4. 2008Z-065G-14

Map: 097-00 Parcel: 084

Subarea 14

Council District 12 – Jim Gotto

A request to rezone from CL to OL zoning property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 600 feet south of I-40 (9.95 acres), requested by Gresham Smith & Partners, applicant, for JJIM, LLC and Thomas Corcoran Trust, owners (see also associated case 90-85-P-14).

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - A request to rezone from Commercial Limited (CL) to Office Limited (OL) zoning, property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 600 feet south of I-40 (9.95 acres).

Existing Zoning

CL District - Commercial Limited is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, and office uses.

Proposed Zoning

OL District -Office Limited is intended for moderate intensity office uses.

DONELSON-HERMITAGE COMMUNITY PLAN

Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) CMC policy is intended to include Medium High to High density residential, all types of retail trade (except regional shopping malls), highway-oriented commercial services, offices, and research activities and other appropriate uses with these locational characteristics.

Consistent with Policy? Yes. With the approval of the associated PUD cancellation, the request for Office Limited (OL) zoning is consistent with Commercial Mixed Concentration policy. The uses permitted within the OL zoning district are compatible with the surrounding uses in the area. The property is located on Old Hickory Boulevard near the entrance ramp to Interstate 40. The uses surrounding the site include commercial, office and multi-family residential. The OL district permits only office uses which allows for less intense uses than the CL district.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION A TIS may be required prior to development.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: CL/Commercial PUD

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Floor Area	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office/Retail (710)*	9.95	N/A	204,000*	2310	332	308

***Amount of square footage currently approved in PUD**

Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: OL

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Floor Area	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office(710)	9.95	0.157	68,047	992	138	156

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: CL/Commercial PUD

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Floor Area	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office/Retail (710)*	9.95	N/A	204,000*	2310	332	308

*Amount of Square footage currently approved in PUD

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: OL

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR	Total Floor Area	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	9.95	0.75	325,066	3307	482	443

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
--			+121,066	+997	+150	+135

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone 9.95 acres from Commercial Limited (CL) to Office Limited (OL). The OL district is intended for moderate intensity office uses which are compatible with the surrounding land uses and supported by the Commercial Mixed Concentration land use policy.

Approved, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-170

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008Z-065G-14 is **APPROVED. (10-0)**

The proposed OL district is consistent with the Donelson/Hermitage Community Plan’s Commercial Mixed Concentration policy which supports office uses.”

- 90-85-P-14**
Hermitage Exit Property (PUD Cancellation)
Map: 097-00 Parcel: 084
Subarea 14
Council District 12 – Jim Gotto

A request to cancel the Hermitage Exit Property Planned Unit Development District Overlay on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 600 feet south of I-40, approved for 204,000 square feet of office/retail uses (9.95 acres), zoned CL and proposed for OL, requested by Gresham Smith & Associates, applicant, JJIM LLC and Thomas Corcoran Trust, owners. (See also Zone Change Proposal No. 2008Z-065G-14).

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - Cancel PUD

A request to cancel the Hermitage Exit Property Planned Unit Development District Overlay on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 600 feet south of I-40, approved for 204,000 square feet of office/retail uses (9.95 acres), zoned Commercial Limited (CL) and proposed for Office Limited (OL).

Existing Zoning

CL District - Commercial Limited is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, and office uses.

Commercial PUD A commercial PUD overlay comprised of 9.95 acres was applied to this site in 1985. The PUD was approved for 204,000 square feet of office and retail uses. The site was planned for four structures; two office buildings consisting of 60,000 square feet each, a small retail building comprised of 14,000 square feet, and a 70,000 square foot retail building.

DONELSON HERMITAGE COMMUNITY PLAN

Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) CMC policy is intended to include Medium High to High density residential, all types of retail trade (except regional shopping malls), highway-oriented commercial services, offices, and research activities and other appropriate uses with these locational characteristics.

Consistent with policy? Yes. Removal of the commercial PUD overlay on this site would revert to the base zoning district of Commercial Limited (CL). However, the associated zone change request to Office Limited (OL) would also be consistent with the development intent of Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) policy.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION A TIS may be required at development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the request to cancel the commercial PUD overlay on 9.95 acres.

Approved, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-171

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 90-85-P-14 is **APPROVED. (10-0)**

Cancellation of the commercial PUD overlay on this site would revert to the base zoning CL district. However, the associated zone change request to OL district is also be consistent with the development intent of Commercial Mixed Concentration policy.”

XI. PUBLIC HEARING: FINAL PLATS

- 6. 2008S-125U-10**
Michalena Subdivision
Map: 104-16 Parcel: 272
Subarea 10
Council District 18 – Keith Durbin

A request for final plat approval to create 2 lots and a variance from the lot comparability requirement of the Subdivision Regulations on property located at 1705 Beechwood Avenue, approximately 300 feet west of Oakland Avenue (0.4 acres), zoned RS7.5 and located within the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Overlay, requested by Jeffrey and Michelle Rencher, owners, Advantage Land Surveying, surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: Defer. If applicant does not agree to defer then staff recommends disapproval.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Final Plat 2008S-125U-10 to August 28, 2008, at the request of the applicant. (10-0)

- 7. 2008S-131G-06**

Security Central Storage Final Plat
Map: 142-00 Parcels: 280, 371
Subarea 6
Council District 35 – Bo Mitchell

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into 2 lots on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 760 feet south of Highway 70 S (16.94 acres), zoned CS, requested by Craig and Doris Allen, owners, Dale & Associates, surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - A request for final plat approval to subdivide Final Plat one lot into two lots on property located at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 760 feet south of Highway 70 S (16.94 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 The final plat creates two lots from one existing lot by changing an existing 1.44 acre parcel into a new lot. Currently, the site is undeveloped and contains slopes over 20 percent. Due to the severe slopes, the lot has been identified as a critical lot. At the time of development, a critical lot plan will be required to minimize grading required to prepare the site for construction and to help preserve the natural features of the lot.

Access Section 3-4.2 (b) of the Metro Subdivision Regulations requires public street frontage for all lots, however lots located in commercial zoning districts may be excepted where a joint access driveway provides better access management. This lot has no public street front, but is accessible by an ingress/egress easement that connects to Old Hickory Boulevard to the west.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No exception taken

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the final plat to create two lots.

Approved, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-172

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008S-131G-06 is **APPROVED. (10-0)**”

XII. PUBLIC HEARING: REVISIONS AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

8. 2006IN-001U-10

David Lipscomb University I.O. (Green Hills Dr. Campus Entrance)
Map: 131-04 Parcel: Part of 002
Subarea 10
Council District 25 – Sean McGuire

A request revise a portion of the preliminary master plan and for final site plan approval for a portion of the David Lipscomb University Institutional Overlay district of property located at 4108 Belmont Boulevard, at the northeast corner of Belmont Boulevard and Shackelford Road (19.49 acres), zoned R10, to retain the current campus entry drive opposite Green Hills Drive, requested by Tuck-Hinton Architects, applicant, for David Lipscomb University, owner.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST - Final Site Plan

A request to revise a portion of the preliminary master plan and for final site plan approval for the David Lipscomb University Institutional Overlay district for a portion of property located at 4108 Belmont Boulevard, at the northeast corner of Belmont Boulevard and Shackelford Road (19.49 acres), zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R10), to retain the current campus entry drive opposite Green Hills Drive, where the approved plan called for an offset.

PLAN DETAILS There is an existing driveway into the campus from Belmont Boulevard, which is aligned with Green Hills Drive. When the Institutional Overlay was adopted by Metro Council on December 16, 2003, the plan included a requirement to shift this driveway several hundred feet to the north. This requirement was included to satisfy neighborhood concerns that Green Hills Drive would be used as a cut-through. The University has met with the neighborhood and is now applying to leave the driveway in the current location, aligned with Green Hills Drive.

The application proposes to design the driveway to provide one entering and two exiting lanes- one for right turns only and one for left turns only. The signage will indicate that the options for a driver exiting the University are to turn right or to turn left, but not to continue onto Green Hills Drive. The application also includes a traffic study that states that the driveway should remain in the current location in order to “optimize internal circulation and minimize impacts to traffic flow along Belmont Boulevard.” Typically, driveways are aligned with other driveways or roads in order to lessen the conflicts between turning movements.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No exception taken for locating the driveway opposite Green Hills Dr.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the revision to the master plan and final site plan to permit the driveway to align with Green Hills Drive.

Approved, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-173

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006IN-001U-10 is **APPROVED. (10-0)**”

- 9. **89P-022U-10**
Melrose Pud (Gale Park, Revision Lot 3)
Map: 118-06 Parcel: 160
Subarea 10
Council District 17 – Sandra Moore

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Melrose Planned Unit Development located at 2625 Gale Lane, at the northwest corner of Gale Lane and Franklin Pike (1.54 acres), to permit 7,505 square feet of retail, restaurant and financial service uses where 3,050 square feet of restaurant uses were previously approved, zoned CS and SCC, requested by Nicky Wells, applicant, for Check Holdings, LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions

APPLICANT REQUEST - Revise PUD

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Melrose Planned Unit Development located at 2625 Gale Lane, at the northwest corner of Gale Lane and Franklin Pike (1.54 acres), to permit 7,505 square feet of retail, restaurant and financial service uses where 3,050 square feet of restaurant uses were previously approved, zoned Commercial Service (CS) and Shopping Center Community (SCC).

PLAN DETAILS The site plan proposes two buildings on 1.54 acres within a Commercial Planned Unit Development. Each building is planned to accommodate retail, food service and financial institution type uses. Building A is comprised of 3,655 square feet and Building B contains 3,850 square feet. The site is split between the two zoning districts. Building A must comply with the bulk regulations for Shopping Center Community zoning and Building B will be regulated by the Commercial Service district. In addition, a portion of the site is located within

the satellite city of Berry Hill.

Access/Parking The site is accessible by a right-in only driveway that intersects Gale Lane and from a full-access driveway that traverses the Kroger portion of the shopping center. Pedestrian pathways are located around the perimeter of each building providing connections to the sidewalk located within the right of way of Gale Lane.

Landscaping The plan proposes landscaping around the perimeter of the site and interior to the parking lot. The landscaping plan includes a total of 21 trees which complies with the requirements for protected and replacement trees in Section 17.24.100 of the Metro Zoning Ordinance.

Preliminary Plan The preliminary PUD was originally approved in 1993, for a total of 150,077 square feet. The plan consisted of 140,227 square feet of retail uses and 9,850 square feet of fast food/office uses. The plan was amended by the Metro Council in 2007, to include a residential portion next to the Kroger site. This amendment reduced the amount of approved commercial square footage in the PUD. Currently, a total of 102,077 square feet is approved for commercial development in the PUD.

Section 17.40.120.G.2.h of the Metro Code stipulates that the total floor area of a commercial or industrial classification of a PUD shall not be increased more than ten percent beyond the total floor area last approved by the council. The request to allow 4,455 more square feet of restaurant and retail uses increases the overall square footage of the PUD by less than ten percent.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. 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.
2. For the proposed curb cut to Gale Lane, construct a full access driveway connection or construct a right-in only as shown on the approved PUD.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions of the revision to the preliminary plan and for final approval of a portion of the Melrose Planned Unit Development.

CONDITIONS

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, architectural elevations illustrating that the front façade of each building designed with windows and a main entrance to address Gale Lane shall be reviewed for approval by Planning Department.
2. This approval does not include any signs. Signs in planned unit developments must be approved by the Metro Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metro Council directs the Metro Planning Commission to review such signs.
3. The requirements of the Metro 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. If the PUD final site plan or final plat indicates that there is less acreage than what is shown on the approved preliminary plan, the final site plan shall be appropriately adjusted to show the actual total acreage, which may require that the total number of dwelling units or total floor area be reduced.
5. Prior to any additional development applications for this property, and in no event later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a corrected copy of the preliminary PUD plan. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the preliminary PUD within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission.

Approved with conditions, (10-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2008-174

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 89P-022U-10 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (10-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, architectural elevations illustrating that the front façade of each building designed with windows and a main entrance to address Gale Lane shall be reviewed for approval by Planning Department.
2. This approval does not include any signs. Signs in planned unit developments must be approved by the Metro Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metro Council directs the Metro Planning Commission to review such signs.
3. The requirements of the Metro 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. If the PUD final site plan or final plat indicates that there is less acreage than what is shown on the approved preliminary plan, the final site plan shall be appropriately adjusted to show the actual total acreage, which may require that the total number of dwelling units or total floor area be reduced.
5. Prior to any additional development applications for this property, and in no event later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission, the applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a corrected copy of the preliminary PUD plan. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the preliminary PUD within 120 days will void the Commission’s approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission.”

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLean suggested a meeting notification policy to staff. He suggested that whenever staff engages the community and their involvement, that a list of all those who have been notified be provided to the Commission for their review, to insure that proper notification was made to all interested parties. He suggested that the list include the names of those contacted, names of principals of groups that were contacted and any comments they had regarding the proposal.

Mr. Bernhardt acknowledged the request being made of the staff.

Ms. Cummings spoke in favor of the suggested policy.

Mr. Bernhardt explained the current policy being used by the staff in relation to meeting notifications.

Mr. Clifton moved and Ms. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to request that staff develop a process to provide to the Commission with a list of all who were sent notification of the Community Plan Updates and the Commission may determine that additional citizens or organizations be added to the list. **(10-0)**

Resolution No. RS2008-175

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **The Commission requested that Staff develop a process to provide to the Commission with a list of all who are sent notification of the Community Plan Updates, “and any policy changes, including, but not limited to, Subarea Plans, Subdivision Regulations, Community Character Manuals, and any additional documents that require public input,” as and the Commission may determine that additional citizens or organizations be added to the list. (10-0)**”

Amended at 8/28/08 MPC meeting

Ms. Cummings explained that she, Mr. Gee and Ms. LeQuire met to discuss and review the Commission's mission statement. She read the old mission statement into the record and then proposed the new statement as being recommended by their committee:

The Mission of the Planning Commission is to guide the future growth and development for Nashville and Davidson County to evolve into a more socially, economically and environmentally sustainable community with a commitment to preservation of important assets, efficient use of public infrastructure, distinctive and diverse neighborhood character, free and open civic life, and choices in housing and transportation.

She further requested that this mission statement appear on all public documents such as the Community Character Manual.

Mr. Bernhardt acknowledged the mission statement as suggested by the Commission and noted that their statement be separate from the department's statement as it reflects the leadership of the Commission. He suggested that the statement be included on any future documents, reports, agendas, etc. that would be adopted by the Commission.

Ms. LeQuire suggested that the mission statement be on the first page of the Commission's website as well.

There was a brief discussion regarding the first sentence of the statement and it was suggested that it be amended to read:

Mission Statement: The Planning Commission is to guide the future growth and development for Nashville and Davidson County to evolve into a more socially, economically and environmentally sustainable community with a commitment to preservation of important assets, efficient use of public infrastructure, distinctive and diverse neighborhood character, free and open civic life, and choices in housing and transportation.

Ms. Jones expressed a concern with the mission statement and the charge of the Commission as outlined in the statement.

Mr. Bernhardt offered additional information on the statement as outlined in the Charter.

Ms. Cummings moved and Ms LeQuire seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to adopt the Commission's mission statement to serve as their guiding principle for decision making. **(10-0)**

Resolution No. RS2008-176

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission **APPROVED** the revised mission statement and include it on new Planning Department publications and on The Planning Commission agenda. **(10-0)**”

10. Executive Director Reports

11. Legislative Update

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Mission Statement: The Planning Commission is to guide the future growth and development for Nashville and Davidson County to evolve into a more socially, economically and environmentally sustainable community with a commitment to preservation of important assets, efficient use of public infrastructure, distinctive and diverse neighborhood character, free and open civic life, and choices in housing and transportation.



The Planning Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, race, sex, color, national origin, religion or disability in access to, or operation of, its programs, services, and activities, or in its hiring or employment practices. For ADA inquiries, contact Josie Bass, ADA Compliance Coordinator, at 862-7150 or e-mail her at josie.bass@nashville.gov. For Title VI inquiries contact Shirley Sims-Saldana or Denise Hopgood of Human Relations at 880-3370. For all employment-related inquiries call 862-6640.