



METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Thursday, February 24, 2011

4:00 pm Regular Meeting

700 Second Avenue South

(between Lindsley Avenue and Middleton Street)

Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center (1st Floor)

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.

Commissioners Present:

Jim McLean, Chairman
Hunter Gee, Vice-Chairman
Phil Ponder
Derrick Dalton
Ana Escobar
Andrée LeQuire, representing Mayor Karl Dean
Councilman Jim Gotto
Stewart Clifton

Staff Present:

Rick Bernhardt, Executive Director
Ann Hammond, Assistant Director
Kelly Armistead, Admin Services Officer III
Doug Sloan, Legal
Craig Owensby, Public Information Officer
Dennis Corrieri, Planning Technician I
Bob Leeman, Planning Manager II
Brenda Bernards, Planner III
Jennifer Carlat, Planning Manager II
Michael Briggs, Transportation Planner
Brian Sexton, Planner I
Jason Swaggart, Planner II
Greg Johnson, Planner II
Tifinie Adams, Planner II
Cindy Wood, Planner III
Rebecca Ratz, Planner II
Scott Morton, Planner II
Jennifer Regen, Development Relations Manager
Anita McCaig, Planner III

Commissioners Absent:

Tonya Jones
Judy Cummings

Richard C. Bernhardt, FAICP, CNU-A

Secretary and Executive Director, Metro Planning Commission

Metro Planning Department of Nashville and Davidson County
800 2nd Avenue South P.O. Box 196300 Nashville, TN 37219-6300
p: (615) 862-7190; f: (615) 862-7130

Notice to Public

Please remember to turn off your cell phones.

The Commission is a 10-member body appointed by the Metro Council. The Commission meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month at 4:00 p.m., unless otherwise noted. The Planning Commission makes the final decision on final site plan and subdivision applications. On all other applications, the Commission recommends an action to the Metro Council (e.g. zone changes, specific plans, overlay districts, and mandatory referrals). The Metro Council can accept or not accept the recommendation.

Agendas and staff reports can be viewed on-line at www.nashville.gov/mpc/agendas or weekdays from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Planning Department office located at 800 2nd Avenue South, downtown Nashville. Also, at the entrance to this meeting room, a binder of all staff reports has been placed on the table for your convenience.

Meetings on TV can be viewed live or shown at an alternative time on Channel 3. Visit www.nashville.gov/calendar for a broadcast schedule.

Writing to the Commission

You can mail, hand-deliver, fax, or e-mail comments on any agenda item to the Planning Department. For the Commission to receive your comments, prior to the meeting, you must submit them by **noon the day of the meeting**. Otherwise, you will need to bring 14 copies of your correspondence to the meeting and during your allotted time to speak, distribute your comments.

Mailing Address: Metro Planning Department, 800 2nd Avenue South, P.O. Box 196300, Nashville, TN 37219-6300
Fax: (615) 862-7130
E-mail: planningstaff@nashville.gov

Speaking to the Commission

If you want to appear in-person before the Commission, view our tips on presentations on-line at www.nashville.gov/mpc/pdfs/mtg_presentation_tips.pdf and our summary regarding how Planning Commission public hearings are conducted at www.nashville.gov/mpc/pdfs/main/RulesSummary.pdf. Briefly, a councilmember may speak at the very beginning of the commission meeting, after the individual item is presented by staff, or after all persons have spoken in favor or in opposition to the request. Applicants speak after staff presents, then, those in favor speak followed by those in opposition. The Commission may grant the applicant additional time for a rebuttal after all persons have spoken. Maximum speaking time for an applicant is 10 minutes, individual speakers is 2 minutes, and a neighborhood group 5 minutes, provided written notice was received prior to the meeting from the neighborhood group.

- Day of meeting, get there at least 15 minutes ahead of the meeting start time to get a seat and to fill-out a "Request to Speak" form (located on table outside the door into this meeting room).
- Give your completed "Request to Speak" form to a staff member.
- For more information, view the Commissions Rules and Procedures, at www.nashville.gov/mpc/pdfs/main/rules_and_procedures.pdf

Legal Notice

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.



The Planning Department does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, religion, creed or disability in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities. Discrimination against any person in recruitment, examination, appointment, training, promotion, retention, discipline or any other employment practices because of non-merit factors shall be prohibited. For ADA inquiries, contact Josie Bass, ADA Compliance Coordinator, at (615) 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 (615) 880-3370. For all employment-related inquiries, contact Ron Deardoff at (615) 862-6640

MEETING AGENDA

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m.

B. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

C. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 27, 2011 MINUTES

Mr. Ponder moved and Councilmember Gotto seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve the January 27, 2011 minutes. (8-0)

D. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Langster asked for deferral of Item 13 till the March 24, 2011 MPC meeting.

Councilmember Langster asked for deferral of the MCSP.

Councilmember Langster asked for Item 3 to be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Claiborne - Item 17 – asked for approval on Consent Agenda as listed.

Councilmember Hollin was in attendance but chose to speak during the Item 4 discussion.

Councilmember Wilhoite spoke in favor of Item 6 on the Consent Agenda.

E. ITEMS FOR DEFERRAL/WITHDRAWAL

1. 2010Z-022TX-001

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

7. 2010Z-019TX-001

BL2010-783 | COLE, CLAIBORNE, JAMESON

13. 2006SP-135U-08

CLIFTON AVENUE TOWNHOMES

Mr. Ponder moved and Councilmember Gotto seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to defer Item 13 to the March 24, 2011 MPC meeting approve the Deferred and Withdrawn Items. (7-0-1) Chairman McLean recused himself.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

2. 2010SP-23-001

DRIVE TIME CAR DEALERSHIP

5. 2010S-121-001

1603 GLEN ECHO ROAD

6. 2010S-123A-001

HARBOURTOWN VILLAGE, SEC 2, RESERVE PARCEL

9. 2011CP-000-002

MOBILITY 2030

February 24, 2011 Meeting

Page 3 of 10

Consent = Consent Agenda
Closed = Public Hearing was previously held and
Defer = closed

Defer Indef = Applicant requests to defer indefinitely
Open = Public hearing is to be held
Withdraw = Applicant requests to withdraw application

12. **2006SP-090U-10**
RICHARD JONES ROAD
14. **2006SP-178U-09**
SIGNATURE TOWER
15. **2006SP-181G-12**
EVERGREEN HILLS
17. **2011SP-001-001**
BL2011-846 / CLAIBORNE
CANDLEWOOD HOTEL
18. **2011Z-001PR-001**
3710 N NATCHEZ COURT
19. **2004UD-002-004**
VILLAGES OF RIVERWOOD
20. **1-72P-002**
CHARLOTTE CENTER
21. **220-77P-001**
POINT PLACE BUSINESS PARK
23. **Contract between TDOT and the MPC on behalf of the MPO for Transportation Planning and Coordination: The amendment will increase the contract amount with additional Federal Highway Administration Metropolitan Planning grant funds made available to the MPO by Congress through the US DOT and TDOT.**
24. **Contract between MPC on behalf of MPO and RPM Transportation Consultants. The amendment extends the contract term to 24 months with two three month extensions for a total term of 30 months.**
25. **Contract amendment for Tifinie Adams, Joni Priest, and Rebecca Ratz.**

Mr. Ponder moved and Councilmember Gotto seconded the motion to approve the revised Consent Agenda. (8-0)

Items from the February 10, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting

1. **2010Z-022TX-001**
COMMUNITY EDUCATION
Staff Reviewer: Jennifer Regen

A request to modify the Metro Zoning Code, Section 17.16.040 (Uses Permitted with Conditions: Educational Uses) by deleting the minimum campus size and reduced lot size standards, modifying the setback and street standards, and adding a minimum public street frontage for community education uses (elementary, middle, and high school), requested by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: WITHDRAW

Withdrawn (7-0-1) Chairman McLean recused himself.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission voted to WITHDRAW Zone Change 2010Z-022TX-001 at the request of the applicant.

2. 2010SP-023-001

DRIVE TIME CAR DEALERSHIP

Map 163, Parcel(s) 191

Council District 32 (Sam Coleman)

Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to rezone from CS to SP-A zoning and for final site plan approval for property located at 520 Collins Park Drive, approximately 1,300 feet east of Bell Road (3.28 acres), to permit auto sales (used) and automobile service, within an existing 5,288 square foot facility, requested by Anderson Architects, applicant, Richland South, LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Rezone to permit auto sales (new and used) and auto service and final site plan approval.

Preliminary SP A request to rezone from Commercial Services (CS) to Specific Plan – Auto (SP-A) zoning and for final site plan approval for property located at 520 Collins Park Drive, approximately 1,300 feet east of Bell Road (3.28 acres), to permit auto sales (new and used) and automobile service, within an existing 5,288 square foot facility.

Existing Zoning

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

Proposed Zoning

SP-A District - Specific Plan-Auto 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 automobile uses.

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

ANTIOCH/PRIEST LAKE COMMUNITY PLAN

Regional Activity Center (RAC) RAC policy is intended for concentrated mixed-use areas anchored by a regional mall. Other uses common in RAC policy are all types of retail activities, offices, public uses, and higher density residential areas. 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.

Consistent with Policy? Yes, the proposed auto related uses are consistent with uses found in and contemplated within the RAC land use policy.

REQUEST DETAILS This is a request to rezone approximately 3.28 acres from CS to SP-A to permit auto sales new and used and auto services. The site is located at 520 Collins Park Drive, which is a dead end street off Bell Road between I-24 and a railroad line. The property is currently developed and was previously used for a truck dealership. The property consists of one structure and a large parking area.

The request does not propose any expansion to the existing 5,288 square foot building. SP is required for used auto sales and auto services. Because the site is located on a dead end street within an area that is cut off from the surrounding area by the interstate and railroad, staff is not recommending construction of a knee wall along Collins Park Drive. A knee wall is typically required with a request for used car lots within the Urban Services District, which is intended to enhance the street side appearance of the auto-oriented use. Due to the site's location it is not appropriate to require a knee wall. Instead, the plan provides perimeter landscaping along Collins Park Drive consistent with Zoning Code requirements. The plan also meets the interior landscaping requirements of the Zoning Code. Consistent with a recently adopted policy, sidewalks are not being required. The policy does not require sidewalks to be constructed for SP zonings when existing structures are to be utilized and there are no proposed major expansions to the existing structures.

Staff Analysis As proposed there are no issues with the request. The site was previously used for auto sales and the proposed use is consistent with the sites Regional Activity Center policy.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No Exceptions Taken

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the request be approved with conditions. As proposed, the request is consistent with the Regional Activity Center land use policy that applies to this property.

CONDITIONS

1. Permitted uses include auto sales new, auto sales used and auto service.
2. Signs shall be spotlighted or back lit with a diffused light source. Back-lighting shall illuminate only the letter, characters, or graphics, but not the background. Billboards and changeable LED, video signs or similar signs allowing automatic changeable messages, shall be prohibited.
3. On premise ground sign shall not be more than 20 feet in height measured from grade to top of sign.
4. 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.
5. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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 (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-26

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2010SP-023-001 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**
(8-0)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Permitted uses include auto sales new, auto sales used and auto service.
2. Signs shall be spotlighted or back lit with a diffused light source. Back-lighting shall illuminate only the letter, characters, or graphics, but not the background. Billboards and changeable LED, video signs or similar signs allowing automatic changeable messages, shall be prohibited.
3. On premise ground sign shall not be more than 20 feet in height measured from grade to top of sign.
4. 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.
5. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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 SP is consistent with the Regional Activity Center land use policy that applies to the property.”

Specific Plans

3. 2011SP-002-001

(formerly 2010Z-015PR-001)

BL2011-844 / Langster

HERMAN STREET

Map 092-06, Parcel(s) 279-280

Council District 21 (Edith Taylor Langster)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request to rezone from RS5 to SP-MU zoning for properties located at 2733 and 2737 Herman Street, at the southeast corner of Herman Street and 28th Avenue North (0.19 acres), to permit a mixed-use development consistent with land use standards of the MUN zoning district, Renita Anthony, applicant, Porter Maples, owner (Formerly Zone Change Case # 2010Z-015PR-001).

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE SP WITH CONDITIONS; DISAPPROVE MUN

APPLICANT REQUEST - Rezone to SP to permit mixed use development

Preliminary SP A request to rezone from Single-Family Residential (RS5) to Specific Plan - Mixed Use (SP-MU) zoning for properties located at 2733 and 2737 Herman Street, at the southeast corner of Herman Street and 28th Avenue North (0.19 acres), to permit a mixed-use development consistent with land use standards of the Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN) zoning district. (Formerly Zone Change Case # 2010Z-015PR-001).

Existing Zoning

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

Proposed Zoning

SP-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.

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS

- Creates Walkable Neighborhoods
- Provides a Range of Housing Choices
- Supports Infill Development

The Herman Street SP promotes mixed use development along 28th Avenue, which is an important arterial road within North Nashville. Development consistent with the SP will strengthen the walkability of the surrounding streets through building placement next to sidewalks and prominent front doors. Multi-family residential allowed within the SP will provide housing diversity within the surrounding single-family residential neighborhood. Located on a previously-developed property, the SP promotes infill development using existing infrastructure within a developed community.

NORTH NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN

T4 Urban Residential Corridor T4 RC policy is intended to preserve, enhance and create urban residential corridors that support predominately residential land uses; are compatible with the general character of urban neighborhoods as characterized by development pattern, building form, land use, and associated public realm; and that move vehicular traffic efficiently while accommodating sidewalks, bikeways, and mass transit.

Consistent with Policy? Yes. The proposed mixed use SP is consistent with the intent of the land use policy to promote a residential

corridor. The specific policy within the North Nashville Community Plan, 08-T4-RC-01, allows for residential development that is accompanied by low-intensity office and retail land uses in the form of live-work development.

PLAN DETAILS The proposed preliminary SP is a standards-based SP that anticipates mixed-use development on the project site at the intersection of Herman Street and 28th Avenue North. The SP proposes to use the standards of the MUN zoning district with additional form-based standards that are intended to implement the design principles of the T4 Residential Corridor policy and the special policy of the North Nashville Community Plan. These principles are intended to promote a strong pedestrian environment and quality building design along the property frontage.

Building Setbacks and Design Along Herman Street and 28th Avenue North street frontages, a build-to zone is proposed to promote building placement consistent with development on surrounding properties. Any building constructed within the site must be set within the build-to zone.

Façade design standards included in the SP are intended to emphasize the relationship between development and public space along the two street frontages. These include requirements intended to strengthen the public streetscape through prominent pedestrian entrances and inconspicuous vehicular entrances.

Parking Standards and Access Setback standards for parking are proposed. Similar to the build-to zone, the parking setback standards are intended to promote development that is consistent with surrounding development and to separate parking from the streetscape.

Specific access points are not proposed within the SP. Appropriate access to the site will be determined by Metro Public Works. A requirement within the SP prohibits vehicular access to the site from the Herman Street frontage.

Landscaping and Signage The proposed SP includes standards for landscaping buffers along adjacent residential properties and stormwater detention on-site. A landscaping buffer may be required with construction of parking. Standards for stormwater detention may be applied if a grading plan is required at development.

Signage must follow the standards of the MUN zoning district. Ground signage is specifically prohibited by the SP.

Council Bill This application, as originally submitted, requested a zone change from RS5 to MUN zoning. Since then, the applicant has amended the application to request SP zoning. However, the Council bill was prepared before this change and currently requests MUN zoning. The recommendation of the Planning Commission needs to address the current Council bill as well as the revised request.

A base zone change to MUN zoning would be inconsistent with the T4 RC land use policy because the T4 RC policy is a residential policy that allows for associated non-residential land uses. MUN zoning would allow for stand-alone commercial land uses without residential development, and without any setback and parking design standards that would ensure consistency with the Community Plan policy. The SP was created to allow for non-residential uses within a residential development, which is consistent with the T4 RC policy. MUN zoning is used within the SP as the fall-back zoning classification. Any standards not specified by the SP would be subject to the MUN zoning classification.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved with conditions:

Add 78-840 note to plan:

- Any excavation, fill, or disturbance of the existing ground elevation must be done in accordance with storm water management ordinance No. 78/840 and approved by The Metropolitan Department of Water Services.

Add Preliminary note to plan:

- This drawing is for illustration purposes to indicate the basic premise of the development. The final lot count and details of the plan shall be governed by the appropriate regulations at the time of final application.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

- Dedicate 30 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of both collector streets 28th Ave and Herman St as per the Major Street Plan.
- Dedicate 10 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of the alley.
 - An access study may be required prior to final SP.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: **RS5**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-Family Detached(210)	0.17	7.41 D	1	10	1	2

Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
---------------------	-------	-------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------

Office Building Low-Rise (710)	0.17	0.444 F	3,287 SF	97	13	13
--------------------------------	------	---------	----------	----	----	----

Traffic changes between typical: **RS5** and proposed **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	+87	+12	+11

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **RS5**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-Family Detached (210)	0.17	7.41 D	1	10	1	2

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Office Building Low-Rise (710)	0.17	0.6 F	4,443 SF	122	16	16

Traffic changes between maximum: **RS5** and proposed **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	+112	+15	+14

METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

Projected student generation **1 Elementary 1 Middle 0 High**

Schools Over/Under Capacity Students would attend Park Avenue Elementary School, Bass Middle School, and Pearl-Cohn High School. Park Avenue Elementary School and Pearl-Cohn High School are under capacity. Bass Middle School has been identified as being over capacity by the Metro School Board. There is capacity within the cluster for middle school students. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated October 2010.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions of the SP. The proposed design standards and the MUN development standards ensure consistency with land use policy in terms of proposed uses and design.

Staff recommends disapproval of a zone change to the MUN zoning classification because MUN zoning, without a regulatory site plan insuring consistency with the Community Plan, is inconsistent with the residential corridor policy.

CONDITIONS

- Depending on the form of future development, a consolidation plat may be required to consolidate the existing lots.
- Prior to the issuance of any permits, public right-of-way dedication and reservation, as defined by the Major and Collector Street Plan that is in effect at the time of final site plan approval, shall be recorded.
- The following notes shall apply to preliminary construction plans:
 - Any excavation, fill, or disturbance of the existing ground elevation must be done in accordance with storm water management ordinance No. 78/840 and approved by The Metropolitan Department of Water Services.
 - This drawing is for illustration purposes to indicate the basic premise of the development. The final lot count and details of the plan shall be governed by the appropriate regulations at the time of final application.
- For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the MUN zoning district.
- A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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.

Mr. Johnson presented the staff recommendation of approval with SP conditions and disapproval of MUN.

Renita Anthony, applicant, stated that she was there to answer any questions from neighbors with concerns.

Sandra Griffey, 916 28th Avenue, stated that she didn't oppose it but she did want to know what type of business it would be and how would it affect parking.

Ms. Anthony stated that it shouldn't affect Ms. Griffey at her address – it will be an alterations business – the customers will just come pick up their items and leave.

Councilmember Gotto asked how many parking spaces. If less than 2000 ft, is there anywhere to park on the street?

Mr. Johnson clarified there is parking on Herman Street.

Council Lady Langster spoke in support of approval.

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion to close the Public Hearing. (8-0)

Mr. Clifton moved and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, to approve staff recommendation. (8-0)

Resolution No. RS2011-27

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2011SP-002-001 is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS; DISAPPROVE MUN. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Depending on the form of future development, a consolidation plat may be required to consolidate the existing lots.
2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, public right-of-way dedication and reservation, as defined by the Major and Collector Street Plan that is in effect at the time of final site plan approval, shall be recorded.
3. The following notes shall apply to preliminary construction plans:
 - Any excavation, fill, or disturbance of the existing ground elevation must be done in accordance with storm water management ordinance No. 78/840 and approved by The Metropolitan Department of Water Services.
 - This drawing is for illustration purposes to indicate the basic premise of the development. The final lot count and details of the plan shall be governed by the appropriate regulations at the time of final application.
4. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the MUN zoning district.
5. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.
6. 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.

7. 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 SP zoning is consistent with the T4 Residential Corridor land use policy. MUN zoning, without a regulatory site plan ensuring consistency with the Community Plan, is inconsistent with the T4 Residential Corridor policy.”

Zone Changes

4. 2010Z-033PR-001

BL2011-854 / HOLLIN

731 MCFERRIN AVENUE

Map 082-08, Parcel(s) 307

Council District 05 (Jamie Hollin)

Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

A request to rezone from RS5 to MUN zoning for property located at 731 McFerrin Avenue, at the southeast corner of McFerrin Avenue and Chicamauga Avenue within the Greenland Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (0.32 acres), requested by Design House 1411 LLC, applicant, Brinkman Holding LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: DISAPPROVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - Rezone from RS5 to MUN.

Zone Change A request to rezone from Single-Family Residential (RS5) to Mixed-Use Neighborhood (MUN) zoning for property located at 731 McFerrin Avenue, at the southeast corner of McFerrin Avenue and Chicamauga Avenue within the Greenland Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (0.32 acres)

Deferral This item was deferred from the January 27, 2011, Planning Commission at the request of the applicant. The applicant met with the District Councilmember and community members on January 26, 2011. The community requested additional information concerning parking, buffering and access. A second meeting was held on February 8, 2011, for additional discussion with the community.

Existing Zoning

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

Proposed Zoning

MUN District - Mixed Use Neighborhood is intended for a low intensity mixture of residential, retail, and office uses.

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

EAST NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN

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

Neighborhood General (NG) Neighborhood General is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located. An Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in these policy areas, to assure appropriate design and that the type of development conforms with the intent of the policy.

Consistent with Policy? No. The proposed MUN zoning district is inconsistent with the MH in NG policy, which does not allow for commercial or office uses. The portion of the property fronting on Chicamauga Avenue is oriented towards the existing residential neighborhood. There is an existing building on the southern end of the property, oriented towards McFerrin Avenue, which has been used as a daycare center since 1995. A daycare center is a permitted use in the RS5 zoning district.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION Parking per Metro code will be required at redevelopment.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: **RS5**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single Family Residential(210)	0.32	7.41 D	2 L	20	2	3

Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Retail (814)	0.32	0.431	6,007 SF	295	12	36

Traffic changes between typical: **RS5** and proposed **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	+275	+10	+33

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **RS5**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single Family Residential(210)	0.32	7.41 D	2 L	20	2	3

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Retail (814)	0.32	0.6	8,363 SF	396	14	42

Traffic changes between maximum: **RS5** and proposed **MUN**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	+376	+12	+39

METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

Projected student generation 1 Elementary 1 Middle 1High

Schools Over/Under Capacity Students would attend Hattie Cotton Elementary School, Gra-Mar Middle School, or Maplewood High School. None of these schools has been identified as being overcrowded by the Metro School Board. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated October 2010.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends disapproval of the requested zone change as the MUN zoning district is inconsistent with the MH in NG land use policy.

Ms. Bernards presented the staff recommendation of disapproval.

David Hunter, 1411 Woodland Street, asked for support for the rezoning, noting that the property has history of being used in a commercial manner whether approved or not.

Terrell Rayley, 935 West Eastland, spoke in support of applicant's proposal.

Megan Morton, 924 West Eastland, spoke in support of applicant's proposal stating that this property is an eyesore and she would really like to see this happen to bring in more business.

Kristin Gillespie, 1017 Seymour Ave, spoke in support of applicant's proposal.

Alice Sloss, 903 Chicamauga Ave, spoke in support of staff recommendation stating that she is concerned about parking issues. Does not want people parking in front of her house.

Mary Coplen 1007 Seymour Ave, spoke in support of staff recommendation stating concerns with traffic, inadequate lighting and safety.

Mr. Ponder moved and Councilmember Gotto seconded the motion to close the Public Hearing. (8-0)

Councilmember Hollin stated that he has addressed parking issues with Public Works for Ms. Sloss. Spoke in support of applicant's proposal noting that this business will bring new jobs and it is a good fit for the neighborhood.

Mr. Gee inquired about policy asking if the request is not consistent with the policy?

Ms. Bernards clarified that the request is not consistent with policy.

Mr. Gee stated that it seems like the perfect opportunity for an SP and that he has similar concerns as the neighbors, and clarified that he is undecided.

Mr. Dalton stated that he is very much in support of infill development but does understand the concerns of the neighbors and is undecided.

Ms. LeQuire asked if an SP could be recommended instead.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that the rezoning could go forward and be followed up by housekeeping amendment.

Ms. LeQuire stated that she is undecided.

Mr. Clifton noted that increasing diversity of uses in urban neighborhood can be a good thing but stated concerns with straight rezoning.

Ms. Escobar stated that she does hear and understand the concerns of neighbors regarding parking and traffic and noted that an SP seems more appropriate.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that the commission would need to approve the applicant's site plan with any conditions, recommend approval of an SP based on that site plan, and recommend a housekeeping amendment.

Mr. Ponder spoke in support of applicant's proposal and stated confidence that the Councilmember can work through the neighborhood concerns

Councilmember Gotto inquired what uses are allowed under MUN zoning.

Ms. Bernards clarified.

Councilmember Gotto asked the applicant if the site plan presented was actual or conceptual.

The applicant stated it is the actual plan.

Councilmember Gotto asked the applicant about SP concerns considering the cost is the same.

The applicant clarified that an SP wouldn't allow March 1 Council approval therefore it would be a two month revenue loss for the project.

Councilmember Gotto stated that he is not sure that requiring an SP right now is the way to go and asked if it is legal to rezone even if inconsistent with land use policy.

Legal stated that it is not illegal to rezone even if inconsistent with land use policy.

Councilmember Gotto moved to approve applicant's request for MUN zoning and recommended policy change. Ms. LeQuire seconded the motion.

Mr. Dalton stated concerns with parking and asked if there was any way to address.

Mr. Gee noted that changing parcel 308 from a policy perspective might give some potential expansion of parking to better serve the area and wouldn't leave it as the higher intensity residential lot.

Councilmember Gotto suggested having a community meeting to address parcels 105, 106, 308, and 309.

Mr. Clifton stated that this is a mistake and that the base rezoning request is not supported by the policy. It is the role of the Planning Commission to review zone change requests against the policy. He stated he is prepared to support an SP, and change the plan, and that it is up to the Council to make political decisions.

Vote taken (7-1) Mr. Clifton voted against.

Resolution No. RS2011-28

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2010Z-033PR-001 is **APPROVED, including directing staff to initiate a housing keeping amendment for parcels 307 and 308 on Map 082-08. (7-1)**

The subject property is located adjacent to the Mixed Use in Neighborhood Urban land use policy, which would permit the proposed MUN zoning. Because of its similar characteristics to lots in the adjacent mixed use policy, including its location along a collector street and proximity to the intersection of two collector streets, the subject property is an appropriate location for a similar mixed use policy."

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Ponder seconded the motion to put Items 2 and 15 back on the Consent Agenda. (8-0)

Subdivision: Final Plats

5. 2010S-121-001

1603 GLEN ECHO ROAD

Map 117-16, Parcel(s) 008

Council District 25 (Sean McGuire)

Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 1603 Glen Echo Road, at the southwest corner of Glen Echo Road and Belmont Boulevard (0.57 acres), zoned R10, requested by Dale & Associates, applicant, for Scott D. Knapp, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE, including an exception to Section 3.5 of the Subdivision Regulations for lot comparability.

APPLICANT REQUEST - Final plat to create two lots

Final Plat A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 1603 Glen Echo Road, at the southwest corner of Glen Echo Road and Belmont Boulevard (0.57 acres), zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R10).

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS

Supports Infill Development This subdivision is on a previously-developed property. Where there were two residential units, there will be four units using the existing infrastructure.

PLAN DETAILS Final Plat

The applicant requests final plat approval for a two lot subdivision at the southwest corner of Glen Echo Road and Belmont Boulevard.

Sidewalks are required on one of the lots. The applicant had originally shown the sidewalk on Lot 2. At the request of the Public Works Department, the sidewalk was moved to the Glen Echo Road frontage of Lot 1. Sidewalks are being added to the south side of Glen Echo Road as property is redeveloping. Glen Echo ends at Belmont Boulevard. Placing the sidewalk at the terminus of the street will better position the Public Works Department to complete the sidewalk network in the future.

Lot Comparability Lot 1 does not meet the lot comparability requirements of the Subdivision Regulations for both area and for frontage on Glen Echo Road. Section 3-5 of the Subdivision Regulations states that new lots in areas that are predominantly developed are to be generally in keeping with the lot frontage and lot size of the existing surrounding lots.

Lot comparability analyses were performed for both the Glen Echo Road frontage and Belmont Boulevard frontage and yielded the following information:

Lot Comparability Analyses		
Street	Requirements	
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (linear ft.)
Glen Echo Road	14,468	97
Belmont Boulevard	16,140	128

Lot 1, with frontages on both streets, would need to meet the requirements for both. Lot 2 only needs to meet the requirements for Glen Echo Road. The proposed lots have the following areas and frontage lengths:

- Lot 1: 11,040.7 square feet, 94.5 feet of frontage on Glen Echo Road and 129.9 on Belmont Boulevard.
- Lot 2: 14,596.5 square feet, 109.7 feet of frontage

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

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

“Where the proposed lot sizes are consistent with the adopted land use policy that applies to the property.”

The land use policy is Residential Medium (RM) which is intended to accommodate residential development within a density range of four to nine dwelling units per acre. The lot is .57 acres in size and two units are currently permitted for a density of approximately 3.5 units per acre which does not meet the RM policy. The density of the subdivided property would be approximately 7 units per acre. The subdivision is consistent with the RM policy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with an exception to Section 3.5 of the Subdivision Regulations for Lot Comparability. The subdivision will bring this property into compliance with the RM policy.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-29

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2010S-121-001 is **APPROVED with an exception to Section 3.5 of the Subdivision Regulations for Lot Comparability. (8-0)**”

Subdivision: Amendments

6. 2010S-123A-001

HARBOURTOWN VILLAGE, SEC 2, RESERVE PARCEL

Map 136-15, Parcel(s) 070

Council District 29 (Vivian Wilhoite)

Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to amend a previously recorded plat to remove the reserve status for property located at 3545 Anderson Road, approximately 450 feet north of Nautilus Drive (0.28 acres), zoned R10, requested by David Taylor, applicant, R.J. York Homes LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - Amend plat to remove reserve status.

Final Plat Approval A request to amend a previously recorded plat to remove the reserve status for property located at 3545 Anderson Road, approximately 450 feet north of Nautilus Drive (0.28 acres), zoned Single and Two-Family Residential (R10).

Zoning

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

SUBDIVISION DETAILS This is a request to amend a previously approved plat to remove the reserve status from a parcel. The parcel is located along Anderson Road south of Smith Springs Road. The plat creating the parcel was approved and recorded in 1974. Since the parcel is reserved, it is not a buildable lot. With the removal of the reserve status, the lot will become buildable. The plat contains several reserve parcels including this lot, and it does not state why the lots were placed in a reserve status. Since the parcel was not explicitly reserved pending action by a public utility to provide a required service, then the removal of the reserve status must be approved by the Planning Commission (Subdivision Regulations, Section 2-9, Miscellaneous Platting Situations).

There are no issues with the request. While all the lot lines are not radial to the street and it has frontage on both Anderson Road and Old Anderson Road is not being created but already exists. The parcel is approximately 12,196 square feet in size and is consistent with the minimum lot size requirement for the R10 zoning district (10,000 square feet). While the property is zoned for two-family residential (R10) a duplex will not be permitted because the property is not a lot of record.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approved

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No Exceptions Taken

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the request to remove the reserve status be approved. The parcel meets the minimum zoning requirements.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-30

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2010S-123A-001 is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

G. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

Zoning Text Amendments

7. 2010Z-019TX-001

BL2010-783 / COLE, CLAIBORNE, JAMESON
NONCONFORMING USES & STRUCTURES
Staff Reviewer: Bob Leeman

A council bill to amend Title 17 of the Metro Zoning Code, to clarify the status and review of nonconforming uses and structures within Davidson County, sponsored by Councilmembers Eric Cole, Phil Claiborne, and Mike Jameson.

Staff Recommendation: DEFER INDEFINITELY

Deferred indefinitely (7-0-1) Chairman McLean recused himself.

The Metro Planning Department DEFERRED INDEFINITELY 2010Z-019TX-001 at the request of the applicant. (7-0-1)

H. COMMUNITY PLAN POLICY CHANGES AND ASSOCIATED CASES

Community Plan Amendments

8. 2011CP-000-001

Implementing Complete Streets: Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030
Staff Reviewer: Michael Briggs

A request to adopt Implementing Complete Streets: Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030, which updates the plan for major and collector streets for Metro Nashville-Davidson County. The Major and Collector Street Plan was last updated and adopted in 1992.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Adopt the Major and Collector Street Plan

Adopt the Major and Collector Street Plan *Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030*, which updates the plan for major and collector streets for Metro Nashville-Davidson County. The Major and Collector Street Plan was last updated and adopted in 1992.

MAJOR & COLLECTOR STREET PLAN BACKGROUND

Summary The Major and Collector Street Plan (MCSP) is a comprehensive plan and implementation tool for guiding public and private investment in the major streets (Arterial-Boulevards and Arterial-Parkways) and collectors (Collector-Avenues) that make up the backbone of the city's transportation system. It is a part of, and implements, *Mobility 2030*, which is a functional plan component of the General Plan for Nashville and Davidson County.

Complete Streets This update of the MCSP reflects Metro's commitment to utilizing a "Complete Streets" approach to street design. Complete Streets is an initiative by which cities, states, and other jurisdictions adopt policies to insure that future roadway projects will attempt to accommodate multiple users – pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit riders, and drivers of motor vehicles, and people of all ages and abilities, including children, older adults, and people with disabilities.

Locally, Mayor Karl Dean's Complete Streets Executive Order informs the direction of the MCSP update. The Complete Streets Executive Order, issued on October 6, 2010, directs Metro Departments to "Give full consideration to the accommodation of the transportation needs of all users, regardless of age or ability..."

The MCSP implements the Complete Streets Executive Order by developing a thoroughfare system that provides for safe and efficient access to multiple users while addressing streetscape design in context with the existing or envisioned character of the community.

Complete Street design should be understood as a process, not a specific product. For that reason, not all "Complete Streets" will look the same. As such, good design standards balance engineering judgment and user needs within the context of the street. Roadway design relies on the design professional's knowledge of elements such as travel speeds, volumes, horizontal and vertical alignments and sight lines. User needs also influence the design of the Complete Street. Many of the facilities contained within the right-of-way are uniquely associated with motorists, pedestrians, transit riders, and cyclists of varying ages and abilities.

Context Sensitive Solutions Character, or the physical context in which the street resides, is another factor considered in Complete Street design. Character influences the form and function of the roadway and its associated streetscape; for example, a rural two-lane Collector-Avenue will be designed differently than an urban, two-lane Collector-Avenue. Both will be designed to complement and enhance the desired character. The determination of street character has not typically taken into account the adjacent land use and context. Conventional street planning typically only allowed two levels of sensitivity to the surrounding land use and context—streets were either rural or urban—resulting in street designs with limited relation to their surroundings.

The Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process has the following attributes:

- Addresses needs in a financially feasible manner by matching the street to the setting that ensures safety for multiple users of corridor;
- Involves stakeholders in the design process, balancing various needs to produce a solution that is an asset of lasting value to the community.
- Allows flexibility in design guidelines, particularly in constrained conditions;
- Designs a transportation system that serves multiple users regardless of travel mode; and
- Incorporates aesthetics as an integral part of good design.

Professional organizations including the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), which represents transportation engineers, the American Planning Association (APA), and the Congress for New Urbanism (CNU), which represent urban planning professionals, have endorsed the CSS approach. Additionally, the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) is taking the same approach with their state transportation routes.

To achieve the goal of creating streets that are sensitive to their context (rural streets in rural settings, urban streets in urban settings, etc.), the MCSP has more refined street designations than the prior plan.

Need to Update Plan The most recent *Major Street Plan* and *Collector Street Plan* were separate documents that were last comprehensively updated in 1992, with minor amendments since then. As an element of the General Plan, the MCSP should be updated every seven to ten years to reflect change that has occurred and to respond to future planned growth, development, and preservation.

How the Major and Collector Street Plan Was Updated The MCSP consists of two pieces – the MCSP map, which provides the classification of every street, and the document, which explains these classifications and how they are to be used to guide future development of and improvement to Nashville’s major and collector streets.

The MCSP was updated through the following steps:

1. Review of the plans referenced below,
2. Analysis of the existing conditions of all the major and collector streets in Davidson County, review of local transportation plans, review of Community Plans and Detailed Design Plans and assessment of the role of each street in light of *Mobility 2030*’s guiding principles,
3. Designation of a Transect Category, Street Context, and Functional Design Type for each major and collector street in Davidson County. (Note that this assessment and proposal of street classifications did include upgrading some local streets to collectors or arterials and downgrading other streets from arterial to collector or from collector to local.)
4. Subjecting these proposed street classifications to the Nashville Area MPO’s regional travel demand model to check the impact of the proposals on the overall street network,
5. Reviewing the document and street classifications with Metro Public Works, Metro Transit Authority and State of Tennessee Agencies, and receiving their input, and
6. Receiving input on street classifications and the document from the public at community meetings.

A comprehensive review of the following local planning documents influenced the MCSP update:

- Each Community Plan’s recommendations for Major and Collector Streets
- Metropolitan Planning Organization Network (Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program)
- Strategic Plan for Sidewalks and Bikeways
- Nashville’s Strategic Transit Master Plan
- 2011 Northeast Corridor Mobility Study
- 2009 Northwest Corridor Conceptual Feasibility Study
- 2007 Southeast Corridor Alternatives Analysis
- The Code of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee
- The Subdivision Regulations of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee
- The Guiding Principles of *Mobility 2030*

HOW THE MAJOR AND COLLECTOR STREET PLAN WILL BE USED

With high development pressures expected to continue through 2035, transportation investments must be strategic and optimized to support economic growth and community livability. The street network will be expected to provide for multi-modal options and support and reflect the surrounding context and land use decisions. The CSS approach and Complete Streets process are designed to better achieve the expectations required of the transportation system. Planning Staff is developing user-friendly implementation tools to assist other Metro Departments, including Planning, Public Works, Stormwater, and MTA and TDOT, transportation stakeholders, the public, and private sector developers in applying the plan.

Users of the MCSP The MCSP is used by the *public* and *private* sectors in planning, designing, budgeting, and constructing new streets and in making improvements to existing streets.

Public Sector The Planning and Public Works Departments will use the MCSP to assess proposed street improvements and new streets to be built through private sector development and redevelopment where additional right of way or relocation of existing right of way may be required; in proposing street improvements and new streets as part of the land development process when Metro government is acting as a public sector developer; and, in proposing street improvements and new streets as part of the local and regional transportation planning and budgeting processes.

Metro Planning Commissioners will use the MCSP to assess the streets proposed in zoning and subdivision cases and to develop a recommended annual Capital Improvements Budget and Program that includes proposed new streets and street improvements.

Citizens will use the MCSP to gain a better understanding of each street's role in Davidson County's transportation network.

Private Sector The private sector will use the MCSP when proposing new development to determine if any major or collector streets are to be provided or upgraded in the proposed development area and what the street cross section should look like. The private sector will then design the new street or improve the existing street accordingly.

The private sector will also use the MCSP when proposing redevelopment to determine if any additional right-of-way and/or facilities need to be provided to meet the future vision for the street.

In both *public and private* sector cases, Metro government will review proposed new streets and improvements to existing streets against the guidelines in the MCSP.

INTERPRETING MCSP DESIGNATIONS The update of the MCSP, is designed to meet the goals of *Mobility 2030*, placing a greater emphasis on designing streets that serve multiple users and that reflect the character of the neighborhoods and centers through which the streets pass. Therefore, this update of the MCSP categorizes each street segment in a manner that provides greater guidance as to the context, purpose and goals of each street segment.

Each street segment classification includes three defining elements - **Environment, Street Context, and Functional Design Type**. In some cases there is a fourth element, which represents the enhanced multimodal expectation and/or scenic arterial overlay.

Every major and collector street is identified with a specific designation comprised of the three elements appropriate for that street segment and, in some cases, a fourth element representing either the enhanced multimodal expectation or scenic arterial overlay.

For example, **T5-M-AB5-UM** is a MCSP designation.

Environment T5-M-AB5-UM in this example references the T5 Center Transect category. Recall that the Transect is an organizing tool used in Nashville's land use planning and policies. This designation influences the scale, location, and orientation of development in a given area. The Transect Categories used in the MCSP include:

- T2 Rural
- T3 Suburban
- T4 Urban
- T5 Center
- T6 Downtown
- D District

These are the same Transect Categories as are used in the Community Character Manual and in Community Plans updated since 2008.

Street Context T5-M-AB5-UM in this example reflects mixed uses that surround this street segment. The three Street Context designations are Residential (R), Mixed Use (M), and Industrial (I). The Street Context adds to the overall understanding of context by defining the predominant existing or intended development pattern flanking a given street section. The Street Context influences design elements of the street and is based upon the adopted Community Plan. In this example, then, the street is passing through a Center that is predominately mixed use.

Functional Design Type T5-M-AB5-UM in this example refers to an Arterial-Boulevard functional design with four travel lanes and one center turn lane. The MCSP has three Functional Design types - Collector-Avenue (CA), Arterial-Boulevard (AB), and Arterial-Parkway (AP). The purpose of Functional Design type is to classify streets according to the character of service they are intended to provide and to design those streets so that they fit their context and serve multiple users. Guidelines are laid out in the MCSP tables and illustrative cross sections to depict these designs.

Multi-modal and Scenic Overlays T5-M-AB5-UM in this example is an urban multi-modal overlay indicating an increased emphasis on mass transit service in the corridor and the importance of pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to the surrounding land uses. Multimodal corridors may be urban (UM) or regional (RM).

Scenic arterials (S) connect areas of scenic and cultural significance and call for enhancement or preservation of existing natural areas on private property just outside the right-of-way.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MCSP

All major and collector streets identified in the MCSP have a designation assigned that reflects the surrounding environment, existing and/or future land use policy, purpose of road within the transportation network, identified future travel lanes, and multi-modal design accommodations. The MCSP also establishes rights-of-way based upon the MCSP designation and existing or planned mass transit service, bike lanes, and parking.

The designations along with design guidelines establish the necessary rights-of-way along Metro's major and collector corridors. In some instances, additional right-of-way width is needed compared to the previous MCSP adopted in 1992 to improve non-motorized travel modes along the corridor through bike lane additions, wider sidewalks, wider planting strips, and on-street parking. The addition of these infrastructure elements will also have the impact of changing the surrounding land use environments by calming traffic.

The new MCSP responds to a number of concerns expressed by residents and elected officials related to past decisions involving Metro's major and collector streets (e.g. lack of non-motorized infrastructure, a road design not mindful of the community's character, and transportation decisions not tied to land use decisions). The draft MCSP is more comprehensive, but Planning Department staff is working closely with Metro Public Works and other Metro staff in its implementation. Planning staff is developing computerized tools to assist in implementation. The documentation of right-of-way decisions will also take place to ensure consistency between developments along a corridor. Increased dialogue is expected as applicants work with both Public Works, Planning, and Codes to ensure the necessary amounts of right-of-way is dedicated based upon the future intent of Metro's major and collector streets.

Constrained Development Situations Planning staff recognizes that in some situations, there are constraints on a developer or property owner's ability to dedicate the standard right-of-way outlined in the proposed MCSP update. This is not new to Nashville – there have long been constrained development situations, especially on streets with historic buildings, with shallow property depths, etc. Today, under the existing MCSP, there is independent negotiation between Metro Departments and applicants involving the rights-of-way. These constrained situations will continue to exist, so discussion among Metro Departments and applicants will continue to take place. In the future, however, the final outcome will be more clearly documented to ensure consistency in the future developments along the same corridor.

Planning staff, in conjunction with Public Works, is currently doing an assessment of potential constrained areas along the major and collector street plan system. These areas will be identified and designated for rights-of-way smaller than the standards in the MCSP. In instances where the applicant and Metro staff cannot come to an agreement on the appropriate amount of right-of-way, the applicant may go to the Metro Planning Commission to request a smaller right-of-way standard.

MAJOR & COLLECTOR STREET PLAN UPDATE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Because of the nature of the MCSP, extensive stakeholder involvement has been undertaken with departments, agencies and partners that implement elements of the transportation infrastructure system in Metro Nashville along with outreach to community members.

Agency Stakeholder Outreach Agencies involved in implementing portions of the MCSP include:

1. Metro Nashville Public Works (MPW)
2. Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA)
3. Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)
4. Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
5. Metro Water Services Stormwater Program

Numerous meetings took place between Planning Department staff and representatives from the above listed agencies. Significant coordination and review of the draft document and MCSP designations were conducted jointly with MPW and TDOT. MTA coordinated with Planning Department staff in identifying future mass transit system opportunities within the draft MCSP based upon their strategic plan. The Nashville Area MPO also coordinated priorities established within the newly adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and their regional mass transit planning efforts.

Transportation Advocacy Outreach Advocacy groups such as the Transit Alliance of Middle Tennessee and Walk/Bike Nashville also reviewed the document and were included within the notifications of community meetings and the draft information on the Planning Department's website.

Community Outreach Staff conducted two community meetings to discuss the update to the Major and Collector Street Plan. The community meeting held on October 26 from 6 pm to 7:30 pm introduced the update to community members. It emphasized the more context-sensitive approach of the MCSP update and introduced the Complete Streets approach. Information was available regarding the streets now included in the MCSP and how the new approach to establishing rights-of-way contrasts with the currently adopted MCSP.

The follow-up community meeting on November 9 from 6 pm to 7:30 pm reviewed again the elements contained within the MCSP designations. Specific concerns that were raised at the initial meeting were discussed along with staff's response. An extensive question and answer period was held with community members on implementation of the MCSP. Notification of community meetings was listed on the Planning Department's website and made public through radio, television, and newspaper. E-mail reminders were sent to those that attended the community meetings or requested notification through the Planning Department's website and through the Planning Departments' Development Dispatch e-mail newsletter, which reaches 2,300 plus people.

After these community meetings, staff opened a three-plus month comment period during which time staff visited with community members about the intent of the MCSP and specific street classifications.

Planning staff was also available to meet on an as-needed basis with local community groups to discuss the update to the MCSP. The Hillwood Area Neighborhood Association invited planning staff to present information to their members and surrounding neighborhoods at their meeting on November 13, 2010.

As of February 4, 2011, planning staff has responded to over 33 e-mails concerning the MCSP. Phone calls have also been taken with questions.

Drafts of the MCSP document and the accompanying interactive map (through which the community can look up the proposed classification of any street segment) were posted on October 14, 2010, December 9, 2010, and January 31, 2011.

Community Feedback One theme that has emerged from the feedback that the Planning Department has received related to the MCSP involved traffic calming on major and collector streets. Residents have expressed concern in how the designations within the MCSP are applied in Metro Public Works' Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. Public Works uses the MCSP functional design type designation as one tool to determine eligibility for the program, which includes only local streets. Streets identified within the MCSP in addition to certain streets designated by the Public Works Department are generally not eligible for these low cost improvements.

Planning Department staff has explained the importance of including streets, even residential collector streets within the MCSP. The MCSP does not address the low cost traffic calming solutions such as signage, speed humps, and the speed radar trailer that are part of Metro Public Works' Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. The MCSP also does not authorize removal of traffic calming devices that also exist on streets today. Rather, the MCSP outlines substantial transportation improvements that could occur if public or private investment occurs along the corridor. For example, these improvements might include sidewalks, narrower pavement widths, bulb-outs, bike lanes, medians, roadside planting strips, or on-street parking. Studies and best practices promoted by ITE and CNU suggest that these improvements can change the environment and character of a corridor, thereby calming traffic in many instances.

Public Hearing Notification of the February 24th Metro Planning Commission Public Hearing for consideration of the Major and Collector Street Plan was sent by email to those who participated in the MCSP process, requested to be notified through the Planning Department's website, and through the Planning Department's Development Dispatch e-mail newsletter. The public hearing was also listed on the Planning Department's website and made public through radio, television, and newspaper media.

CHANGES SINCE THE STATIC DRAFT PLAN WAS POSTED

Planning staff posted the draft *Implementing Complete Streets: Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030* on January 31, 2010 and indicated to community stakeholders that while comments and suggestions were still welcome, no changes would be made to that document until changes were proposed at Planning Commission. Staff has found that posting a "static" draft prior to Planning Commission hearing is helpful to the community because then everyone is responding to the same document at the public hearing.

During the time that the static version of the draft plan was posted, information from stakeholders has prompted the removal of Carothers Road from the proposed MCSP. Ordinance No. BL2006-1295 was approved and establishes street standards on Carothers Road that meets the planning and mobility concepts of the Carothers Crossing UDO design standards and these standards in the proposed MCSP.

No other street designations or changes are proposed at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Approve the Major and Collector Street Plan (MCSP) entitled *Implementing Complete Streets: Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030* with the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

1. Remove Carothers Road from the MCSP because of approved Ordinance No. BL2006-1295, which establishes streets standards on Carothers Road that meets the planning and mobility concepts of the UDO's design standards and of the proposed MCSP.
2. Change the MCSP designation of Harding Road from east of Bosley Springs Road to west of Belle Meade Plaza from T5-M-AB5-UM to T5-M-AB6-UM to meet the transportation plan objectives of the adopted UDO.
3. Grant planning staff permission to fix typographical and grammatical errors as necessary.

Mr. Briggs presented the staff recommendation of approval with conditions.

Councilman Gotto out at 5:46 p.m.

Chairman McLean out at 5:46 p.m.

Councilman Gotto and Chairman McLean in at 5:49 p.m.

Mr. Dalton out at 5:49 p.m.

Mr. Dalton in at 5:57 p.m.

Jim McAteer, 130 Nestor Street, spoke in support of staff recommendation and stated that overall this is a great step forward for Nashville and this document will help guide Nashville into the future.

Ed Cole, 3022 23rd Ave S, spoke in support of staff recommendation.

Bell Newton, 3950 Woodlawn Drive, spoke in support of the plan generally but in opposition of the Bosley Springs Connector until a Woodlawn Traffic Study is completed.

John Cooper, 3925 Woodlawn Drive spoke in opposition to the Bosley Springs Connector until more study is completed.

Trish Bolian, 6002 Hickory Valley Road, spoke on behalf of Hillwood Neighborhood Association and noted "connector" ramifications, traffic calming issues in Hillwood, and stated that the same "collector" title given to multiple streets that are not the same.

Mr. Ponder out at 6:18 p.m.

James Kelley, 3702 Richland Ave, spoke on behalf of Greenways for Nashville and asked for deletion of the Bosley Springs Connector because of the negative impact on the greenway.

Mr. Dalton out at 6:24 p.m.

Mr. Dalton in at 6:26 p.m.

Louan Brown, 3071 Elm Hill Pike, stated that her issues have been addressed but her neighbors have valid concerns. Would like to defer until all agencies can use the same terminology.

David Kleinfelter, 2904 23rd Ave S, spoke in support of staff recommendation, stating that this is a major step forward. If deferred, he would request it is only deferred one or two meetings, but would prefer approval and a six month review.

Mark Macy, Public Works, stated support of the MCSP but asked for a deferral due to having questions on the impact of MCSP on federal funds. Has submitted three questions to TDOT in writing and would like to get a response to these questions in writing before approval. 1) Will proposed classification system jeopardize future federal funding opportunities? 2) Will the proposed classification system have any impact on the existing Federal Aid Urban System for Davidson County? 3) On routes where federal funds have already been used for improvements, if the proposed classification system shows less lanes, will it become a liability for Metro to repave? Also requested the Public Works be allowed to meet with the Executive Committee to solve some issues.

Dr. Chris Ferrell, Trevecca University, spoke against staff recommendation of Welsh Road, stating that this four lane access highway was going to go through the middle of the Trevecca campus.

Mr. Bernhardt explained that the proposed plan was a conceptual location of the road for University Row and how this is a potential alignment that is not an exact location. Also clarified that this is intended to enhance the universities, not destroy them.

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion to close the Public Hearing. (7-0)

Councilman Gotto asked Mr. Macy how long it will take to get answers from TDOT as he does not want to delay this too long.

Mr. Macy stated that he has already heard that TDOT is fairly confident that everything is okay, but he still wants the answers in writing, hopefully within a month

Mr. Bernhardt recommended to commission that they approve the plan, make amendments to the plan, and defer the vote until Public Works has their answers from TDOT.

Mr. Clifton spoke in agreement with Mr. Bernhardt and stated that Public Works deserves to have their questions and doubts understood and answered.

Councilmember Gotto stated that he needs more information and suggested that each street be discussed and decided upon individually.

Gotto moved and Ms. Escobar seconded the motion to approve the plan with the understanding that the final vote will be deferred until Public Works receives the answers to their questions.

Mr. Gee made an amendment to the motion and Councilmember Gotto seconded the amendment that Public Works has a meeting with the Executive Committee to discuss issues and concerns.

Mr. Clifton stated that it is inappropriate for Public Works to meet with the Executive Committee regarding a specific issue.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that Public Works should notify the Planning staff of any issues they have that need to be addressed.

Mr. Gee withdrew his amendment due to the fact that it is against the Executive Committee rules.

Chairman McLean requested that Public Works send their concerns to the Planning staff and scheduled an Informal Work Session at 2:30 p.m. on March 10th with Public Works to discuss those concerns.

Mr. Clifton recommended removal of the Bosley Springs Connector from the plan and asked that it be looked at more specifically.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that staff has no objection to that request.

Ms. LeQuire stated that she would like more information on Harding Road as AB6.

Councilmember Gotto suggested pulling Bosley Springs, Welsh Road, and all collectors in Hillwood out of the plan and expressed concern over the lack of the promised Woodlawn Traffic Study.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that staff has no objections to taking them off.

Ms. LeQuire suggested to link Harding Road widening and Bosley Springs and link to traffic study.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that staff has no objections to that request.

Mr. Clifton suggested removing the Harding widening, Bosley Springs connector, and all 5 collectors in the Hillwood area.

Mr. Gee thanked staff for all their hard work and spoke in favor of the plan.

Ms. LeQuire inquired about vertical integration of terminology.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that vertical integration will not happen.

Mr. Gee inquired about right-of-way width and Mr. Bernhardt stated that this sets a standard right-of-way.

Mr. Gee inquired if this sets street standards and Mr. Bernhardt clarified that no, that is handled by Public Works.

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Clifton seconded the motion to approve staff recommendation.

Councilmember Gotto moved to amend the motion and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion to delete the Bosley Springs connector from the plan. (7-0)

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion to disapprove staff recommendation and retain the currently adopted six lane designation on Harding Road. (7-0)

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Clifton seconded the motion to delete Hillwood Boulevard, Vine Ridge, Davidson Road, Brook Hollow, and Hickory Valley from the plan. (7-0)

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Dalton seconded the motion to defer the motion as amended to the meeting subsequent to getting answers to Public Works questions. (7-0)

Mr. Gee stated concerns that the streets were pulled out with no real review or discussion.

Chairman McLean scheduled an Informal Work Session for March 24th at 2:30 p.m. to discuss in detail each street pulled from the plan.

Councilmember Gotto stated that the commission can amend them back into the plan if desired.

Amendments to the motion were approved and the motion to approve with conditions was deferred to allow time to obtain responses to questions raised by the Public Works Department, as listed below, and to hold a Work Session on March 10, 2011, for further discussion of questions raised by the Public Works Department (7-0)

Summary of Discussion:

"The Metropolitan Planning Commission, for 2011CP-000-001, discussed:

Motion to Approve Major and Collector Street Plan with conditions, including:

- Remove Carothers Road from the MCSP because of approved Ordinance No. BL2006-1295, which establishes street standards on Carothers Road that meets the planning and mobility concepts of the UDO's design standards and of the proposed MCSP.
- Change the MCSP designation of Stewarts Ferry Pike from I-40 to McCrory Creek Road from T3-M-AB4 to T3-M-AB5 and from McCrory Creek Road to Lebanon Pike from T3-R-AB3 to T3-R-AB5 to reflect Public Works' pre-planning to widen to five lanes.
- Remove Oakley Drive from the MCSP from Trousdale Drive to Edmondson Pike to reflect the removal of the proposed connection from the Collector Plan as adopted in the Southeast Community Plan.
- The MCSP will be effective as of August 1, 2011.
- Grand planning staff permission to fix typographical and grammatical errors, as necessary.

- **Motion Amendment: Amend the motion to retain the currently adopted six lane designation on Harding Road.**
- **Delete the following from the Major and Collector Street Plan**
 - a. Proposed Bosley Springs Connector
 - b. Hillwood Boulevard.
 - c. Hickory Valley Road.
 - d. Vine Ridge Drive
 - e. Brook Hollow Road.
 - f. Davidson Road.

Action: Defer the motion as amended to allow time to obtain responses to questions raised by the Public Works Department as listed below. Hold a work session on March 10, 2011 for further discussion of questions raised by the Public Works Department. 7-0

Questions to Tennessee Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration:

1. Will the proposed classification system jeopardize future federal funding opportunities?
2. Will the proposed classification system have any impact on the existing FAU system for Davison County, mostly related to eligibility of funding and continuation of improvements?
3. On routes where we have already used federal funds for improvements, if the proposed classification system shows less laneage, will it be a liability to Metro? (7-0)"

9. 2011CP-000-002

MOBILITY 2030

Staff Reviewer: Michael Briggs

A request to amend Mobility 2030 to incorporate the Nashville Strategic Transit Master Plan and the Strategic Plan for Sidewalks and Bikeways as elements of Mobility 2030.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - Amend Mobility 2030

Amend Mobility 2030 A request to amend *Mobility 2030* to incorporate the *Nashville Strategic Transit Master Plan* and the *Strategic Plan for Sidewalks and Bikeways* as elements of *Mobility 2030*.

BACKGROUND *Mobility 2030* is one of the functional plans of the General Plan, which guides growth and development in Metro Nashville/Davidson County. *Mobility 2030* outlines Guiding Principles, which are the philosophical basis for transportation decisions by public and private entities.

The Guiding Principles established by *Mobility 2030* are:

- Create efficient community form;
- Offer meaningful transportation choices;
- Sustain and enhance the economy;
- Value safety and security;
- Protect human health and the environment;
- Ensure financial responsibility; and
- Address transportation from a regional perspective.

Need to Update Plan This request to amend *Mobility 2030* will incorporate the *Nashville Strategic Transit Master Plan* completed in 2009 and adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the *Strategic Plan for Sidewalks and Bikeways* completed by Metro Public Works in 2008 as elements of *Mobility 2030*.

The decision to adopt these mode-specific plans into *Mobility 2030* was informed by Mayor Karl Dean's Complete Streets Executive Order, issued on October 6, 2010, which directs Metro Departments to "Give full consideration to the accommodation of the transportation needs of all users, regardless of age or ability..."

Officially incorporating these mode-specific plans as elements of *Mobility 2030* reflects the multi-modal philosophy and commitment to coordination among Metro Departments to implement a robust, multi-modal transportation system for Davidson County. In addition, it confirms the role that these plans already serve in the review process of the Planning Department.

Public Hearing Notification of the February 24, 2011, Metro Planning Commission Public Hearing for consideration of the amendments to *Mobility 2030* was sent by email to those who participated in the Major and Collector Street Plan (MCSP) update process, requested to be notified through the Planning Department's website regarding the MCSP, and through the Planning Department's Development Dispatch e-mail newsletter. The public hearing was also listed on the Planning Department's website and made public through radio, television, and newspaper media.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Approve the amendments to *Mobility 2030* to incorporate the *Nashville Strategic Transit Master Plan* and the *Strategic Plan for Sidewalks and Bikeways* as elements of *Mobility 2030*.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-32

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2011CP-000-002 is **APPROVED, including the addition of Lombardy Avenue to the Strategic Plan for Bikeways and Sidewalks. (8-0)**"

10. 2011CP-008-001

NORTH NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN: 2010 UPDATE

Staff Reviewer: Tifinie Adams

A request to amend the North Nashville Community (Subarea 8) Transportation Plan to include recommendations from the adopted Implementing Complete Streets: Major and Collector Street Plan of Metropolitan Nashville, A Component of Mobility 2030 for major streets in the North Nashville Community, requested by Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE if the Major and Collector Street Plan is approved; DEFER if the Major and Collector Street Plan is deferred.

Deferred (8-0) Chairman McLean recused himself.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED 2011CP-008-001 to follow the Major and Collector Street Plan. (8-0)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS TO METRO COUNCIL

Zoning Text Amendments

11. 2011Z-001TX-001

New Zoning Code Terminology Related to the Update of the Major and Collector Street Plan

Staff Reviewer: Rebecca Ratz

A request to amend Metro Zoning Code, Chapters 17.04 (Definitions) and 17.12 (District Bulk Regulations) by revising the definitions associated with street designations to reflect new Major and Collector Street Plan terminology; and by modifying the measurement of street setbacks for multi-family and non-residential districts and non-residential uses in the AG, AR2a, R and RS districts, consistent with these new designations, requested by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE if the Major and Collector Street Plan is approved; DEFER if the Major and Collector Street Plan is deferred.

Deferred (8-0) Chairman McLean recused himself.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED 2011Z-001TX-001 to follow the Major and Collector Street Plan. (8-0)

Specific Plans

12. 2006SP-090U-10

RICHARD JONES ROAD

Map 117-15, Parcel(s) 153

Council District 25 (Sean McGuire)

Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MNR) district known as "Richard Jones Road", to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for property located at 2002 Richard Jones Road (3.93 acres) and located within the Green Hills Urban Design Overlay District, approved for retail and restaurant uses within an existing 3-story building via Council Bill BL2006-1107 adopted by Metro Council on January 17, 2007, review initiated by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: FIND THE SP ACTIVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - Four year SP review to determine activity.

SP Review The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MNR) district known as "Richard Jones Road", to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for property located at 2002 Richard Jones Road (3.93 acres) and located within the Green Hills Urban Design Overlay District, approved for retail and restaurant uses within an existing 3-story building via Council Bill BL2006-1107 adopted by Metro Council on January 17, 2007.

Zoning Code Requirement Section 17.40.106.1 of the Zoning Code requires that a SP District be reviewed four years from the date of Council approval and every four years after until the development has been deemed complete by the Planning Commission.

Development within each SP District is to be reviewed in order to determine if the project is complete or actively under development to implement the approved development concept. If the review determines that the project is complete or actively under development, then no further review is necessary at this time. If the review determines that the project is inactive then the Planning Commission is to determine if its continuation as an SP district is appropriate.

DETAILS OF THE SP DISTRICT The Richard Jones SP was approved for retail and restaurant uses within an existing building.

Analysis Staff visited the site on January 17, 2011. While there is not a restaurant within the building, the building is occupied. The staff assessment of this SP is that it is active and staff recommends that this SP be found active and that it be placed back on the four-year review list.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the Richard Jones Road SP be found to be active.

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006SP-090U-10 is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

13. 2006SP-135U-08

CLIFTON AVENUE TOWNHOMES

Map 091-12, Parcel(s) 197-198
Council District 21 (Edith Taylor Langster)
Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (R) district known as “Clifton Avenue Townhomes”, to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for properties located at 711 and 713 40th Avenue North (0.54 acres), approved for ten units via Council Bill BL2006-1253 effective on January 19, 2007, review initiated by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: FIND THE SP ACTIVE

Deferred to the March 24, 2011 MPC meeting. (7-0-1) Chairman McLean recused himself.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission DEFERRED 2006SP-135U-08 to the March 24, 2011, meeting (7-0-1)

14. 2006SP-178U-09

SIGNATURE TOWER

Map 093-06-1, Parcel(s) 082
Council District 06 (Mike Jameson)
Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MU) district known as “Signature Tower”, to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for property located at 501 Church Street (1.22 acres), approved for a 1,396,000 square foot building to contain 435 residential units, 197 hotel rooms, and 17,000 square feet of restaurant and retail uses via Council Bill BL2006-1291 effective on January 16, 2007, review initiated by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: FIND THE SP INACTIVE and recommend to the Council that the property be rezoned to DTC.

APPLICANT REQUEST - Four year SP review to determine activity.

SP Review The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MU) district known as "Signature Tower", to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for property located at 501 Church Street (1.22 acres), approved for a 1,396,000 square foot building to contain 435 residential units, 197 hotel rooms, and 17,000 square feet of restaurant and retail uses via Council Bill BL2006-1291 effective on January 16, 2007.

Zoning Code Requirement Section 17.40.106.1 of the Zoning Code requires that a SP District be reviewed four years from the date of Council approval and every four years after until the development has been deemed complete by the Planning Commission.

Development within each SP District is to be reviewed in order to determine if the project is complete or actively under development to implement the approved development concept. If the review determines that the project is complete or actively under development, then no further review is necessary at this time. If the review determines that the project is inactive then the Planning Commission is to determine if its continuation as an SP district is appropriate.

DETAILS OF THE SP DISTRICT The Signature Tower SP was approved for a 70-story building rising to a height of 1,030 feet. The building includes 400 residential units, a 197 room hotel and first floor restaurant and retail uses. There are five levels below grade to accommodate 636 parking spaces.

Specific Plan Review Staff conducted a site visit on January 17, 2011. There did not appear to be any construction activity on the site. A letter was sent to the property owner of record requesting details that could demonstrate that the SP was active.

The property owner contacted staff and indicated that there has been no activity on this SP and has no objections to this property being rezoned to the Downtown Code.

FINDING OF INACTIVITY When the assessment of an SP is that it is inactive, staff is required to prepare a report for the Planning Commission with recommendations for Council Action including:

1. An analysis of the SP district's consistency with the General Plan and compatibility with the existing character of the community and whether the SP should remain on the property, or
2. Whether any amendments to the approved SP district are necessary, or
3. To what other type of district the property should be rezoned.

If the Planning Commission agrees with the staff assessment, staff will prepare a written report of the Commission's determination to Council with a recommendation on the following:

1. The appropriateness of the continued implementation of the development plan or phase(s) as adopted, based on current conditions and circumstances; and
2. Any recommendation to amend the development plan or individual phase(s) to properly reflect existing conditions and circumstances, and the appropriate base zoning classification(s) should the SP district be removed, in whole or in part, from the property.

Holds on Permits Section 17.40.106.I.1 of the Zoning Code requires that once the review of an SP with a preliminary assessment of inactivity is initiated, no new permits, grading or building, are to be issued during the course of the review. For purposes of satisfying this requirement, a hold shall be placed on all properties within the SP on the date the staff recommendation is mailed to the Planning Commission so that no new permits will be issued during the review.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Consistency with the General Plan When the Signature Tower SP was adopted, the Downtown Community Plan was in the process of being updated. While this SP is consistent with the principles of the plan, a Downtown Code (DTC) has been adopted that better implements the principles, goals and objectives of the Downtown Community Plan. Staff is recommending that this property be rezoned to DTC.

Proposed amendments to the SP There are no amendments proposed to this SP.

Proposed Rezoning Staff recommends that the property be rezoned to DTC. As noted above, the DTC better implements the Downtown Community Plan. This property is in a Mixed-Use policy in the Core. The Core is the heart of the Downtown business district, the economic engine of the Middle Tennessee region, and a significant economic force in the Southeast. It is the densest neighborhood in Downtown and is intended to accommodate a mix of uses with an emphasis on office in high-rise buildings.

The DTC implements the community vision for Downtown outlined in the Downtown Community Plan and provides more certainty to the development process, by replacing the Commercial Core (CC) with form-based zoning, which provides clear standards for the form of development and a clear understanding for each property owner of what their entitlements and obligations are.

The DTC allows more development rights than the CC zoning district and permits additional land uses. In addition, the DTC includes basic urban design standards to ensure a safe, interesting, and comfortable experience in the public realm. As discussed in the Downtown Community Plan, pedestrian comfort and safety is prioritized with an interesting sidewalk realm, activity on the ground level of buildings, and controlled vehicular access.

There is a height limit of 30 stories in the DTC but this property is eligible for the Bonus Height Program. This program gives additional height in exchange for the following public benefit contributions:

- Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification of individual buildings.
- LEED for Neighborhood Development.
- Pervious surface.
- Publicly-accessible Open Space.
- Workforce Housing,
- Civil Support Space,
- Upper-level garage liners.
- Underground parking.

Report to the Council If the Planning Commission agrees with the staff assessment, staff will prepare a report to Council recommending that this property be rezoned to DTC. If the Council agrees with the Planning Commission recommendation, there will be a new case filed by Planning staff. The rezoning will have to go through the normal zone change process with a public hearing at the Planning Commission and at Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the Signature Tower SP be found to be inactive and that that Planning Commission recommend to the Council that the property be rezoned to DTC.

Resolution No. RS2011-44

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006SP-178U-09 is **FOUND TO BE INACTIVE, and is recommended to the Council that the property be rezoned to DTC. (8-0)**

DTC zoning better implements the Downtown Community Plan compared to the current SP zoning and the former CC zoning on the subject property.”

15. 2006SP-181G-12

EVERGREEN HILLS

Map 182-00, Parcel(s) 011, 214, 221

Council District 32 (Sam Coleman)

Staff Reviewer: Brenda Bernards

The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MR) district known as “Evergreen Hills”, to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.1 of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for properties located at 13880 Old Hickory Boulevard and at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered) (188.69 acres), approved for 200 townhouse units and 700 single-family lots via Council Bill BL2006-1254 effective on January 16, 2007, review initiated by the Metro Planning Department.

Staff Recommendation: FIND THE SP ACTIVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - Four year SP review to determine activity.

SP Review The periodic review of an approved Specific Plan (MR) district known as "Evergreen Hills", to determine its completeness pursuant to Section 17.40.106.I of the Metro Zoning Code (Review of a Development Plan), for properties located at 13880 Old Hickory Boulevard and at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered) (188.69 acres), approved for 200 townhouse units and 700 single-family lots via Council Bill BL2006-1254 effective on January 16, 2007.

Zoning Code Requirement Section 17.40.106.I of the Zoning Code requires that a SP District be reviewed four years from the date of Council approval and every four years after until the development has been deemed complete by the Planning Commission.

Development within each SP District is to be reviewed in order to determine if the project is complete or actively under development to implement the approved development concept. If the review determines that the project is complete or actively under development, then no further review is necessary at this time. If the review determines that the project is inactive then the Planning Commission is to determine if its continuation as an SP district is appropriate.

DETAILS OF THE SP DISTRICT The Evergreen Hills SP was approved for 200 townhouse units and 700 single-family lots at an overall density of approximately 5.2 dwelling units per acre. The plan calls for a variety of different housing choices with 200 town houses and 700 residential lots of various sizes. There are four separate neighborhood centers with higher residential densities within the centers and decreasing density levels to the periphery.

There is automobile and pedestrian connectivity within the development through a modified grid network of streets that include sidewalks, and pedestrian paths through some of the interior open spaces. A total of four stub streets, and two alley stubs are included. There is approximately 49 acres of open space for both active and passive use.

Determination of Activity Staff visited the site on January 17, 2011. While there was no activity on the site, the property owner’s representative had provided a list of activities at the time the 90-day letter informing them of the upcoming review was received.

The Metro Council approved the Evergreen Hills SP in January of 2007; therefore it would be ready for its 4 year review by the Metro Planning Commission. The project has been stalled due the ongoing depression of the economy, especially the residential housing market. The developer is just in a holding pattern waiting on the market to improve. I search my project file and found the following items the developer has completed since the SP was approved;

- *Boundary Survey*
- *Aerial Topographic Survey*
- *Traffic Impact Study*
- *Nashville Crayfish Survey*
- *Paid \$132,000 in Water and Sewer Capacity Fees*
- *Prepared and Submitted Final SP Construction Plans for 140 Lots in Phase 1 & 2*
- *Received Final Approval on Phase 1 & 2 Final SP Plans from MPC, MWS, MSW, MPW*
- *Received a ARAP Permit From TDEC for Stream Crossing*
- *Received a NPDES Construction Permit from TDEC*
- *Prepared a High Voltage Underground Electrical design for NES*
- *Bid the project and selected a Site Grading Contractor*

ANALYSIS In reviewing the documentation provided by the owner, staff finds that the owner has described an aggregate of actions that indicates activity. Staff recommends that this SP be found active and that it be placed back on the four-year review list. At that time, if the SP is not found to be complete, the owner will need to demonstrate that additional activity has taken place in the SP in order for it to be found active. Staff would note, however, that at this time the SP remains appropriate for the site and area. The approved plan is consistent with the Neighborhood General policy of the Southeast Community Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the Evergreen Hills SP be found to be active.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-45

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2006SP-181G-12 is **FOUND TO BE ACTIVE. (8-0)**”

16. 2009SP-025-001

BL2009-597 / COLEMAN

BELZ MOUNTAIN SPRINGS COMMUNITY

Map 164-00, Parcel(s) PART OF 040, 174

Council District 32 (Sam Coleman)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request to change from RS7.5 to SP-MR zoning a portion of properties located at 5000 Mountain Springs Road and at Hobson Pike (unnumbered), north of Hobson Pike (40.8 acres), to permit 219 multi-family dwelling units, requested by Civil Site Design Group, PLLC, applicant, for Belz-McDowell Properties, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST -Construct 219 townhouses.

Preliminary SP A request to change from Single-Family Residential (RS7.5) zoning to Specific Plan - Mixed Residential (SP-MR) zoning a portion of properties located at 5000 Mountain Springs Road and at Hobson Pike (unnumbered), north of Hobson Pike (40.8 acres), to permit 219 multi-family dwelling units.

Existing Zoning

RS7.5 District - RS7.5 requires a minimum 7,500 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 4.94 dwelling units per acre. This zoning would permit 236 lots on this property.

Proposed Zoning

SP-MR District - Specific Plan-Mixed Residential 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 a mixture of housing types.*

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

ANTIOCH / PRIEST LAKE COMMUNITY PLAN

Neighborhood General (NG) NG is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located. An 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.

Consistent with Policy? The proposed development meets the intent of the design principles for NG policy. Townhouses are alley-loaded and have relatively short setbacks along public and private street frontages. Open space areas are prominent because of their placement within the development along public streets. Although the proposal includes only one street connection, stub street connections are provided for future connections to the east (Murfreesboro Pike) and to the south (Hobson Pike).

NG policy recommends diversity in housing types. Although the proposed development includes only one housing type, it is adjacent to the Summerfield subdivision to the west, which is a single-family residential subdivision, and a multi-family neighborhood to the east. Taken in the context of surrounding development, this SP will provide additional housing diversity.

Project Description This SP proposal includes 219 townhouse units. All vehicular access to the site will be provided through a street connection to the Summerfield subdivision to the west through Shagbark Trail. Public and private streets will provide access to all townhomes from Shagbark Trail.

Analysis The layout of the development has been improved since the last Commission hearing in 2009. With the inclusion of an alley system for all proposed units, the strength of the pedestrian realm is heightened compared to the previous plan, which included a large number of street-loaded townhouse units. The alley system will eliminate driveway breaks in the sidewalk network. Conditions of approval have been added to ensure that individual townhouse units are designed to maintain the strength of the pedestrian environment presented by the site plan.

Although only one street connection is proposed to the adjacent Summerfield subdivision to the west, stub street connections are provided for future connections to the east to Murfreesboro Pike and to the south to Hobson Pike and to the future Southeast Connector arterial road, which will extend near the southern edge of the project site. Metro Public Works has reviewed the traffic impact study submitted by the applicant and will determine off-site traffic mitigations at the time of final SP submittal.

According to the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, endangered species may exist on the project site. A condition of approval has been included, stating that prior to final site plan approval, the applicant must obtain a letter from Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation or a botanical inventory from a qualified biologist stating if endangered species exist on this site. Presence of endangered species may require modification to the plan.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION The offsite pond must be constructed along with this development.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. The developer's final construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
2. All construction traffic for this project is to be routed through Mountain Springs Drive to Murfreesboro Rd or other access but not through the Summerfield Development.
3. The roundabout on Mountain Springs Drive shall be designed per NCHRP Report 672.
4. The extension of Ashford Trace shall be shown as a collector to the future S.E. arterial.
5. Mountain Springs Drive should be shown and labeled as extending in the future through the Belz Commercial Tract and intersecting with the S.E. arterial.
6. Guest parking off the alley shall be provided for units 172-208.
7. Construct private streets per Medium street standard drawing ST-252 to accommodate the anticipated on-street parking. Private streets as currently shown do not scale correctly.

8. All private streets and alleys shall connect to the public street using a concrete ramp PW-ST324.
9. Construct cul-de-sacs per standard drawing ST-331.
10. Identify dumpster locations and plan for recycling collection. Solid waste plan must be approved by the Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division.
11. Identify mail service delivery plan (kiosk location / parking)
12. Offsite traffic mitigations may be required, and will be determined with the final SP plan at the time of development but will not include an obligation to construct Mountain Springs Rd. as required by the Mountain Springs Phase 2 development.

*Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **RS7.5**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-Family Detached (210)	40.8	4.94 D	201 L	1977	151	201

*See note below

*Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **SP-MR**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Single-Family Detached (210)	-	-	23 L	221	18	24

*See note below

*Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **SP-MR**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Res. Condo/Townhome (230)	-	-	195 U	1150	89	104

*See note below

*Traffic changes between maximum: **RS7.5** and proposed **SP-MR**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	-606	-44	-73

*Note: This table reflects the original SP submittal, which requested the same number of total units (219 units) as the current proposal, but included 32 single-family lots. The current proposal does not include single-family lots

METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

Projected student generation 25 Elementary 18 Middle 16 High

Schools Over/Under Capacity Students would attend Mt. View Elementary School, Kennedy Middle School, or Antioch High School. Mt. View Elementary and Kennedy Middle have been identified as being over capacity by the Metro School Board. There is no capacity for elementary and middle school students within the cluster.

The fiscal liability for 25 elementary students is \$500,000. The fiscal liability for 18 middle school students is \$423,000. This data is for informational purposes only and is not a condition of approval. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated October 2010.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions of the zone change request. The proposed SP meets the intent of the NG policy for design principles and housing diversity.

CONDITIONS

1. A pedestrian connection shall be provided from the SP development to the adjacent, proposed school site.
2. Building frontages shall clearly identify the primary pedestrian entrance toward the street, which shall be separate from vehicular entrances. Pedestrian entryways shall be 100 percent visible, oriented to and accessible from street/pedestrian plaza/parks. All primary public entrances shall have a paved connection to the project's sidewalk network.
3. To promote architectural diversity among individual townhouse units, the front facade design of individual residential units shall be varied within each grouping of attached units.
4. Prior to building permit approval, the conditions of approval for BL2003-1383 shall be satisfied for the project site and documentation shall be submitted to Metro Planning Department.
5. Prior to final site plan approval, obtain letter from Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation or a botanical inventory from a qualified biologist stating if endangered species exist on this site. Presence of endangered species may require modification to the plan.
6. The offsite stormwater regional facility must be constructed along with this development.
7. All construction traffic for this project is to be routed through Mountain Springs Drive to Murfreesboro Rd or other access but not through the Summerfield Development.
8. The roundabout on Mountain Springs Drive shall be designed per NCHRP Report 672.
9. The extension of Ashford Trace shall be shown as a collector to the future Southeast arterial.
10. Mountain Springs Drive should be shown and labeled as extending in the future through the Belz Commercial Tract and intersecting with the Southeast arterial.
11. Guest parking off the alley shall be provided for units 172-208.
12. Construct private streets per Medium street standard drawing ST-252 to accommodate the anticipated on-street parking. Private streets as currently shown do not scale correctly.
13. All private streets and alleys shall connect to the public street using a concrete ramp PW-ST324.
14. Construct cul-de-sacs per standard drawing ST-331.
15. Identify dumpster locations and plan for recycling collection. Solid waste plan must be approved by the Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division.
16. Identify mail service delivery plan (kiosk location / parking)
17. Offsite traffic mitigations may be required, and will be determined with the final SP plan at the time of development but will not include an obligation to construct Mountain Springs Rd. as required by the Mountain Springs Phase 2 development.

18. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the RM6 zoning district for townhouse buildings as of the date of the applicable request or application.
19. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.

Mr. Johnson presented the staff recommendation of approval with conditions.

Councilmember Coleman spoke in support of staff recommendation.

Councilmember Gotto asked if there is a donation of land for a school with this.

Councilmember Coleman stated yes, 10 acres were given for a school and 17 acres given for a park.

Mr. Gee asked if anyone in attendance was in opposition.

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Gee seconded the motion to approve staff recommendation. (8-0)

Resolution No. RS2011-46

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2009SP-025-001 is APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)

Conditions of Approval:

1. A pedestrian connection shall be provided from the SP development to the adjacent, proposed school site.
2. Building frontages shall clearly identify the primary pedestrian entrance toward the street, which shall be separate from vehicular entrances. Pedestrian entryways shall be 100 percent visible, oriented to and accessible from street/pedestrian plaza/parks. All primary public entrances shall have a paved connection to the project's sidewalk network.
3. To promote architectural diversity among individual townhouse units, the front facade design of individual residential units shall be varied within each grouping of attached units.
4. Prior to building permit approval, the conditions of approval for BL2003-1383 shall be satisfied for the project site and documentation shall be submitted to Metro Planning Department.
5. Prior to final site plan approval, obtain letter from Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation or a botanical inventory from a qualified biologist stating if endangered species exist on this site. Presence of endangered species may require modification to the plan.

6. The offsite stormwater regional facility must be constructed along with this development.
7. All construction traffic for this project is to be routed through Mountain Springs Drive to Murfreesboro Rd or other access but not through the Summerfield Development.
8. The roundabout on Mountain Springs Drive shall be designed per NCHRP Report 672.
9. The extension of Ashford Trace shall be shown as a collector to the future Southeast arterial.
10. Mountain Springs Drive should be shown and labeled as extending in the future through the Belz Commercial Tract and intersecting with the Southeast arterial.
11. Guest parking off the alley shall be provided for units 172-208.
12. Construct private streets per Medium street standard drawing ST-252 to accommodate the anticipated on-street parking. Private streets as currently shown do not scale correctly.
13. All private streets and alleys shall connect to the public street using a concrete ramp PW-ST324.
14. Construct cul-de-sacs per standard drawing ST-331.
15. Identify dumpster locations and plan for recycling collection. Solid waste plan must be approved by the Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division.
16. Identify mail service delivery plan (kiosk location / parking)
17. Offsite traffic mitigations may be required, and will be determined with the final SP plan at the time of development but will not include an obligation to construct Mountain Springs Rd. as required by the Mountain Springs Phase 2 development.
18. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the RM6 zoning district for townhouse buildings as of the date of the applicable request or application.
19. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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 SP meets the intent of the Neighborhood General (NG) land use policy related to design principles and housing diversity.”

17. 2011SP-001-001

BL2011-846 / CLA1BORNE

CANDLEWOOD HOTEL

Map 096-13, Parcel(s) 154

Council District 15 (Phil Claiborne)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request to rezone from CS to SP-C zoning for property located at 2724 Elm Hill Pike, approximately 900 feet west of Donelson Pike (1.28 acres), to permit hotel and restaurant uses, requested by T-Square Engineering, applicant, Signature Hospitality, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Rezone to permit a hotel with up to 81 rooms

Preliminary SP A request to rezone from Commercial Service (CS) to Specific Plan – Commercial (SP-C) zoning for property located at 2724 Elm Hill Pike, approximately 900 feet west of Donelson Pike (1.28 acres), to permit hotel and restaurant uses.

Existing Zoning

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

Proposed Zoning

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.

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

DONELSON-HERMITAGE COMMUNITY PLAN

Existing Policy

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. CMC policy allows for highway-oriented commercial land uses. The proposed hotel use is located near the intersection of two arterial streets, approximately one half mile north of Interstate 40. The proposal is consistent with design principles within CMC policy in providing a basic level of pedestrian access and landscaping.

PLAN DETAILS The SP proposes a four-story, 81-room hotel placed at the rear of the site, which slopes down toward the front of the site along Elm Hill Pike. The SP includes one direct driveway access to connect the site to Elm Hill Pike. The proposed surface and structured parking meets Zoning Code requirements for the number of parking spaces for the proposed hotel.

ANALYSIS An SP is proposed for this hotel project in order to allow a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.815 which exceeds the 0.6 FAR permitted under the CS zoning district currently in place. The additional FAR will allow for a fourth floor. Although the proposed FAR does not comply with the existing CS zoning, the building height gained through the additional FAR would be permitted by the CS zoning district in this location. The increased FAR allowance is consistent with the CMC land use policy and will not result in development that is out-of-character with its surroundings.

In addition to the hotel use, the SP proposes restaurant uses. Because the location and size of the restaurant is not shown on the site plan, the future incorporation of a restaurant onto the site as a primary use will require an amendment to the SP, so that the location of the restaurant can be identified and additional parking spaces can be provided. A restaurant use, as an accessory use to the hotel, could be added if it is consistent with the approved site plan.

FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION Approved based on no construction being done this application. Any new construction shall meet all fire code requirements for fire hydrant(s) location, fire hydrant flow and fire dept. access.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Provide a Water Quality Concept. Some areas appear to be bypassing the proposed water quality feature.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

- The developer's final construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
- Along Elm Hill Pk, label and dimension right-of-way, show and label edge of pavement, show five foot sidewalk, four foot grass strip, curb & gutter, and a minimum two foot paved shoulder.
- Show driveway ramp per Metro ST-324.
- Contact PW for details on connecting street improvements to the adjacent project.

- An access and parking study is required prior to SP development or, submit parking study and construct a left turn lane on Elm Hill Pk coordinated with adjacent property left turn lane construction and provide adequate sight distance at access.

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **CS**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	1.28	0.6 F	33,454 SF	575	79	117

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **SP-C**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Hotel (310)	1.28	0.815 F	45,441 SF (81rooms)	723	34	42

Traffic changes between maximum: **CS** and proposed **SP-C**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-	+148	-45	-75

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed SP because it is consistent with the CMC land use policy.

CONDITIONS

1. The future incorporation of a restaurant as a primary use within the SP shall require an SP amendment in order to identify the size and location of the restaurant use with the site and to ensure that sufficient parking for the additional use is provided.
2. Comments listed above from Metro Public Works and Metro Stormwater shall be addressed on the corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan.
3. Prior to building permit approval, one of the following shall be completed:
 - An access and parking study shall be approved by Metro Public Works,
 - A parking study shall be approved by Metro Public Works and a left turn lane on Elm Hill Pike shall be constructed that is coordinated with the left turn lane on the adjacent property and that provides adequate sight distance at access.
4. Ground signs within this SP shall be limited to a maximum height of 15 feet. Billboards are prohibited within the SP.
5. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Metro Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the CS zoning district.
6. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Metro 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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 (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-47

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **2011SP-001-001 is APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**
(8-0)

Conditions of Approval:

1. The future incorporation of a restaurant as a primary use within the SP shall require an SP amendment in order to identify the size and location of the restaurant use with the site and to ensure that sufficient parking for the additional use is provided.
2. Comments listed above from Metro Public Works and Metro Stormwater shall be addressed on the corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan.
3. Prior to building permit approval, one of the following shall be completed:
 - An access and parking study shall be approved by Metro Public Works,
 - A parking study shall be approved by Metro Public Works and a left turn lane on Elm Hill Pike shall be constructed that is coordinated with the left turn lane on the adjacent property and that provides adequate sight distance at access.
4. Ground signs within this SP shall be limited to a maximum height of 15 feet. Billboards are prohibited within the SP.
5. For any development standards, regulations and requirements not specifically shown on the SP plan and/or included as a condition of Metro Council approval, the property shall be subject to the standards, regulations and requirements of the CS zoning district.
6. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Metro 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. The corrected copy provided to the Planning Department shall include printed copy of the preliminary SP plan and a single PDF that contains the plan and all related SP documents. 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 SP is consistent with the Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) land use policy.”

Zone Changes

18. 2011Z-001PR-001

3710 N NATCHEZ COURT

Map 133-06, Parcel(s) 256

Council District 16 (Anna Page)

Staff Reviewer: Brian Sexton

A request to rezone from CS to MUL district property located at 3710 N. Natchez Court, approximately 380 feet east of Nolensville Pike (.76 acres), requested by Hee Kyung Shin, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE

APPLICANT REQUEST - one from commercial to mixed-use zoning.

Rezoning A request to rezone from Commercial Service (CS) to Mixed-Use Limited (MUL) zoning for property located at 3710 N. Natchez Court, approximately 380 feet east of Nolensville Pike (.76 acres).

Existing Zoning

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

Proposed Zoning

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

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

SOUTH NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN

Existing Policy

Community Center (CC) CC is intended for dense, predominantly commercial areas at the edge of a neighborhood, which either sits at the intersection of two major thoroughfares or extends along a major thoroughfare. This area tends to mirror the commercial edge of another neighborhood forming and serving as a “town center” of activity for a group of neighborhoods. Appropriate uses within CC areas include single- and multi-family residential, offices, commercial retail and services, and public benefit uses. An Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in these policy areas, to assure appropriate design and that the type of development conforms with the intent of the policy.

Nolensville Pike Corridor Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan

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

Consistent with Policy? Yes. The request to rezone from CS to MUL is consistent with the MH in CC policy. The policy supports multi-family residential and commercial uses. While an associated site plan was not submitted with this rezoning request, the proposed MUL would bring the property more into compliance with the existing character of the community. The property is surrounded by existing residential dwellings and commercial establishments.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION A TIS may be required at development.

Typical Uses in Existing Zoning District: **CS**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	.76	0.483 F	15,990 SF	326	44	97

Typical Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUL**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	.76	0.182 F	6,025 SF	154	20	20

Traffic changes between typical: **CS** and proposed **MUL**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	-9,875 SF	-172	-24	-77

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **CS**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	.76	0.6 F	19, 863 SF	385	52	102

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **MUL**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
General Office (710)	.76	1F	33,105 SF	570	78	116

Traffic changes between maximum: **CS** and proposed **MUL**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	+ 13,242 SF	+185	+26	+14

METRO SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

Projected student generation **3 Elementary** **2 Middle** **2 High**

Schools Over/Under Capacity Students would attend Glenclyff Elementary School, Wright Middle School, and Glenclyff High School. Glenclyff Elementary is as identified as being over capacity. There is no capacity within the cluster for additional elementary students. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated October 2010.

Fiscal Liability The fiscal liability of three new elementary students is \$60,000 (3 X \$20,000 per student). This is only for information purposes to show the potential impact of this proposal, it is not a staff condition of approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the request be approved. The proposed MUL zoning district is consistent with the MH in CC policies. The proposed MUL would bring the property more into compliance with the existing character of the community.

Resolution No. RS2011-48

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **2011Z-001PR-001 is APPROVED. (8-0)**

The MUL zoning district is consistent with the Mixed Housing in Community Center (MH in CC) land use policy.”

J. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Urban Design Overlays: final site plans

19. 2004UD-002-004

VILLAGES OF RIVERWOOD

Map 097, Parcel(s) 014, 016, 158-159

Council District 14 (James Bruce Stanley)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request for a modification to a portion of the Villages of Riverwood Urban Design Overlay for properties located at 3816 Dodson Chapel Road and at Hoggett Ford Road (unnumbered), on the north side of Interstate 40, to modify the front garage setback from the existing standard of a 8 foot minimum setback from the front facade to a 2 foot setback for lots with street access as set forth within Phase 2 of the approved UDO plan, zoned RM9 and MUN and partially located within the Floodplain Overlay District, requested by Ragan-Smith-Associates Inc., applicant, for Beazer Homes, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Modify approved garage setbacks.

Modify Preliminary UDO A request for a modification to a portion of the Villages of Riverwood Urban Design Overlay for properties located at 3816 Dodson Chapel Road and at Hoggett Ford Road (unnumbered), on the north side of Interstate 40, to modify the front garage setback from the existing standard of a 8 foot minimum setback from the front facade to a 2 foot setback for lots with street access as set forth within Phase 2 of the approved UDO plan, zoned RM9 and MUN and partially located within the Floodplain Overlay District.

PROJECT HISTORY In 2004, the preliminary Villages of Riverwood Urban Design Overlay (UDO) site plan was approved by Metro Council. The plan included a total of 1,978 dwelling units and 65,000 square feet of mixed-use development, including the possibility of office and retail, and a future assisted-living facility.

PLAN DETAILS This proposed UDO modification will change the garage setback requirements for street-loaded single-family detached lots within Phase 2 of the UDO. The Villages of Riverwood currently requires a minimum garage setback of 20 feet from the front property line and 8 feet from the front façade of each dwelling. The proposed modification would still require a minimum garage setback of 20 feet from the front property line, but would shorten the required setback to the front façade from 8 feet to 2 feet.

Phase 2 has received final site plan approval for 95 single-family lots. Because all of the lots within Phase 2 are street-loaded, the modification would apply to each lot.

ANALYSIS The applicant cites significant topography within this phase of the UDO and adds that the modification would allow for reduced grading. Garage design standards have been added by the applicant as part of the application to mitigate for the increased prominence of garage doors as a result of the shortened setback requirement. A standard two-car garage door must be designed to appear as two single-width doors. Additionally, the length of the garage façade along the street frontage is limited to a maximum of 20 feet to restrict its prominence.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

- A 20 foot minimum setback for garages is required in order to maintain an accessible path of travel on the public sidewalk.
- To prevent the overhang of vehicles onto the public sidewalk garages should be setback a minimum of 20 feet from the right-of-way (back of sidewalk) and ideally 22 feet to accommodate the popular extended cab pickups and large SUVs.

NES RECOMMENDATION

1. Developer to provide a civil duct and gear (pad/switch) locations for NES review and approve. This shall cover the entire development area.
2. 15-foot public utility easement required adjacent to public r-o-w, where the high voltage conduit is to be installed. (If developer desires the easement reduced then NES conduit system must include spare conduits with concrete encasement).
3. If easements widths less than 20-wide are desired then transformer knuckle easements are required; clearances require a minimum of 25 feet wide by 20 foot deep easements centered on property line.
4. NES is requiring a layout to include the building lot porch setback lines for each new section to be built. This setback will determine the number of conduits and if concrete will be required.
5. NES can meet with developer/engineer upon request to determine electrical service options and easements required.
6. NES needs any drawings that will cover any road improvements to Metro r-o-w that Public Works will require.
7. NES follows the National Fire Protection Association rules; Refer to NFPA 70 article 450-27; and NESC Section 15 - 152.A.2 for complete rules (see NES Construction Guidelines under "Builders and Contractors" tab @ www.nespower.com).
8. NES needs to know if the developer has other options on property next to this area, if so NES needs an overall concept plan.
9. Developer shall provide street lighting locations. This is general services area and should meet Metro's minimum light requirements.
10. If porches are allowed to be constructed beyond the minimum setback limits and into the public utility easements; then the easement will be considered reduced by that much of the easement. Such encroachments may increase the cost of electrical infrastructure to allow for reduced or limited access to equipment. NES reserves the right to enter and to erect, maintain, repair, rebuild, operate and patrol electric power overhead and underground conductors and communications circuits with all necessary equipment reasonably incident thereto including the right to clear said easement and keep the same clear of brush, timber, inflammable structures, buildings, permanent structures, and fire hazards; all over, under, upon, and across the easement as granted on any plats.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions. The applicant has identified issues with site topography in the modification request and has proposed design standards to mitigate for shorter garage setbacks. The proposed modification is consistent with the intent of the UDO.

CONDITION

1. The applicant shall comply with Public Works and NES comments listed above.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-49

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **2004UD-002-004 is APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant shall comply with Public Works and NES comments listed above."

Planned Unit Developments: final site plans

20. 1-72P-002

CHARLOTTE CENTER

Map 102-08, Parcel(s) 117

Council District 20 (Buddy Baker)

Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Charlotte Center Planned Unit Development Overlay located at 3710 Annex Avenue, at the corner of Charlotte Pike and Annex Avenue, zoned CS (13.95 acres), to permit a 4,569 square foot fast-food restaurant, replacing a previously approved 4,179 square foot fast-food restaurant, requested by GBC Design Inc., applicant, for Ufax Estates Inc., owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS INCLUDING UPDATED PUBLIC WORKS CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Revise preliminary plan and final approval to permit a fast food restaurant.

Preliminary Plan Revision A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Charlotte Center Planned Unit Development Overlay located at 3710 Annex Avenue, at the corner of Charlotte Pike and Annex Avenue, zoned Commercial Services (CS) (13.95 acres), to permit a 4,569 square foot fast food restaurant, replacing a previously approved 4,179 square foot fast food restaurant.

Existing Zoning

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

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

REQUEST DETAILS The Charlotte Center Planned Unit Development (PUD) is located on the north side of Charlotte Pike just south of I-40. The existing shopping center on the site consists of 134,578 square feet of floor area. The PUD was originally approved in 1972. It was amended in 2009 to permit 153,231 square feet of retail, restaurant, commercial amusement (indoor), and financial institution uses. A revision for this portion of the PUD was recently approved by the Planning Commission in November of last year. The revision permitted a 4,179 square foot fast food restaurant where a 15,074 food service store (retail) was previously approved.

This request is to increase the floor area of the last approved fast food restaurant from 4,179 square feet to 4,569 square feet and for final site plan approval. As proposed, the total floor area in the PUD will be 142,726 square feet which does not exceed the floor area authorized by the Council approved PUD plan.

The previously approved plan proposed that the restaurant would be on a new individual parcel, which required the construction of a sidewalk along Charlotte Pike. The current request does not propose any new lots, and the restaurant will remain on the same parcel as the rest of the PUD. A sidewalk is not required along Charlotte Pike.

Parking A total of 780 parking spaces are required by zoning for this PUD, but the plan provides only 597 spaces. While the numbers are deficient from what is required by the Zoning Code, a preceding parking study that was required for a revision in 2009 and approved by Public Works concluded that there is sufficient parking on the site. The study indicated that the parking demand and subsequent utilization of the shopping center was very low due to the relatively low parking demand that is generated by the Bowling Alley. The study indicated that the PUD had a weekday parking demand of only 551 spaces and a weekend parking demand of 581 spaces.

While the previous shared parking study had been approved by Public Works, a new study is now required as well as a shared parking agreement. At the time this report was written, the new study and parking agreement has not been submitted for review, and staff is recommending that the request be deferred until the study and agreement have been submitted to and approved by Public Works. It is also important to note that any future changes in use within the development may require a new parking study, and may not be permitted if sufficient parking is not demonstrated.

ANALYSIS The request is within the limits of a revision, and it does not require Council approval. The proposed expansion to the restaurant is minor, and there are no issues with the proposed expansion. While the proposal does not provide the minimum number of parking spaces required for the various uses in the development, a previous parking study indicates that there is sufficient parking. While a previous shared parking study indicates that there is sufficient parking, a new study and

shared parking agreement are required. At the time this report was written the new study and parking agreement had not been submitted for review, and staff is recommending that the request be deferred until the study and agreement has been approved by Public Works. If a shared parking study and agreement are approved by Public Works prior to the February 24, 2011, meeting, then staff will recommend that the request be approved with conditions.

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION

1. The developer's final construction drawings shall comply with the design regulations established by the Department of Public Works. Final design may vary based on field conditions.
2. Need parking and access study.
3. If sidewalks are required by Metro Codes or Planning:
 - a. Call out edge of pavement along Charlotte Pike.
 - b. Show 8 foot sidewalk per Metro ST-210, with 6 foot grass strip.
 - c. Show curb and gutter per Metro St-200.
 - d. Show driveway ramp per Metro ST-324.
 - e. Include details.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Approve with conditions:

1. Provide Manhole weir calculations.
2. Provide \$800.00 grading permit fee payable to Metro Water Services.
3. Provide Dedication of Easement documents.
4. Provide Maintenance Agreement.
5. Provide recording fees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends that the request be deferred until such time that a shared parking study and shared parking agreement have been approved by Public Works. If a shared parking study and agreement are approved by Public Works prior to the February 24, 2011, meeting then staff recommends that the request be approved with conditions as it is consistent with all zoning provisions.

CONDITIONS

1. Prior to building permit approval, a shared parking agreement shall be approved by Public Works and legally recorded with the Register of Deeds.
2. A revised shared parking study may be required with any change of use within the shopping center. Use changes may not be permitted if sufficient parking cannot be provided.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services.
4. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metro Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metro Planning Commission.
8. The PUD final site plan as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans may require reapproval by the Planning Commission and/or Metro Council.

9. A corrected copy of the PUD final site plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the issuance of any permit for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the final PUD site plan within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-50

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **1-72P-002 is APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, including updated Public Works conditions. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to building permit approval, a shared parking agreement shall be approved by Public Works and legally recorded with the Register of Deeds.
2. A revised shared parking study may be required with any change of use within the shopping center. Use changes may not be permitted if sufficient parking cannot be provided.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services.
4. Prior to the issuance of any permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metro Department of Public Works for all improvements within public rights of way.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metro Planning Commission.
8. The PUD final site plan as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans may require reapproval by the Planning Commission and/or Metro Council.
9. A corrected copy of the PUD final site plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the issuance of any permit for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the final PUD site plan within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission."

21. 220-77P-001

POINT PLACE BUSINESS PARK

Map 096-13, Parcel(s) 195

Council District 14 (James Bruce Stanley)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request for a revision to the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Point Place Commercial Planned Unit Development located at 443 Allen Road, approximately 610 feet east of Donelson Pike, zoned CL (6.09 acres), to permit the addition of 75 parking spaces, requested by Perry Engineering LLC, applicant, for Point Place LLC, owner.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST - Permit alterations to site for additional parking.

Revise Preliminary PUD and Final Site Plan A request for a revision to the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Point Place Commercial Planned Unit Development located at 443 Allen Road, approximately 610 feet east of Donelson Pike, zoned Commercial Limited (CL) (6.09 acres), to permit the addition of 75 parking spaces.

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

PLAN DETAILS The Point Place Business Park PUD is located 600 feet to the east of the intersection of Donelson Pike and Old Elm Hill Pike in the Donelson-Hermitage area. The PUD consists of two adjacent properties and houses an office building on each lot. The proposed PUD revision will add additional parking at the rear of the PUD.

This preliminary PUD revision adds approximately 75 parking spaces to the northeast corner of the site. The location of the proposed parking area is at the rear of the site adjacent to residential property zoned R10. The Zoning Code requires a Type "C" landscape buffer along property lines shared with residential zoning. The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan that fulfills Zoning Code requirements for a Type C landscape buffer.

The PUD is accessed through driveway connections from both Donelson Pike and Old Elm Hill Pike. Internal cross-access between properties and parking lots is available.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION

1. Provide Detention Agreement, Long Term Maintenance Plan, Dedication of Easement form, and recording fees.
2. Provide Grading Permit fee (\$805) and NOC.
3. For the initial erosion control measure sheet, add check dams to existing ditch. Add permanent outlet protection (and detail) to all headwalls.
4. Provide updated (and all) civil details (headwalls, WQ3, etc.) and remove any details not being used (Aqua Swirl, Stormtech, etc.).
5. For the underground detention systems, add access manholes / inspection ports.
6. The inverts for OS2 (plan view vs. section view) don't match. Also double check the invert elevations for WQ8 (doesn't match).

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends approval with conditions. The proposed changes are consistent with the approved plan.

CONDITIONS

1. Comments listed above from Metro Stormwater shall be satisfied prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.
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. Prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services.
5. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metro Planning Commission.
6. The PUD final site plan as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans may require reapproval by the Planning Commission and/or Metro Council.
7. A corrected copy of the PUD final site plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the issuance of any permit for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the final PUD site plan within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission.

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-51

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **220-77P-001 is APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. (8-0)**

Conditions of Approval:

1. Comments listed above from Metro Stormwater shall be satisfied prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

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. Prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, confirmation of PUD final site plan approval shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management division of Water Services.
5. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metro Planning Commission.
6. The PUD final site plan as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans may require reapproval by the Planning Commission and/or Metro Council.
7. A corrected copy of the PUD final site plan incorporating the conditions of approval by the Planning Commission shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the issuance of any permit for this property, and in any event no later than 120 days after the date of conditional approval by the Planning Commission. Failure to submit a corrected copy of the final PUD site plan within 120 days will void the Commission's approval and require resubmission of the plan to the Planning Commission."

Subdivision: Final Plats

22. 2011S-003-001

VAULX LANE SUBDIVISION

Map 118-02, Parcel(s) 034

Council District 17 (Sandra Moore)

Staff Reviewer: Greg Johnson

A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 2500 Vaulx Lane, approximately 200 feet north of Inverness Avenue (0.6 acres), zoned R10, requested by George and Lillie Lester, owners, Campbell, McRae & Associates Surveying, Inc., surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICANT REQUEST -Final plat to create two lots

Final Plat A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 2500 Vaulx Lane, approximately 200 feet north of Inverness Avenue (0.6 acres), zoned One and Two Family Residential (R10).

CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS N/A

PLAN DETAILS

Final Plat

The applicant requests final plat approval for a two lot subdivision on Vaulx Lane. Neither of the two proposed lots meets lot comparability standards for lot frontage and must be considered by the Planning Commission.

A sidewalk is required on one of the two proposed lots. A note has been added to the plat requiring construction of a sidewalk prior to issuance of a building permit.

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

Lot comparability analysis was performed and yielded the following information:

Error! Objects cannot be created from editing field codes.

The proposed lots have the following areas and frontage lengths:

- Lot 1: 13,357 square feet, 52.5 feet of frontage
- Lot 2: 12,663 square feet, 52.5 feet of frontage

Based on the lot comparability analysis, the frontage length of each lot is approximately two feet shorter than required.

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

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

“Where the proposed lot sizes are consistent with the adopted land use policy that applies to the property.”

The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the adopted land use policy that applies to the area. The land use policy is Residential Medium density (RM), which allows for residential densities of four to nine dwelling units per acre. Construction of a duplex on each proposed lot would yield less than seven units per acre.

Capacity fees The applicant has not paid required capacity fees to Metro Water Services. Planning staff cannot recommend approval of the subdivision until these capacity fees have been paid and plat approval has been received from Water Services.

STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION Final plat approved

PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION No exception taken

WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION We must hold our review until required capacity fees are paid.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION Staff recommends disapproval. With approval from Metro Water Services, staff recommends approval of the subdivision because the proposed lot sizes are consistent with the Residential Medium density (RM) land use policy.

Mr. Johnson presented the staff recommendation of approval with conditions.

Mr. Clifton out at 7:19 p.m.

Mr. Clifton in at 7:21 p.m.

Tarrick Love, 1709B 5th Ave N., representing applicant, spoke in support of staff recommendation.

Unknown name, 2403 Cisco Street, spoke in support of staff recommendation stating that this will bring it into consistency with the rest of the neighborhood.

Edwina Toms, 2401 Cisco Street, spoke against staff recommendation stating concerns with overcrowding, changing of the neighborhood character, number of proposed dwellings, increased traffic flow, and effect of surrounding property values.

Ronald Toms, 2401 Cisco, spoke against staff recommendation.

Frankin Gooch, 877 Hillview Heights, spoke against staff recommendation.

Heraldo Falconi, 2416 Vaulx Lane, would like a 60' setback to keep with the character of the neighborhood, has concerns with increased traffic.

Iris Winters, 2420, Vaulx Lane, stated concerns with the integrity of the property and requested a setback consistent with the other houses.

Mr. Clifton moved and Councilmember Gotto seconded the motion to close the Public Hearing. (7-0)

Mr. Dalton asked for clarification on the setback for this property and how does it compare to the other properties.

Mr. Johnson clarified.

Ms. LeQuire asked applicant for intended setback.

Mr. Love stated that the plan is to start the setback at 70' and clarified that none of the properties will be three stories.

Ms. LeQuire asked if the applicant had considered any buffering at the rear or sides of the property.

Mr. Love stated that there would be a 6' fence at the rear of the property and there would be one entrance in and one out at the front of the property.

Mr. Gee stated that this is appropriate request.

Mr. Clifton stated that the commission should probably approve it based on staff's analysis and the commission's basic commitment to more dense neighborhoods where appropriate.

Chairman McLean noted that the commission can request a minimum setback of 60' or 70'.

Ms. Escobar stated that she would approve with 60' setback.

Councilmember Gotto inquired if the commission can restrict to no more than two stories.

Legal stated that the zoning is what it is and those type of restrictions can't be made.

Councilmember Gotto moved and Mr. Escobar seconded the motion to approve staff recommendation and added that the MPC wishes to see the setback of these structures consistent with what is there currently and also the structures be no more than two stories. (7-0)

Resolution No. RS2011-52

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that **2011S-003-001** is **APPROVED**, including an exception to Section 3.5 of the Subdivision Regulations for lot comparability and recommend to the applicant that the setback be consistent with the other structures north of the property on Vaulx Lane and that all structures be a maximum of two stories in height. (7-0)"

K. OTHER BUSINESS

23. **Contract between TDOT and the MPC on behalf of the MPO for Transportation Planning and Coordination: The amendment will increase the contract amount with additional Federal Highway Administration Metropolitan Planning grant funds made available to the MPO by Congress through the US DOT and TDOT.**

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-53

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that a contract between TDOT and the MPC on behalf of MPO for Transportation Planning and Coordination is **APPROVED. (8-0)**"

- 24. Contract between MPC on behalf of MPO and RPM Transportation Consultants. The amendment extends the contract term to 24 months with two three month extensions for a total term of 30 months.**

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-54

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that an amendment to the contract between MPC on behalf of MPO and RPM Transportation Consultants is **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

- 25. Contract amendment for Tifinie Adams, Joni Priest, and Rebecca Ratz.**

Approved (8-0), Consent Agenda

Resolution No. RS2011-55

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the employee contracts amendments for Tifinie Adams, Joni Priest, and Rebecca Ratz are **APPROVED. (8-0)**”

- 26. Historical Commission Report**
- 27. Board of Parks and Recreation Report**
- 28. Executive Committee Report**
- 29. Executive Director Report**
- 30. Legislative Update**
-

L. MPC CALENDAR OF UPCOMING MATTERS

February 24, 2011

MPC Meeting
4 pm, Sonny West Conference Center
Public Hearing: Major and Collector Street Plan

March 10, 2011

MPC Meeting
4 pm, Sonny West Conference Center
Text Amendment: alley sign standards for commercial districts

March 24, 2011

MPC Meeting
4 pm, Sonny West Conference Center
Public Hearing: proposed amendments to the Subdivision Regulations

April 14, 2011

MPC Meeting
4 pm, Sonny West Conference Center
Capital Budget

April 28, 2011

MPC Meeting
4 pm, Sonny West Conference Center
Primrose UDO
Receive consultants' preliminary comments on Downtown Sign Standards

M. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary