



**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**

May 28, 2009

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
Doug Sloan, Legal Counsel
Bob Leeman, Planning Mgr. II
Trish Brooks, Admin. Svcs Officer 3
Craig Owensby, Public Information Officer
Brenda Bernards, Planner III
Brian Sexton, Planner I
Jason Swaggart, Planner II
Anita McCaig, Planner III
Jennifer Carlat, Planning Mgr. II
Carrie Logan, Planner II
Steve Mishu, Metro Water
Jonathon Honeycutt, Public Works

Mission Statement: The Planning Commission guides growth and development as Nashville and Davidson County 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.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Hammond announced that Item #9, "Resolution authorizing the expenditure of up to \$17,500 from the Advance Planning and Research Fund to undertake the scanning of files to implement the provisions of the General Plan in relation to Specific Plan rezoning" was added to the agenda. She explained that the original Item #9, "A request to accept a letter of credit for \$61,000 for Quiet Creek, Phase 2, when the estimates provided by the relevant Metro Departments totals \$244,000, was administratively approved, and removed from the agenda.

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

III. APPROVAL OF MAY 14, 2009 AND MAY 20, 2009, MINUTES

Ms. Jones moved and Dr. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve the May 14, 2009 and May 20, 2009 minutes as presented. **(8-0)**

IV. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Hunt briefly spoke on the myriad of comments he has heard regarding the May Town Center. He then commented on the lack of economic development in the northwest quadrant of the City and how the May Town Center could produce quality, sustainable growth for the area. He stated he was in support of the requested zone change.

Councilmember Jameson first explained that he was asked by Councilmember Barry and Councilmember Cole to include their names as part of the record as expressing their opposition to the proposed May Town Center. They were unable to attend the meeting. Councilmember Jameson then spoke on the growing vacancy rate downtown as reported by Grubb & Ellis and expressed his concerns on these reports with respect to the proposed May Town Center. He expressed concerns with the environmental issues associated with building the May Town Center in accordance to Mayor Dean's goals in making the City of Nashville, one of the greenest cities in the southeast. He briefly explained the findings and recommendations of the Mayor's Green Ribbon Committee to the Commission. As he closed, he spoke on the importance of placing focus on the urban core of the city in order to sustain new urbanism growth for Nashville and how the May Town Center would distract from supporting the necessary growth needed downtown. He also spoke on the mantra of environmentalism which is to reduce, reuse and recycle and how this mentality should be used for cities as well. He asked that the Commission disapprove the requested zone change.

Councilmember Evans acknowledged Councilmember's Hunt concern on the lack of infrastructure and growth in the northwest portion of the county. However, she then spoke on the Reston, VA project, as it was being used for comparison purposes for the May Town Center, and explained each of the components that were needed in order to make Reston a viable project. Components such as its location to a transportation network, the demographics of the community, its location in an excellent public education system, and its close proximity to an international airport. She further offered that these components as mentioned by Councilmember Hunt were not present and could not sustain a similar project and the May Town Center would fail. Councilmember Evans expressed her concerns with regard to the affect that the May Town Center development would have on several other Council districts such as Districts 22, 23, 24 and 25 and spoke of constituent concerns that would be affected by its development. She mentioned the need to consider the West Nashville Community Plan update prior to any consideration on the May Town Center. She asked that the Commission disapprove the requested zone change.

Councilmember Holleman acknowledged Councilmember Matthews support for the May Town Center, however, expressed his concerns with respect to the May Town Center development affecting the entire region as opposed to only Council District 1. His district is in the pathway of connecting this development to the rest of the city and he expressed his concerns regarding its impact on District 24. He explained the work that he and his constituents have completed on the West Nashville Community Plan update and spoke of how the May Town Center would impact their transportation network and infrastructure. He also explained that he and his constituents have not had the chance to review the Traffic Impact Study recently released from RPM and would like for the Commission to allow them an opportunity to review the study and provide their comments regarding the study at the next Public Hearing scheduled for June 25, 2009. Councilmember Holleman then pointed out some of the highlights included the Traffic Impact Study and how they would directly affect his district. He requested that the Commission deny the zone change request until he and his community can further digest any impacts on their district.

Councilmember Craddock expressed his support for the May Town Center development as the project is a good quality development; and that the proposal would lessen the burden on the Nashville's taxpayers. He spoke on the issue of spiraling property taxes and the need to seek good quality development to further enhance the City of Nashville. Councilmember Craddock then acknowledged the importance of not allowing a development of this size to adversely affect surrounding districts and to need to find the best way to implement the project for the betterment of all living in Nashville.

Councilmember Baker explained that the May Town Center would be a win/win situation for the City of Nashville. He spoke on how the project would generate its own tax base to support the infrastructure for a project of its size. He spoke on the importance of the May family upholding their promises included in the development and requested that the Commission approve the zone change request.

Councilmember Matthews spoke on the importance of recognizing the various elements that make the City of Nashville a great city that it is. He then spoke of all the comments on both sides of the issue and the importance of maintaining the open line of communication exhibited by both parties. He explained the history of the proposal and his original request for deferment. He then stated that over the year, he has obtained the necessary information in which he could now support the

proposed May Town Center development and explained all of the positive attributes that could be derived from the development. Attributes such as increased jobs for the area, and additional opportunities for corporate relocations to the City of Nashville. Councilmember Matthews then spoke on the negative comments from the opposition and offered his rebuttal to each of the issues mentioned in those comments. He spoke on how the project will provide a catalytic affect on the City's economic growth; how the project will sustain smart growth for the region, and how the project is the best proposal for land conservation for this area of town. He stated he would assist the bill as it makes it way through the approval process at Council. Councilmember Matthews then spoke of the partnership between Tennessee State University and the May Town Center developers and the positive elements that will be derived through this partnership. He spoke of the speculations mentioned of the partnership; however, named various reasons in which TSU was the best partner to become an element of the May Town Center development. Councilmember Matthews reiterated that supporting the project would allow large companies the opportunity to relocate to Nashville outside of the downtown core. He then spoke on how the project will provide open green spaces and the importance of becoming the greenest city in the southeast. He stated that the May Town Center upholds the goals of the city while providing the necessary economic component for the city. As Councilmember Matthews closed, he explained all of the conversations he has with all involved parties and expressed his support for the May Town Center. He stated that his support does not come without conditions, and that the developer needs to be extremely sensitive to all communities affected by the development and that their continued collaboration is needed to find a place of balance and common ground for all of Nashville.

Councilmember Gotto explained that he was asked to read a statement from Councilmember Forkum on his position of the proposed May Town Center. He explained that the position of Councilmember Forkum was not his; but was that of Councilmember Forkum only. The information read explained that Councilmember Forkum was not in favor of approving the proposed SP for the May Town Center.

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

1. 2009Z-015PR-001

Map: 155-00 Parcel: 122
Bellevue Community Plan
Council District 35 – Bo Mitchell
Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to amend a previously approved Council Bill (BL2005-543) to modify a condition restricting access to Moss Road for property located at 5109 Moss Road, approximately 775 feet south of Collins Road (6.03 acres), zoned RM9, requested by Councilmember Bo Mitchell, applicant, Betty French and Mary and James Johnson, owners.

Staff Recommendation: Defer to August 27, 2009, meeting.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED Zone Change 2009Z-015PR-001 to August 27, 2009, at the request of the applicant. (8-0)

5. 2008CP-007G-03

Scottsboro-Bells Bend DNDP (ADA)
Bordeaux/Whites Creek Community Plan
Council District 1 – Lonnell R. Matthews, Jr.
Staff Reviewer: Anita McCaig

A request to amend the *Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan* to include detailed policies for an area referred to as the Alternate Development Area that permits development of a mixed use town center and corporate campuses, while permanently preserving significant open space and the rural character of the remainder of Scottsboro/Bells Bend.

Staff Recommendation: Defer to June 25, 2009, meeting.

Mr. Gee questioned whether the Alternative Development Area was to be heard at the next meeting.

Mr. Bernhardt explained that the public hearing on the Alternative Development Area (ADA) was closed by the Commission at their last meeting.

Mr. Clifton then questioned if the Alternative Development Area was the same as the one originally heard, or were there amendments made to the plan.

Mr. Bernhardt explained that the ADA did include modifications since the original Alternative Development Area was presented to the Commission.

Mr. Clifton then questioned whether a separate public hearing on the ADA was necessary for the proposed SP zoning.

Mr. Bernhardt explained it was the Commission's choice on whether they wanted to hear both the plan amendment as well as the zone change request.

Ms. LeQuire then questioned whether the amendments were of a substantial nature.

Mr. Gee suggested that the Commission hear the revisions included in the Alternative Development Area at their meeting due to the fact that the public was present and could also hear the amendments.

Mr. Gotto clarified that the amendments to the plan were only those included in the SP zone change request submitted by the developer.

There was discussion brief discussion regarding the plan amendment and the requested zone change.

Mr. Gotto moved and Mr. Ponder seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to remove Item #5, 2008CP-007G-03, Scottsboro-Bells Bend DNDP (ADA) from the Deferred and Withdrawn Items agenda and to hear this item at the appropriate time of the present meeting. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2009-68

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008CP-007G-03 is DEFERRED to the JUNE 25, 2009, meeting. (8-0)”

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
ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------|--|----------|
| 2. | 2009Z-023PR-001 | A request to amend the Arts Center and Capital Mall Redevelopment District Plans for various properties located east of 8th Avenue South, located within the Gateway Boulevard Urban Design Overlay, to transfer various properties from the Arts Center Redevelopment Plan to the Capital Mall Redevelopment Plan, establish certain development standards for the old convention center site and the new convention center site, establish an effective time period, and provide a means for funding and acquiring property for the new convention center. | -Approve |
|----|-----------------|--|----------|

CONCEPT PLANS

- | | | |
|----|---------------|--|
| 3. | 2006S-096U-05 | A request to extend preliminary approval to April 11, 2010, for Solon Court Subdivision, approved for 12 single-family residential lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations. |
|----|---------------|--|

- Approve with conditions and including a variance for the plat extension

4. 2006S-148G-14 A second request to extend the preliminary approval to June 16, 2010, for Hermitage Creek Subdivision, approved for 11 single-family cluster lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

-Approve with conditions and including a variance for the plat extension

OTHER BUSINESS

7. An employee contract renewal for Jason Swaggart. -Approve
8. A Resolution to establish a new fee schedule for the processing and review of Specific Plans. (Proposal No. 2009Z-007TX-001) -Approve
10. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of up to \$17,500 from the Advance Planning and Research Fund to undertake the scanning of files to implement the provisions of the General Plan in relation to Specific Plan rezoning. -Approve
12. Readoption of the Rules and Procedures of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. -Approve

Mr. Clifton requested that staff make a brief presentation on Item #2, which was the request to amend the Arts Center and Capital Mall Redevelopment District Plans for various properties located east of 8th Avenue South, located within the Gateway Boulevard Urban Design Overlay, to transfer various properties from the Arts Center Redevelopment Plan to the Capital Mall Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Joe Cain, Metropolitan Development Housing Authority, explained that the request would assist with placing the proposed new convention center in only one redevelopment district; as it is currently located in two redevelopment districts. The request would amend the boundary line for the Capital Mall Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Clifton then questioned whether the requested amendment addressed any design issues of the Convention Center.

Mr. Cain explained that the request did not address any design aspects of the center, but only the broader concepts on land use for the proposed convention center.

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

VII. PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

2. **2009Z-023PR-001**
 MDHA Redevelopment Plans Amendments
 Map: 093-10
 Parcels: 065, 066,067, 070 – 077, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 087, 088, 090, 091
 Map: 093-10
 Parcels:092, 093, 094, 095, 096, 097, 099, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 469
 Downtown Community Plan
 Council District 19 – Erica S. Gilmore
 Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to amend the Arts Center and Capital Mall Redevelopment District Plans for various properties located east of 8th Avenue South, zoned CF, CC and SP and located within the Gateway Boulevard Urban Design Overlay (6.51 acres), to transfer various properties from the Arts Center Redevelopment Plan to the Capital Mall Redevelopment Plan, establish certain development standards for the old convention center site and the new convention center site, establish an effective time period, and provide a means for funding and acquiring property for the new convention center, requested by M.D.H.A., applicant, for various owners.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

APPLICANT REQUEST A request to amend the Arts Center and Capital Mall Redevelopment District Plans for various properties located east of 8th Avenue South, zoned Core Frame (CF), Commercial Core (CC), and Specific Plan (SP) and located within the Gateway Boulevard Urban Design Overlay (213.94 acres), to transfer various properties from the Arts Center Redevelopment Plan to the Capital Mall Redevelopment Plan, establish certain development standards for the old convention center site and the new convention center site, establish an effective time period, provide a means for funding and acquiring property for the new convention center, and adopt the master site plan for the new convention center.

Existing District

CF District Core Frame is intended for a wide range of parking and commercial service support uses for the central business District.

CC District Commercial Core is intended for high intensity office, retail, restaurant, amusement, and multi-family uses.

SP-MU District Specific Plan-Mixed Use 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 residential uses in addition to office and/or commercial uses.

REDEVELOPMENT DISTRICT Nashville's redevelopment districts are established to ensure the use and long-term viability of the urban areas that they encompass. The districts aim to strategically reverse disinvestment and blight and promote redevelopment that is sustainable from the perspective of economics, environment, aesthetics, public safety and historic preservation. Although specific goals differ across districts, all include strategies for achieving vibrant mixes of land use, income levels and modes of transportation.

DOWNTOWN NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN

Detailed Neighborhood Design Plans

The Arts Center and Capitol Mall Redevelopment Plans overlap several *Detailed Neighborhood Design Plans* (DNDPs) within the Downtown Community as well as existing and proposed DNDPs in the Green Hills/Midtown Community. While the Redevelopment Plans are regulatory in nature, the DNDPs are policy documents that provide guidance - on a block-by-block basis - on future development and preservation within a defined neighborhood.

When the Downtown Community Plan was last updated in 2007, the Downtown Plan delineated seventeen neighborhoods in Downtown - each with its own character and its own role to serve in supporting a healthy, growing Downtown. The Arts Center and Capitol Mall Redevelopment Plans overlap seven Downtown neighborhoods. Each neighborhood is listed below with a very brief description of the vision for its future growth and preservation. For more information on the intent of each DNDP, see the *Downtown Community Plan: 2007 Update* at <http://www.nashville.gov/mpc/subarea/subarea9.htm>

Core Future growth in the Core is envisioned to contribute to the economic vitality of the city and region, primarily through the development of office buildings with other uses to support the office such as residential, hotel, entertainment and retail, all of which should be developed in a manner that creates a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. This neighborhood is the area of greatest development intensity in Downtown where the tallest buildings are found.

Public Square Future growth in the Public Square neighborhood should complement the existing civic buildings and open space such as the Metro Courthouse, the Justice A.A. Birch Courthouse and Public Square, providing a mixture of uses to support the existing civic uses, in a manner that creates a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Building heights are mid-rise and should not exceed the elevation of the State Capitol to preserve views of the Capitol.

Second and Broadway Future development in the Second and Broadway neighborhood should be designed to preserve and enhance Second Avenue and Lower Broadway as corridors that shape the historical and cultural identity of Nashville. The adaptive reuse of historic buildings is encouraged and new development should respect the historic buildings and the overall character, height and massing of the corridor.

Upper Broadway Future development in the Upper Broadway neighborhood should be designed to preserve and enhance the numerous historic structures along Upper Broadway, accommodating a mix of uses and recognizing Upper Broadway's role in transitioning from the mid-rise character of the adjacent Midtown neighborhood to the historic, low-rise character of Lower Broadway.

SoBro Future growth in the SoBro neighborhood is envisioned to be a complement to, and an extension of, the Downtown Core. SoBro is intended to be a high-intensity, mixed use neighborhood emphasizing cultural, entertainment and residential uses while accommodating some office uses. To enliven the numerous entertainment venues in the neighborhood, all development should create a comfortable and lively pedestrian environment.

Gulch The Gulch is less dense than the Core or SoBro and is intended to accommodate a mix of uses in chiefly mid-rise buildings, with an emphasis on residential, entertainment and retail uses in a combination of new buildings and adaptively reused existing and/or historic structures. Given the Gulch's unique street pattern and topography, there are specific locations that are appropriate for development that is distinctive with regard to height or architectural features.

Lafayette The Lafayette neighborhood is envisioned to redevelop as a vibrant, mixed use neighborhood of primarily low- to mid-rise buildings with taller buildings flanking the primary corridors - Lafayette Street and 8th Avenue South. It is envisioned that the Lafayette neighborhood could provide significant housing for Downtown.

The Arts Center and Capitol Mall Redevelopment Plans also overlap one existing DNDP and three planned, but not yet created, DNDPs in the Green Hills-Midtown Community. Each neighborhood is listed below with a very brief description of the vision for its future growth and preservation. For more information on the intent of each DNDP, see the *Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update* at <http://www.nashville.gov/mpc/subarea/subarea10.htm>

Edgehill The Edgehill DNDP was adopted in 2005. It calls for the preservation of the mixed income neighborhood including preservation of existing housing, with new housing in mixed use centers or as a transition to higher intensity development. The plan calls for preservation of the existing pedestrian-friendly environment, additional mixed use development on a neighborhood scale and additional open spaces for passive and active use by the neighborhood.

Green Hills/Midtown (Future) The *Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update* calls for the creation of DNDPs for three "neighborhoods" in Midtown - areas Church Street, Music Row and Broadway. Because these DNDPs have not yet been created, the guidance of the land use policies in place – Neighborhood Urban and Office Concentration policies – is controlling. See descriptions of these policies below.

Land Use Policies and Detailed Land Use Policies

The following is a list of the *Detailed Land Use Policy* (the first policy listed and the one that is applied during the Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan [DNDP] process) and the *Land Use Policy* (the second policy listed, and the one that is applied during the Community Plan Update). Recall that in all Community Plan Updates, each piece of land is assigned a Land Use Policy to guide decisions on its future growth, development and preservation. When additional, neighborhood-scale planning is required, the Detailed Land Use Policy is applied. The entire Downtown Community underwent Detailed Neighborhood Design Planning when the Downtown Community Plan was updated in 2007. Therefore all properties – including those within the Arts Center and Capitol Mall Redevelopment Plans – have Detailed Land Use Policies.

Policies

Civic or Public Benefit in Downtown Core (CPB in DC) This policy includes various public facilities including schools, libraries and public services uses within the Downtown Core neighborhood. See description of the vision for the Core neighborhood above.

Amusement and Entertainment in Downtown Core (AE in DC) This policy includes amusement and entertainment uses such as performance venues, arenas, stadiums and the like, within the Downtown Core neighborhood. See description of the vision for the Core neighborhood above.

Transportation in Downtown Core (T in DC) – This policy is used to distinguish a variety of transportation uses including railroad yards, land ports, bus terminals, etc, within the Downtown Core neighborhood. See description of the vision for the Core neighborhood above.

Mixed Use in Downtown Core (MxU in DC) This policy includes buildings that have a mix of uses within the block and/or within the building, allowing residential, commercial and office uses. A mixture of uses within one building is preferable to create a pedestrian-oriented streetscape with ground-floor commercial or office and upper floor office or residential. Mixed Use is found within the Land Use Policy of "Downtown Core". See description of the vision for the Core neighborhood above.

Mixed Use in Second and Broadway (MxU in SB) This policy includes buildings that have a mix of uses within the block and/or within the building, allowing residential, commercial and office uses. A mixture of uses within one building is preferable to create a pedestrian-oriented streetscape with ground-floor commercial or office and upper floor office or residential. Mixed Use is found within the Land Use Policy of “Second and Broadway”. See description of the vision for the Second and Broadway neighborhood above.

Amusement and Entertainment in Second and Broadway (AE in SB) This policy includes amusement and entertainment uses such as performance venues, arenas, stadiums and the like, within the Second and Broadway neighborhood. See description of the vision for the Second and Broadway neighborhood above.

Parks, Reserves and Other Open Space in Open Space (PR in OS) This policy is used to distinguish existing open spaces intended for active and passive recreation and the buildings – including community centers – that support them.

Parks, Reserves and Other Open Space in Potential Open Space (PR in POS) This policy is also used to distinguish open spaces intended for active and passive recreation, however, it is used in the *Potential Open Space* Land Use Policy, suggesting that the land has not been secured for open space, but open space is recommended in the future.

Mixed Use in Downtown Neighborhood (MxU in DN) This policy includes buildings that have a mix of uses within the block and/or within the building, allowing residential, commercial and office uses. A mixture of uses within one building is preferable to create a pedestrian-oriented streetscape with ground-floor commercial or office and upper floor office or residential. Mixed Use is found within the Land Use Policy of “Downtown Neighborhood”. Downtown Neighborhood policy is applied in Downtown outside of the Core and SoBro to a variety of neighborhoods such as the Gulch and Lafayette that are envisioned to redevelop with some mixed use, but a heavy emphasis on residential.

Mixed Use in Neighborhood Urban (MxU in NU) This policy includes buildings that have a mix of uses within the block and/or within the building, allowing residential, commercial and office uses. A mixture of uses within one building is preferable to create a pedestrian-oriented streetscape with ground-floor commercial or office and upper floor office or residential. The description of the Land Use Policy, Neighborhood Urban, is below.

Neighborhood Urban (NU) – NU is for fairly intense, expansive areas that are intended to contain a significant amount of residential development, but are planned to be mixed use in character. Predominant uses in these areas include a variety of housing, public benefit uses, commercial activities and mixed-use development. An Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in these policy areas, to assure appropriate design and that the type of development conforms with the intent of the policy.

Office Concentration (OC) OC policy is intended for existing and future large concentrations of office development. It is expected that certain types of commercial uses that cater to office workers, such as restaurants, will also locate in these areas. Residential uses of at least nine to twenty dwelling units per acre (RMH density) are also an appropriate secondary use.

AMENDMENT DETAILS In 2008 the Metro Council authorized the Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency (MDHA) to undertake predevelopment activities for the construction of a new downtown convention center –the Music City Center (Resolution No. 2008-143). The amendment to the Arts Center Plan and the Capitol Mall Plan is designed to assist in the predevelopment activities of the Music City Center as previously authorized by Metro Council. It will be the third amendment to the Arts Center Plan and the eighth amendment to the Capitol Mall Plan. The amendment is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Ensure that the Music City Center will be completely within one redevelopment district.
2. Provide basic guidelines and objectives for the redevelopment of the old convention center site.
3. Provide basic guidelines and objectives for the redevelopment of the Music City Center site.
4. Extend the duration of the effective period for the Capitol Mall Plan.
5. Update the Tax Increment in the Capital Mall Plan.
6. Grant MDHA the authority to assemble the land needed for the Music City Center.
7. Adopt the Master Plan.

District Boundary Changes Currently the area for the Music City Center is within both the Arts Center Plan district and the

Capitol Mall Plan district. To better facilitate the development of the convention center, the boundaries between the two districts will be realigned so that the Music City Center will be entirely within the Capital Mall Plan. This will require the property east of 8th Avenue that is within the Arts Center Plan District to be transferred over to the Capitol Mall Plan District.

Old Convention Center Site With the development of the new convention center the old convention center site will be available for redevelopment. The amendment provides basic guidelines for redevelopment of the site. It addresses intent for redevelopment, types of uses, design objectives, and access.

New Convention Center Site The Master Plan for the Music City Center provides basic guidelines for the development of the center on a block by block basis. It addresses intent, types of uses, design objectives, and access.

Effective Period of Plan The amendment extends the duration of the Capitol Mall Plan provisions until 2040, allowing ample time for maturity of bonds and/or bank loans issued to finance TIF backed improvements.

Tax Increment Financing To accommodate the development of the Music City Center and related projects, the amendment increases the tax increment financing provision by \$85 million.

Assembly of Land The amendment authorizes MDHA to assemble the land required for the Music City Center and related projects through negotiation, condemnation or other necessary legal means.

Master Plan This amendment includes the Master Plan (Exhibit 6). The Master Plan does not include individual building design but regulates land use as specified in the Capitol Mall Plan.

Staff Analysis As written, the guidelines are consistent with the goals and objectives found in the Downtown Nashville Community Plan. The amendment provides the necessary changes in the Capital Mall Plan to assist in the development of the Music City Center as authorized by Metro Council. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendment to the Metro Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the Arts Center Plan and the Capitol Mall Plan.

Approved, (8-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2009-65

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2009Z-023PR-001 is **APPROVED. (8-0)**

The proposed amendments to the Arts Center and Capital Mall Redevelopment District Plans are not inconsistent with the various policies in the Downtown Community Plan.”

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING: CONCEPT PLANS

- 3. **2006S-096U-05**
Solon Court (Preliminary Plat Extension)
Map: 083-04 Parcel: 285
Map: 084-01 Parcel: 022
East Nashville Community Plan
Council District 7 – Erik Cole
Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

A request to extend preliminary approval to April 11, 2010, for Solon Court Subdivision, approved for 12 single-family residential lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations, requested by Stewart Building Group LLC, owner, Dale & Associates, surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions and including a variance for the plat extension

APPLICANT REQUEST - Preliminary Plat Extension

A request to extend preliminary approval to April 11, 2010, for the Solon Court subdivision, approved for 12 single-family residential lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Zoning

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

SUBDIVISION DETAILS The preliminary plat for the Solon Court subdivision was approved by the Planning Commission on April 11, 2006. The original request for this site was for a 12 lot subdivision on a temporary dead-end street. The Planning Commission approval included a permanent dead-end street. In order to accommodate the revised street, and to comply with the conditions of approval, the lots were shifted and reduced in number by one.

There were two conditions of approval of the preliminary plat. The first required that the temporary turnaround for the street be located outside of the building envelopes of the adjacent lots and the second required that all Public Works and Stormwater conditions be addressed prior to final plat approval.

With the approval of a permanent cul-de-sac, the first condition was no longer required. The second condition remains as a condition of approval. As the change from temporary to permanent cul-de-sac modified the lot layout of this subdivision, the applicant will need to provide staff paper copies of the preliminary plat with the new layout.

Extension Request The applicant is requesting an extension of the approval to April 11, 2010 to complete the installation of the infrastructure. The construction plans have been approved and installation is approximately 80% completed.

The preliminary plat was approved under the previous Subdivision Regulations. Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations prohibits the extension of a preliminary plat approved under the old Subdivision Regulations adopted March 21, 1991.

- 2. *Subdivisions Submitted or Approved Prior to the Effective Date.* Any subdivision submitted as a complete application or approved in preliminary or final form, but not yet expired, prior to the effective date may, at the discretion of the applicant, continue under the subdivision regulations adopted March 21, 1991, as amended, but no extensions shall be granted for these subdivisions.

Variance Request The applicant has requested a variance to this section of the Subdivision Regulations. Section 1-11 permits the Planning Commission to grant variances if it is found that extraordinary hardships or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with these regulations provided that such variance does not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of these regulations.

The findings are based on a number of criteria. These include conditions unique to the property that are not applicable generally to other property and the particular physical conditions of the property involved. The physical conditions must cause a particular hardship to the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations were carried out.

Construction approval was granted by Water Services in 2006 and by Stormwater and Public works in 2007. Due to the difficult topography of this site, the progress of construction has been slowed but significant work has been completed to date including:

- Grading is 80% complete
- The pond needs fine grading and stabilization and the retaining wall on the low side of the pond's berm is not constructed
- Water and Sewer are in place (including service lines) and have been inspected, but the as-built set of plans have not yet been approved
- Electric is in the ground and has been inspected
- No gas is proposed
- Stormwater infrastructure is in place
- The roadway is at sub-grade and lacks gravel base, sub-base and curbing
- All utilities are in place and have been inspected

In summary, the site still needs final grading and stabilization of the pond, along with the wall construction, and the completion of the gravel base, asphalt and curb/gutter. The developer anticipates the infrastructure will be completed and a final plat submitted within six months.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Extension Approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that approval with conditions of the preliminary plat be extended to April 11, 2010 and that the Planning Commission grant a variance to Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

CONDITIONS

1. All Public Works and Stormwater conditions of the original preliminary plat approval shall be addressed prior to final plat approval.
2. The applicant shall submit a copy of the preliminary plat with the new layout.

Approved with conditions, including a variance for the plat extension (8-0), *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2009-66

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006S-096U-05 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, including a variance for the plat extension. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. All Public Works and Stormwater conditions of the original preliminary plat approval shall be addressed prior to final plat approval.
2. The applicant shall submit a copy of the preliminary plat with the new layout.”

-
4. **2006S-148G-14**
Hermitage Creek
Map: 086-00 Parcel: 249
Donelson/Hermitage/Old Hickory Community Plan
Council District 12 – Jim Gotto
Staff Reviewer: Carrie Logan

A second request to extend the preliminary approval to June 16, 2010, for Hermitage Creek Subdivision, approved for 11 single-family cluster lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations, requested by H. Group LLC, owner, Wamble & Associates, surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions and including a variance for the plat extension

APPLICANT REQUEST - A second request to extend the preliminary Preliminary Plat Extension approval to June 16, 2010, for Hermitage Creek Subdivision, approved for 11 single-family cluster lots, and a request for a variance from Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Zoning

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

SUBDIVISION DETAILS - The original preliminary plat for Hermitage Creek was approved by the Planning Commission on May 25, 2006, under the previous Subdivision Regulations that were adopted March 21, 1991. A request to extend the preliminary plat for one year, along with a variance, was approved by the Planning Commission on June 12, 2008.

Extension Request - The applicant is requesting an extension of the approval to June 16, 2010, to complete the installation of the infrastructure.

The preliminary plat was approved under the previous Subdivision Regulations. Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations prohibits the extension of a preliminary plat approved under the old Subdivision Regulations adopted March 21, 1991.

3. *Subdivisions Submitted or Approved Prior to the Effective Date.* Any subdivision submitted as a complete application or approved in preliminary or final form, but not yet expired, prior to the effective date may, at the discretion of the applicant, continue under the subdivision regulations adopted March 21, 1991, as amended, but no extensions shall be granted for these subdivisions.

The applicant has requested a variance to this section of the Subdivision Regulations. Section 1-11 permits the Planning Commission to grant variances if it is found that extraordinary hardships or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with these regulations provided that such variance does not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of these regulations.

The findings are based on a number of criteria. These include conditions unique to the property that are not applicable generally to other property and the particular physical conditions of the property involved. The physical conditions must cause a particular hardship to the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations were carried out.

The applicant has stated that “All utilities, except the NES power pole, are installed, and have passed by inspectors, water and sewer. The flow tests on the hydrants are to be completed soon. The bridge specified by PW is being designed ... The road is ready for curb/gutter and asphalt, along with a turn lane to be installed on Tulip Grove Rd.”

The applicant expects to submit a final plat, along with the necessary bond, no later than August 2009.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No Exception Taken regarding the extension of the preliminary plat approval. The construction plan approval is greater than two (2) years and has expired. Prior to construction, resubmit the construction plans to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION Conditional. Before a plat for one or two family buildings can be approved, plans must show results from fire hydrant(s) flow test, performed within 6 months with a minimum of 1000 gpm @ 20 psi available at fire hydrants.

- Approved based on no construction being done this application.
- Approved based on no construction being done this application. Any new construction will require additional information.
- This approval is for the concept plans only the developer shall provide the Fire Marshal's office with additional details before the development plans can be approved.

Add to Plat Notes: The Nashville Fire Dept. requires new construction to comply with the 2006 edition of NFPA 1, Table H.

WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION Approve as consistent with previous approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that approval with conditions of the preliminary plat be extended to June 16, 2010 and that the Planning Commission grant a variance to Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Approved with conditions, including a variance for the plat extension (8-0), *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2009-67

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006S-148G-14 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, including a variance for the plat extension. (8-0)**”

Conditions of Approval:

1. Staff recommends that approval with conditions of the preliminary plat be extended to June 16, 2010 and that the Planning Commission grant a variance to Section 1-9.2 of the Subdivision Regulations.”

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

7. An employee contract renewal for Jason Swaggart.

Approved, (8-0) *Consent Agenda*

8. A Resolution to establish a new fee schedule for the processing and review of Specific Plans. (Proposal No. 2009Z-007TX-001)

Approved, (8-0) *Consent Agenda*

9. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of up to \$17,500 from the Advance Planning and Research Fund to undertake the scanning of files to implement the provisions of the General Plan in relation to Specific Plan rezoning.

Approved, (8-0) *Consent Agenda*

Resolution No. RS2009-69

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that authorization of up to \$17,500 from the Advance Planning and Research Fund for the scanning of files to implement the provisions of the General Plan in relation to Specific Plan rezoning is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

10. Election of Officers/Annual Meeting.

Mr. Clifton explained that he, Dr. Cummings, and Mr. Tyler were selected to review the offices of the Commission.

Mr. Clifton stated that as a result of their review, it was being recommended that Mr. Phil Ponder continue to serve as Vice Chairman and Mr. McLean continue to serve as Chairman for the Commission.

Mr. Gotto moved and Ms. Lequire seconded the motion, which passed unanimously to approve the recommendation whereas Jim McLean will serve as Chairman and Mr. Ponder will serve as Vice Chairman. **(8-0)**

Mr. Ponder announced that Tonya Jones will continue as the Commission representative and serve on the Metro Parks Board, and that he, Mr. Phil Ponder will be appointed by the Mayor’s office to serve as the Commission’s representative on the Metro Historical Commission.

11. Readoption of the Rules and Procedures of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Approved, (8-0) *Consent Agenda*

12. Historical Commission Report
13. Board of Parks and Recreation Report
14. Executive Director Reports
15. Legislative Update

Mr. McLean explained that he would be leaving early and that Vice Chairman Ponder would chair the meeting when the Commission returns from recess.

The Commission recessed at 5:15 p.m.

The Commission resumed at 5:32 p.m.

Mr. Tyler arrived at 5:50 p.m.

Mr. McLean left the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

X. PUBLIC HEARING: SPECIFIC PLANS

6. 2008SP-022G-03

May Town Center

Map: 079-00 Parcel: 002

Map: 090-00 Parcels:001, 002, 003, 010, 011, 201, 202

Bordeaux/Whites Creek Community Plan

Council District 1 – Lonnell R. Matthews, Jr.

Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

A request to change from AR2a to SP-MU for properties located at 3886, 3920, 3924, 3992, 4068, 4072, 4194, and 4206 Old Hickory Boulevard and Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 4,700 feet south of Cleecees Ferry Road (1,487.69 acres), to create a new mixed use SP district called "May Town Center" proposed for general office uses, commercial uses, hotels, residential uses, and open space, requested by Civil Site Design Group, applicant, for H.T.P.C. 2 Partnership and Bells Landing Partners, owners.

Staff Recommendation: A staff recommendation for the preliminary SP plan will be provided with the Staff Report for the June 25, 2009, meeting.

Mr. Ponder gave a brief explanation on the procedures that would be followed for the public hearing as the Commission voted on and adopted the procedures at their May 20, 2009, special called meeting. He also explained the procedures that would be followed at the next public hearing on the May Town Center development that will be held on June 25, 2009.

Ms. LeQuire suggested that the Commission reconsider their decision to only hear public comments on the Economic Impact Study of the May Town Center at their June 25, 2009, and to also hear comments on the Traffic Impact Study as well, as suggested by Councilmember Holleman.

Mr. Clifton suggested that the Commission make this decision at the end of the meeting, or possibly deliberate the contents of the June 25, 2009, public hearing at the June 11, 2009, meeting.

Ms. McCaig briefly explained the differences included in the Alternative Development Area in relation to the proposed SP zoning for the May Town Center development.

Ms. Bernards presented the Specific Plan for the May Town Center to the Commission.

At this time, the proponents were alerted that they had up to 20 minutes for their presentation and they could set aside five minutes for their rebuttal.

Mr. Tony Giarratana explained that he would like to hold the five minutes for rebuttal and would only utilize the first 15 minutes. He spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

Dr. Melvin Johnson, Office of the President, TSU, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

Ms. Rebecca Brooks, 2401 Rollett Ct., Wilbur Smith Associates, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

Mr. Joe Collier, 5215 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

Mr. Tony Giarratana explained that the proponent side would give up their 5 minutes for rebuttal to continue their presentation.

Mr. John Hart, 1 Glencoe Manor Court, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

Mr. Giarratana again addressed the Commission and spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center development.

At this time, the opponents were alerted that they had up to 20 minutes for their presentation.

Mr. Sumpter Camp, 5204 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center development.

Mr. David Briley, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center development.

Mr. Sumpter Camp, 5204 Tidwell Hollow Road readdressed the Commission and spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center development.

Ms. Jones left at 6:40 p.m.

At this time, the Public Hearing was open to all those who wanted to address the Commission on Item #6, 2008SP-022G-3, May Town Center.

Mr. Ron Goehring, 4388 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Salleta Holloway, 3025 Anderson Road, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Wesley Barnes, 4118 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Billy Johnson, 4831 Old Hydes Ferry Road, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Noble Jones, 3814 Dakota Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. David Koellein, 1344 Rosa Parks Blvd., spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. John Noel spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Wanda Lovell, 5301 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Mark Lovell, 5301 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Darek Bell, 7900 Hwy 100, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Alan Oakley, 707 42nd Avenue North, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Ted Krommer, 4309 Belmont Park, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Anita Groves, 3187 Lagrange Drive, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

The Commission recessed at 7:03 p.m.

The Commission resumed at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Scott Johannessen, 3200 West End Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Harris Gilbert, 245 Ensworth Place, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Kelvin Prince, 109 Breakwater Bay, spoke in favor of the May Town Center.

Mr. Reginald Williams, 2421 26th Avenue North, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Bob Hatcher, 614 Copperfield Ct., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Kim Shinn, 884 Rodney, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Minda Lazarov, 4443 Pecan Valley Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Mark Thomas, 4477 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Alan Dooley, 6319 Percy Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. David Phillips, 5300 Old Hickory Blvd. spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Keith Loiseau, 5611 Old Hickory Blvd, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Ed Wansing, 102 Eisenhower Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Scott Chambers, 2307 Oxford Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Trish Bolian, 6002 Hickory Valley, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Frederick Kelly, 4023 Ashland City Hwy., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Ellen Jacobson, 703 Lynnbrook Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Betsy Moran, 6215 Robin Hill Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Jane Coble, 5033 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Cynthia Paschal, 6312 Percy Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Matt Walker, 1709 Windover Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Jeff Weems, 308 S. Marthona Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Alicia Batson spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Barry Sulkin, 4443 Pecan Valley Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center and submitted information to the Commission for the record.

Mr. Chris Utley, 411 Emerald Court, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Tom Hardin, 519 Fatherland Street expressed issues with the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Kathleen Wolfe, 5268 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Jeff Ockerman, 205 South 12th Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Alan Powell, 744 Bresslyn Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Eric Wooldridge, 5188 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Edward Schneider, 5047 Seymour Hollow Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Jim Price, 5268 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Carlos Trenary, 627 River Rouge Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Saeed Saeed, 2921 Burtonwood Drive, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Ryan Chapman, 415 Church Street, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Allisandra Bellows, 5001 Indiana Avenue, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Rick Bradley, 5001 Indiana Avenue, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. David Wells, 4767 Eatons Creek Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Rebecca Maddox spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Susan Shannon, 4806 Michigan Avenue, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

The Commission recessed at 8:30 p.m.

The Commission resumed at 8:38 p.m.

Ms. Marge Davis, 45 Burriss Court, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Wade McCurdy, 5906 River Trace, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Cassi Johnson, 309 Gaywood Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Linda Bernado, 4435 Pecan Valley Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Coehee Moore, 3244 Dove Place, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Bill Coble, 5033 Old Hickory Blvd. spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Will Brown, 4121 Clarksville Pike, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Sherry Knot, 5204 Tidwell Hollow Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Ms. Brenda Butka, 5188 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Jeff Zeitlen, 6314 Chickering Woods, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. John Mistler, 3512 Richardson Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. John Summers, 5000 Wyoming, spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center and submitted information to the Commission for the record.

Mr. Joe Ingle, 5711 Old Hickory Blvd., spoke in opposition to the proposed May Town Center and submitted information to the Commission.

Mr. Jack May, applicant, spoke in favor of the proposed May Town Center.

Mr. Clifton suggested that the Commission consider the contents of the next public hearing to be held on June 25, 2009.

Mr. Gotto moved and Ms. LeQuire seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to continue the 2008SP-022G-03, May Town Center public hearing on June 25, 2009, with the condition that the hearing will include comments from the public on both the Economic Impact Study as well as comments on the Transportation Impact study. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2009-70

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the public hearing for 2008SP-022G-03 will be continued at the June 25, 2009, meeting, with the condition that the hearing will include comments from the public on both the Economic Impact Study and Transportation Impact Study. (8-0)”

Mr. Gotto moved and Dr. Cummings seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to defer Item #5, 2008CP-007G-03, Soettsboro-Bells Bend DNDP (ADA) to the June 25, 2009, meeting. **(8-0)**

Resolution No. RS2009-71


“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2008SP-022G-03 is **DEFERRED TO THE JUNE 25, 2009, MEETING. (8-0)**”

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

 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.