



# METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Thursday, March 27, 2014**

**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:  
Stewart Clifton, Vice Chair  
Hunter Gee  
Phil Ponder  
Greg Adkins  
Andree LeQuire  
Councilmember Walter Hunt

Staff Present:  
Rick Bernhardt, Executive Director  
Doug Sloan, Deputy Director  
Jennifer Carlat, Assistant Planning Director  
Kelly Adams, Administrative Services Officer III  
Craig Owensby, Public Information Officer  
Bob Leeman, Planning Manager II  
Kathryn Withers, Planning Manager II  
Carrie Logan, Planner III  
Anita McCaig, Planner III  
Jason Swaggart, Planner II  
Duane Cuthbertson, Planner II  
Tifinie Capehart, Planner II  
Melissa Sajid, Planner II  
Andrew Collins, Planner II  
Ben Miskelly, Planner I

Commissioner's Absent: Jim McLean, Lillian Blackshear, Derrick Dalton, Jeff Haynes

**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, nine of whom are appointed by the Metro Council and one of whom serves as the mayor's representative. 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](http://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](http://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](mailto: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/mpc\\_mtg\\_presentation\\_tips.pdf](http://www.nashville.gov/mpc/pdfs/mpc_mtg_presentation_tips.pdf) and our summary regarding how Planning Commission public hearings are conducted at [www.nashville.gov/mpc/docs/meetings/Rules\\_and\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.nashville.gov/mpc/docs/meetings/Rules_and_procedures.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 Commission's Rules and Procedures, at [www.nashville.gov/mpc/pdfs/main/rules\\_and\\_procedures.pdf](http://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 [josie.bass@nashville.gov](mailto:josie.bass@nashville.gov). For Title VI inquiries, contact Tom Negri, interim executive director of Human Relations at (615) 880-3374. For all employment-related inquiries, call 862-6640.

# MEETING AGENDA

---

## A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m.

## B. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Adkins moved and Mr. Gee seconded the motion to adopt the agenda. (6-0)

## C. APPROVAL OF MARCH 13, 2014 MINUTES

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Adkins seconded the motion to approve the March 13, 2014 minutes. (6-0)

## D. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Council Lady Karen Johnson spoke in favor of Item 9 and expressed appreciation for the work that staff has done in moving the bill forward.

Councilman Holleman spoke regarding Item 5 and stated that the neighbors in Nevada Heights are concerned with losing their view and would like to see the larger buildings up to the Charlotte corridor.

## E. OTHER BUSINESS: ITEM 13- NashvilleNext (Resource Team Update)

Ms. Carlat presented the NashvilleNext Resource Team Update.

## F. OTHER BUSINESS: ITEM 14- Presentation of 4000 Hillsboro Pike in the Green Hills UDO

Mr. Collins presented the 4000 Hillsboro Pike portion of the Green Hills UDO.

---

## G. ITEMS FOR DEFERRAL / WITHDRAWAL

---

### 2. 2014CP-000-001

LUPA TRANSLATION TO CCM POLICIES

### 12. Contract between the Nashville-Davidson County Metropolitan Planning Commission on behalf of the Nashville Area MPO and Gresham, Smith and Partners for Professional Services related to the Conduct of the State Route 109 Access Management Study.

Mr. Ponder moved and Mr. Gee seconded the motion to approve the Deferred Items. (6-0)

---

## H. CONSENT AGENDA

---

**NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC:** Items on the Consent Agenda will be voted on at a single time. No individual public hearing will be held, nor will the Commission debate these items unless a member of the audience or the Commission requests that the item be removed from the Consent Agenda.

### 1. 2014S-037-001

507 MOORE AVENUE

### 3a. 2014CP-010-001

GREEN HILLS MIDTOWN PLAN AMENDMENT

### 3b. 2014SP-014-001

HAWKINS STREET TOWNHOMES

### 4. 2014Z-005TX-001

**6. 2014Z-020PR-001**

**7. 2014Z-022PR-001**

**8. 2005P-009-001**  
AUTO MASTERS (AMENDMENT)

**10. 2014NHC-002-001**  
EASTWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION OVERLAY EXPANSION

**16. Accept the Director's Report and Approve Administrative Items**

Mr. Gee moved and Mr. Adkins seconded the motion to approve the Consent Agenda. (6-0)

---

## I. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

---

The items below were deferred from a previous Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant or by the commissioners. For Community Plan Policy items, see H. Community Plan Policy Changes and Associated Cases.

### **Subdivision: Final Plats**

#### **1. 2014S-037-001**

##### **507 MOORE AVENUE**

Map 105-07, Parcel(s) 351

Council District 17 (Sandra Moore)

Staff Reviewer: Melissa Sajid

A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 507 Moore Avenue, approximately 210 feet west of Rains Avenue, zoned R6 (0.34 acres), requested by Dale & Associates, applicant; Lynne Wallace, owner.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve with a condition.**

##### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Create two lots.**

##### Final Plat

A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 507 Moore Avenue, approximately 210 feet west of Rains Avenue (.34 acres), zoned One and Two Family Residential (R6).

##### **EXISTING ZONING**

One and Two-Family Residential (R6) requires a minimum 6,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 7.71 dwelling units per acre including 25 percent duplex lots. *R6 would permit a maximum of 2 duplex lots for a total of 4 units.*

##### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

N/A

##### **PLAN DETAILS**

The proposed final plat is for a two lot infill subdivision for property located on Moore Avenue near Rains Avenue. The existing lot is 14,800 square feet and has 100 feet of frontage on Moore Avenue and is proposed to be subdivided into two lots with the following areas and street frontages:

- Lot 1: 8,330 Sq. Ft., (0.19 Acres), and 60 Ft. of frontage;
- Lot 2: 6,470 Sq. Ft., (0.15 Acres), and 40 Ft. of frontage.

The plan indicates that the existing house on Lot 1 is to remain, which impacts the proposed lot configuration so that the existing house will meet the required 5 foot side setback. If the property line between Lots 1 and 2 were shifted to create two rectangular lots, Lot 2 would not meet the minimum lot size for R6. Per the "flag lot" definition in the Subdivision Regulations, Lot 2 would not be considered a flag lot since the "pole" of the flag is wide enough to have a building built on it.

##### Infill Compatibility

Section 3-5.3 of the Subdivision Regulations outlines the criteria for reviewing infill subdivisions located within the Neighborhood General policy area. Staff reviewed the final plat against the following criteria as required by the Subdivision Regulations:

- A. Zoning Code: Both lots meet the minimum standards of the R6 zoning district.
- B. Street Frontage: Both lots have frontage on a public street.
- C. Agency Review: All review agencies recommend approval.
- D. Special Policy: The subject property does not fall under a special policy.

In addition to the criteria in Section 3-5.3, the subdivision must be reviewed with regard to the access requirements set forth in Section 3-5.5 of the Subdivision Regulations, which applies to all infill subdivisions. Section 3-5 states that all infill lots shall

have rear or side access via an existing alley. The intent of the Subdivision Regulation requirement for alley access is to manage the number of driveways and the points of vehicular conflict along a residential street as well as mitigate the intensity of driveways within residential front yards. Moore Avenue is located in an area that has a grid street system and accommodates through traffic. An existing improved alley is located to the rear of the subject property and the applicant proposes rear alley access for Lot 2. An existing driveway, however, is located to the east of the existing house on Lot 1.

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

- Approved with conditions.
- 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.
- If sidewalks are required, then they should be shown on the plan per Public Works standards with the required curb and gutter and grass strip.

**STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

**WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION**

Approved

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the subdivision with conditions and disapproval without all conditions.

**CONDITION**

1. Prior to plat recordation, the lot area shown in the upper right corner of the final plat shall be corrected.
2. Prior to plat recordation, Note 21 shall be removed.
3. Add note: With redevelopment of Lot 1, the access to Lot 1 shall be relocated and limited to rear access from the existing improved alley only.

Approved with a condition (6-0), Consent Agenda

**Resolution No. RS2014-78**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014S-037-001 is **Approved with a condition. (6-0)**

**CONDITION**

1. Prior to plat recordation, the lot area shown in the upper right corner of the final plat shall be corrected.
2. Prior to plat recordation, Note 21 shall be removed.
3. Add note: With redevelopment of Lot 1, the access to Lot 1 shall be relocated and limited to rear access from the existing improved alley only.

---

## **J. COMMUNITY PLAN POLICY CHANGES AND ASSOCIATED CASES**

---

The Planning Commission will make the final decision on a Community Plan Amendment. The Commission will make a recommendation to the Metro Council on any associated cases(s). The Metro Council will make the final decision to approve or disapprove the associated case(s).

### **Community Plan Amendments**

#### **2. 2014CP-000-001**

**LUPA TRANSLATION TO CCM POLICIES**

Council District

Staff Reviewer: Anita Mccaig

A request to amend the Bordeaux-Whites Creek Community Plan: 2003 Update, Donelson-Hermitage-Old Hickory Community Plan: 2004 Update, Downtown Community Plan: 2007 Update, East Nashville Community Plan: 2006 Update, Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan: 2005 Update, Joelton Community Plan: 2003 Update, Parkwood-Union Hill Community Plan: 2006 Update, South Nashville Community Plan: 2007 Update and the Southeast Community Plan: 2004 Update by translating LUPA (Land Use Policy Application) land use policies to CCM (Community Character Manual) land use policies, requested by the Metro Planning Department, applicant.

**Staff Recommendation: Defer to the April 10, 2014, Planning Commission meeting.**

**The Metropolitan Planning Commission deferred 2014CP-000-001 to the April 10, 2014, Planning Commission meeting. (6-0)**

### 3a. 2014CP-010-001

#### GREEN HILLS MIDTOWN PLAN AMENDMENT

Map 093-13, Parcel(s) 359  
Council District 19 (Erica S. Gilmore)  
Staff Reviewer: Tifinie Capehart

A request to amend the Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan to change the Land Use Policy from Single-Family Detached in Neighborhood General (SFD in NG) Policy to T4 Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE) Community Character Policy for property located at 1209 Hawkins Street, approximately 270 feet west of 12th Avenue South, (0.19 acres), requested by Dale & Associates, applicant; Frank Maxwell, III, owner (also see Specific Plan case # 2014SP-014-001).

**Staff Recommendation: Approve**

#### APPLICANT REQUEST

**Amend land use policy from Single-Family Detached in Neighborhood General (SFD in NG) to Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE).**

#### Minor Plan Amendment

A request to amend the Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan to change the Land Use Policy from Single-Family Detached in Neighborhood General (SFD in NG) Policy to Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE) Community Character Policy for property located at 1209 Hawkins Street (0.19 acres).

#### CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS

- Supports a Variety of Transportation Choices
- Provides a Range of Housing Choices
- Supports Infill Development
- Promotes Compact Building Design

The application of Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy on property located at 1209 Hawkins Street would support transportation and housing choices through infill development and compact building design.

The application of Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy in this area would offer future residents choices in transportation; the subject site is located in close proximity to transit routes and stops, bike routes, and has access to existing sidewalk infrastructure.

The Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy also encourages a range of housing options, fostering neighborhoods that support aging-in-place, transit, and successful neighborhood market places. Providing a range of housing types is most often facilitated by infill development. Infill development most often utilizes existing infrastructure and should be designed to provide appropriate transitions in massing, height, and scale. The Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy supports and provides guidance for infill development by encouraging appropriate transitions so that infill development is compatible with existing development. In addition, infill development also considers compact building design with reduced footprints that lessen the impact on surrounding development and green space.

#### GREEN HILLS - MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN

##### Current Policy

Single-Family Detached in Neighborhood General (SFD in NG) policy is intended for single-family housing that varies based on the size of the lot. Detached houses are single units on a single lot. NG policy is intended to meet a spectrum of housing needs with a variety of housing that is carefully arranged, not randomly located.

##### Proposed Policy

Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE) policy is intended to create and enhance urban neighborhoods that are compatible with the general character of existing urban neighborhoods as characterized by their development pattern, building form, land use and associated public realm, with opportunities for housing choice and improved pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connectivity. The resulting development pattern may have higher densities than existing urban neighborhoods and/or smaller lots sizes, with a broader range of housing types providing housing choice. This reflects the scarcity of easily developable land (without sensitive environmental features) and the cost of developing housing.

#### BACKGROUND

The companion to this case, 2014SP-014-001, considers a zone change from R6 zoning district (single and two family, minimum 6,000 square foot lot) to Specific Plan Residential (SP- R) zoning district to allow up to four dwelling units on property located at 1209 Hawkins Street. The proposed SP-R zoning to allow up to four dwelling units is inconsistent with the SFD in NG policy which supports only single-family detached residential land uses; the four dwelling units are proposed to be attached units. The applicant requests a plan amendment to T4 NE so that the proposed zone change will be consistent with the land use policy.

## COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

An early postcard notification announcing the plan amendment was sent to surrounding property owners. A notice communicating the time and date of the Planning Commission Public Hearing was sent to property owners within 600 feet of the subject property.

## ANALYSIS

### Physical Site Conditions

The subject property has minimal topographical constraints; there is some topography at the back of the site near the adjacent alley, but would have minimal impact on the site itself. There is no floodplain or floodway.

### Land Use

The subject property is currently classified single family residential. Land uses adjacent to the subject property include residential (ranging from single-family to residential with four or more units), and institutional. There are also properties classified as vacant in the immediate area.

### Existing Development Pattern

The development pattern is urban, characterized by smaller lots and buildings with shallow to moderate setbacks. Properties in the area are roughly 10,000 square feet (0.23 acres). The subject property shares the southern block face of Hawkins Street between 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue South where building setbacks are generally between 10 and 30 feet in depth.

### Access

The subject property has access from an alley that runs perpendicular to Hawkins Street. At the southern edge of the subject property the alley turns west to run parallel to Hawkins Street providing access to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

### Historic Features

The subject property is not identified as an historic feature. The subject property is located within the Organized Neighbors of Edgehill neighborhood, where there are properties identified as Worthy of Conservation.

### Summary

The application of Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy is appropriate. The application of this policy would encourage diverse residential development in an area that has access to existing transportation choices and infrastructure. Implementation of this policy is best facilitated through compact infill development. Under the guidance of Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy, compact infill development considers context (i.e. appropriate height, massing, scale, and transitions) to facilitate harmonious residential development. Additionally, the site is adjacent to existing Mixed Housing in Neighborhood General policy along a prominent corridor to the east and is bounded by the alley to the west, that can serve as the transition to SFD in NG policy.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Approved (6-0), Consent Agenda

### **Resolution No. RS2014-79**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014CP-010-001 is **Approved. (6-0)**

## 3b. 2014SP-014-001

### HAWKINS STREET TOWNHOMES

Map 093-13, Parcel(s) 359  
Council District 19 (Erica S. Gilmore)  
Staff Reviewer: Melissa Sajid

A request to rezone from R6 to SP-R zoning for property located at 1209 Hawkins Street, approximately 270 feet west of 12th Avenue South (0.19 Acres), to permit up to four residential units, requested by Dale & Associates, applicant; Frank Maxwell, III, owner.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions and disapprove without all conditions.**

### APPLICANT REQUEST

**Preliminary SP to permit four residential units.**

#### Preliminary SP

A request to rezone from One and Two-Family Residential (R-6) to Specific Plan-Residential (SP-R) zoning for properties located at 1209 Hawkins Street, approximately 270 feet west of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South (0.19 acres), to permit up to four residential units.



### **Existing Zoning**

One and Two-Family Residential (R6) requires a minimum 6,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 7.71 dwelling units per acre including 25 percent duplex lots. *R6 would permit a maximum of 1 lots, which would permit a duplex, creating a total of two units.*

### **Proposed Zoning**

Specific Plan-Residential (SP-R) 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 only one residential building type.

### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

- Supports a Variety of Transportation Choices
- Supports Infill Development

The proposed SP supports development that is consistent with the character of surrounding development and creates an opportunity for infill housing. In addition, the site is served by an existing transit route and sidewalk network that runs along 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South which will be supported by the additional density proposed by the SP.

### **GREEN HILLS – MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN**

#### **Existing Structure Plan Policy**

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

#### **Existing Detailed Policy**

Single Family Detached (SFD) is intended for single family housing that varies based on the size of the lot. Detached houses are single units on a single lot.

#### **Proposed Policy**

Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE) is intended to create and enhance urban neighborhoods that are compatible with the general character of existing urban neighborhoods as characterized by their development pattern, building form, land use and associated public realm, with opportunities for housing choice and improved pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connectivity. The resulting development pattern may have higher densities than existing urban neighborhoods and/or smaller lots sizes, with a broader range of housing types providing housing choice. This reflects the scarcity of easily developable land (without sensitive environmental features) and the cost of developing housing.

#### Consistent with Policy?

The proposed SP is not consistent with the existing policy. NG policy supports a mixture of housing types. However, the subject property also falls under the Single-Family Detached (SFD) detailed policy, and the proposed townhome development is not consistent with the special policy.

A community plan amendment (2014CP-010-001) has been requested to change the policy from Single-Family Detached in Neighborhood General (SFD in NG) to Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE). The proposed SP is consistent with the T4 NE policy. The request introduces an additional housing option in the area. In addition, the proposed development is located adjacent to existing transit which will be supported by greater residential density as proposed by the SP.

### **PLAN DETAILS**

The site is located on Hawkins Street to the west of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. The existing structure is proposed to be demolished. Surrounding zoning includes R6, RM20 and ON, and the area is characterized by a variety of land uses. Access to the site is from an existing alley located to the west of the property.

#### Site Plan

The plan proposes four attached residential units. The maximum height of the units will be three stories in 35' to the top of the roof. The site is not contiguous to any existing residential uses; the property abuts an alley to the west and south and an MDHA office building/parking lot to the east.

One unit faces Hawkins Street and will have the appearance of a single-family home at the street. The interior units will front the existing alley, which will be widened to 20 feet. An enclosed solid waste and recycling area is shown at the rear of the property. Architectural images have been included with the preliminary SP and depict two-story brick buildings with craftsman style design elements.

Each unit provides one garage parking space and four additional parking spaces are provided at the rear of the property. Signage will indicate that no parking is permitted in the alley. The SP is in proximity to an existing transit line that runs along

12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and the closest MTA stop is located at the corner of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Hawkins Street. Sidewalks exist along Hawkins Street and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. In addition, a sidewalk is proposed to connect the unit facing Hawkins Street to the existing sidewalk network. Pervious pavement is proposed for all parking areas and driveways throughout the site in order to address stormwater concerns.

**ANALYSIS**

The proposed SP is consistent with the proposed Urban Neighborhood Evolving land use policy, and the plan meets two critical planning goals. If the associated policy amendment is approved, staff recommends approval of the SP with conditions and disapproval without all conditions. If the associated policy amendment is not approved, the staff recommends disapproval.

**FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION**

- N/A

**STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

- Approved

**TRAFFIC & PARKING RECOMMENDATION**

- No exception taken

**WATER SERVICES RECOMMENDATION**

- Approved as Preliminary SP only. Applicant must submit Construction plans and pay Capacity Fees before Final SP is approved.

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

- No exception taken
- 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.

Maximum Uses in Existing Zoning District: **R6**

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)	0.19	7.71 D	2 U*			

\*Based on one two-family unit

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

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Multi-Family Residential (220)	0.19	-	4 U			

Traffic changes between maximum: **R6** and proposed **SP-R**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	+ 2			

**SCHOOL BOARD REPORT**

Projected student generation existing R6 district: 0 Elementary 0 Middle 0 High

Projected student generation proposed SP-R district: 0 Elementary 0 Middle 0 High

The proposed SP-R zoning district would not generate any more students than what is typically generated under the existing R6 district. Students would attend Eakin Elementary School, West End Middle School, and Hillsboro High School. Eakin Elementary School and West End Middle School have been identified as over capacity. There is capacity within the cluster for additional elementary and middle school students. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated September 2013.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with conditions and disapproval without all conditions.

**CONDITIONS**

1. Uses within the SP shall be limited to up to four attached, residential units.
2. 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 RM20-A zoning district as of the date of the applicable request or application.
3. Finished ground floors and porches shall be elevated a minimum of 18” from the abutting average ground elevation.
4. Maximum height of units shall be 2 stories in 35 feet to the top of the roof with the exception of covered access provided to the rooftop terrace and storage areas located on the rooftop terrace.
5. A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by Metro Council shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to or with final site plan application.
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.
8. Add the following note to plan: Ownership for units may be divided by a Horizontal Property Regime or a subdivision with a minimum lot size of 600 square feet.

Approved with conditions and disapproved without all conditions (6-0), Consent Agenda

**Resolution No. RS2014-80**

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014SP-014-001 is **Approved with conditions and disapproved without all conditions. (6-0)**

**CONDITIONS**

1. **Uses within the SP shall be limited to up to four attached, residential units.**
2. **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 RM20-A zoning district as of the date of the applicable request or application.**
3. **Finished ground floors and porches shall be elevated a minimum of 18” from the abutting average ground elevation.**
4. **Maximum height of units shall be 2 stories in 35 feet to the top of the roof with the exception of covered access provided to the rooftop terrace and storage areas located on the rooftop terrace.**
5. **A corrected copy of the preliminary SP plan incorporating the conditions of approval by Metro Council shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to or with final site plan application.**
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.**
8. **Add the following note to plan: Ownership for units may be divided by a Horizontal Property Regime or a subdivision with a minimum lot size of 600 square feet.**

---

## K. RECOMMENDATIONS TO METRO COUNCIL

---

The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Metro Council on the requests below. The Metro Council will make the final decision to approve or disapprove the request.

### **Zoning Text Amendments**

#### **4. 2014Z-005TX-001**

BL2014-715 \ BLALOCK

##### **ZONING APPLICATION FEES & PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE COSTS**

Staff Reviewer: Carrie Logan

A request to amend Chapter 17.40 of Title 17 of the Metropolitan Zoning Code, Zoning Regulations, pertaining to the zoning application fees and public hearing notice costs for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by a member or members of the Metropolitan Council, requested by Councilmember Davette Blalock, applicant.

**Staff Recommendation: Disapprove**

**APPLICANT REQUEST**    **Modify zoning application fee and public hearing requirements for Councilmembers.**

**Text Amendment A request to amend Chapter 17.40 of Title 17 of the Metropolitan Zoning Code, Zoning Regulations, pertaining to the zoning application fees and public hearing notice costs for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by a member or members of the Metropolitan Council.**

---

#### **CURRENT TEXT**

The Zoning Code allows a Councilmember to file an application to amend the official zoning map. Application fees are required, except for rezoning requests initiated by a member or members of council for the purpose of:

1. Rezoning the property from a greater intensity residential use to a lesser intensity residential use (i.e., an "R" district to an "RS" district);
2. Rezoning the property from an office, commercial, or industrial district to a residential or residential single-family district;
3. Rezoning ten or more parcels from a specific plan (SP) district to another base zoning district; or
4. Applying the urban design overlay district, historic preservation district, neighborhood conservation district, or urban zoning overlay district, as provided in Chapter 17.36
5. An amendment to or cancellation of a planned unit development (PUD) district after the planning commission has determined the PUD to be inactive in accordance with Section 17.40.120.H.

All applicants, including Councilmembers, must provide public hearing notice, which includes mailed notices and posted signs for both Planning Commission and Council.

---

#### **PROPOSED TEXT**

This text amendment would waive a Councilmember's application fees for:

1. Applying the urban design overlay district, historic preservation district, neighborhood conservation district, or urban zoning overlay district, as provided in Chapter 17.36;
2. An amendment to or cancellation of a planned unit development (PUD) district after the planning commission has determined the PUD to be inactive in accordance with Section 17.40.120.H.; or
3. For any other rezoning request initiated by a member of council, provided that each member of council shall be entitled to no more than one such fee waiver per calendar year unless the rezoning request is consistent with subsections C.1 or C.2 of this section.

Additionally, this amendment would require the Planning Department to bear the cost and responsibility of preparing public hearing notice.

---

#### **ANALYSIS**

**This ordinance would require** the costs and responsibility for public hearing signs and printing and mailing of written notices regarding the public hearing for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by members of the metropolitan council to be borne by the Planning Department, whenever the proposed amendment to the official zoning map falls within the fee waiver exceptions in Section 17.40.740.C of the metropolitan code. This ordinance also proposes that each member of council shall be entitled to no more than one such fee waiver per calendar year *in addition to* the application of any urban design overlay district, historic preservation district, neighborhood conservation district, or urban zoning overlay district or the amendment to or cancellation of a planned unit development (PUD) district after the planning commission has determined the PUD to be inactive.

**The Planning Department has analyzed the costs for public hearing signs and printing and mailing of written notices for rezonings proposed by members of the Metropolitan Council for the calendar years of 2012 (\$3,635) and 2013 (\$12,700), including costs for paper, printing, postage, signs and staff time. However, recent changes in the housing market**

and overall economy have increased rezoning applications. In **just the first month of 2014, approximately \$10,181** was spent on public hearing signs and **printing and mailing of written notices for rezonings proposed by members of the Metropolitan Council. Additionally, it is anticipated that a substantial increase in the number of rezoning applications would occur if all costs are borne by the Planning Department.**

Assuming that each member of council would want to take advantage by rezoning a large area, the Planning Department has estimated a cost \$63,487.32 for the notices and signs for 40 rezonings.

However, in addition to the one rezoning per member of council, this ordinance would require the Planning Department to bear the costs and responsibility for all overlays initiated by members of council. In January 2014, two of the four cases submitted by members of council were for overlays. Although this is anticipated to increase, using this as a basis to project future cost associated with overlay applications, staff estimates that notices and signs for overlays will be an additional \$24,528.24 per calendar year.

Therefore, the total estimate per calendar year is \$93,015.56.

Additionally, the Metropolitan Clerk's Office would incur additional expenses related to the publication of public hearing notices for each of the rezoning requests and at least one additional administrative staff member would be required to complete the signs and notices (\$28,739, plus benefits).

Fees collected for rezonings go into the General Fund, not to the Planning Department. There is no additional funding proposed with this bill.

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends disapproval.

---

**ORDINANCE NO. BL2014-715**

An Ordinance amending Chapter 17.40 of Title 17 of the Metropolitan Code, Zoning Regulations, pertaining to the zoning application fees and public hearing notice costs for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by a member or members of the Metropolitan Council (Proposal No. 2014Z-005TX-001).

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY:**

Section 1. That Section 17.40.720 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Zoning Regulations, is hereby amended by designating the existing provisions as subsection A., and by adding the following provision as subsection B.:

"B. The planning department shall have the responsibility for the preparation and mailing of written notices regarding the public hearing for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by a member or members that fall within the fee waiver exceptions in Section 17.40.740.C of the metropolitan code. The planning department shall also be responsible for all costs associated with such written notices."

Section 2. That Section 17.40.730 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Zoning Regulations, is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection D.:

"D. The planning department shall have the responsibility for the preparation of public notice signs for amendments to the official zoning map initiated by a member or members that fall within the fee waiver exceptions in Section 17.40.740.C of the metropolitan code. The planning department shall also be responsible for all costs associated with the preparation of such signs."

Section 3. That Section 17.40.740 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Zoning Regulations, is hereby amended by deleting subsection C. in its entirety and substituting with the following new subsection C.:

C. Any rezoning request initiated by a member or members of council for the purpose of:

1. Applying the urban design overlay district, historic preservation district, neighborhood conservation district, or urban zoning overlay district, as provided in Chapter 17.36;
2. An amendment to or cancellation of a planned unit development (PUD) district after the planning commission has determined the PUD to be inactive in accordance with Section 17.40.120.H.; or
3. For any other rezoning request initiated by a member of council, provided that each member of council shall be entitled to no more than one such fee waiver per calendar year unless the rezoning request is consistent with subsections C.1 or C.2 of this section.

Section 4. Be it further enacted, that this ordinance take effect immediately after its passage and such change be published in a newspaper of general circulation, the welfare of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County requiring it.

Sponsored by: Davette Blalock

Disapproved (6-0), Consent Agenda

**Resolution No. RS2014-81**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014Z-005TX-001 is **Disapproved. (6-0)**"

## **Specific Plans**

### **5. 2011SP-009-003**

BL2014-704 \ LANGSTER

#### **ONE C1TY (AMENDMENT # 1)**

Map 092-14, Parcel(s) 039, 079, 083-085, 095, P/O 094

Council District 21 (Edith Taylor Langster)

Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to amend the ONE C1TY Specific Plan district approved for a mixed-use development for properties located at 329, 330, 331, and 336 28th Avenue North, 28th Avenue North (unnumbered) and 3001 Charlotte Avenue, southwest of the intersection of 28th Avenue and Charlotte Avenue (18.73 Acres), to permit temporary improvements, permit additional uses not currently permitted and increase the maximum building height, requested by Civil Site Design Group PLLC, applicant; Nashcam, L.P., owner.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions and disapprove without all conditions.**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**SP amendment to permit temporary improvements, additional uses and additional building height.**

#### Preliminary SP

A request to amend the ONE C1TY Specific Plan district approved for a mixed-use development for properties located at 329, 330, 331 and 336 28th Avenue North, 28th Avenue North (unnumbered) and 3001 Charlotte Avenue, southwest of the intersection of 28th Avenue and Charlotte Avenue (18.73 Acres), to permit temporary improvements, permit additional uses not currently permitted and increase the maximum building height.

#### **Existing Zoning**

Specific Plan-Mixed Use (SP-MU) 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.

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

N/A

#### **GREEN HILLS-MIDTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN**

Urban Mixed-Use Neighborhood (T5 MU) policy is intended to preserve and enhance urban mixed use neighborhoods that are characterized by a development pattern that contains a diverse mix of residential and non-residential land uses, and that are envisioned to remain or develop in a mixed use pattern. T5 MU areas are intended to be among the most intense areas in Davidson County. T5 MU areas include the County's major employment centers, representing several sectors of the economy including health care, finance, retail, the music industry, and lodging.

#### Consistent with Policy?

Yes. The proposed amendment permits two additional uses and permits temporary improvements that are intended to generate excitement about the overall project during its development stage. The amendment will also increase the overall maximum height from 12 stories to 15 stories. The plan will continue to permit an intense mixture of uses including office, retail, restaurants as well as residential. The amendment also does not alter the existing design guidelines that are intended to create a walkable urban development that meets the design intent of the policy.

#### **PLAN DETAILS**

The ONE C1TY Specific Plan was approved by Metro Council on May 20, 2011. It is located near the intersection of Charlotte Pike and the new 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue Connector. Prior to the SP being adopted, the site was zoned for office/residential (ORI) and industrial (IR). Most of the structures on the site have been demolished. A final site plan for an office building (phase 1) has been approved and site development has commenced.

The primary intent of the proposed amendment is to permit temporary improvements and additional uses on a portion of the site along Charlotte Avenue. The site consists of a large building pad from a structure that was previously demolished. Permitted improvements would include driveways, hardscape, parking, utilities, structures and landscaping. These improvements could remain until the development envisioned by the original plan is constructed. The additional uses- commercial amusement, inside and outside- are included to implement the proposed temporary improvements to generate activity on the site prior to the construction of the final proposed development. The plan also calls for the maximum building height to be increased from 12 stories to 15 stories.

#### **FIRE MARSHAL'S OFFICE**

N/A

#### **PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

**Approve with conditions**

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. Revise layout to include the previously approved road network. Remove the angled parking, indicate correct laneage, etc. The road network that is shown is not the road network that was approved with the Final SP for Phase 1 and the associated construction drawings.
3. Prior to use and occupancy of the temporary container buildings, all previously SP conditioned vehicular and pedestrian infrastructure improvements shall be constructed in accordance with approved construction plans.
4. A focused TIS may be required if increased building height results in increased SP square footage.

#### **STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

**Ignore**

#### **WATER SERVICES**

**Approved**

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Approve with conditions and disapprove without all staff conditions

#### **CONDITIONS**

1. Requirements specified in BL2011-891 not specifically being amended under this application shall remain in effect.

Mr. Gee recused himself from Item 5 but remained present for the public hearing and commission discussion.

Tom White spoke in favor of the application, noted that Council Lady Langster is totally supportive of this project, and clarified that it is consistent with policy. He noted that viewshed is a doctrine that cannot be practically applied or used against his client.

Ryan Doyle, ONEC1TY project manager, spoke in favor of the application and expressed interest in continuing the momentum of the Charlotte corridor.

Troy Heithcock, 3300 Nevada Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application due to concerns with decreased property values and loss of his current view. He noted that the taller buildings should be kept closer to Charlotte.

Michael Beecham, 3302 Nevada Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application due to decreased property values and current view loss.

Ted Pins, 3300 Nevada Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application due to decreased property values and view loss.

Jay McDaniel, 296 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue N, spoke in opposition to the application and requested that taller buildings be kept closer to Charlotte.

Tom White clarified that there is a current 12-story matter of right in this area with 15-story rights in many of the surrounding areas.

#### **Vice Chair Clifton closed the Public Hearing.**

Mr. Adkins inquired if there is a specific right to a viewshed.

Mr. Bernhardt clarified that while there are communities that have regulated viewsheds, he is not aware of a generic right to a viewshed.

Mr. Ponder spoke in favor of the application and noted that there isn't much difference between 12 stories and 15 stories.

Councilmember Hunt stated that the homes in Nevada Heights seem to be 75-100' higher than I-440 and doesn't see an issue whether it is 12 stories or 15 stories.

Mr. Bernhardt clarified that staff has not seen a viewshed analysis so they cannot speak to whether or not, or to what degree, either 12 or 15 stories will impact the view.

Ms. LeQuire noted that even if this is approved today, there will still be time for the neighbors and the developer to meet.

**Ms. LeQuire moved and Mr. Adkins seconded the motion to approve with conditions and disapprove without all conditions. (5-0-1) Mr. Gee recused himself.**

**Resolution No. RS2014-82**

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2011SP-009-003 is **Approved with conditions and disapproved without all conditions. (5-0-1)**

**CONDITIONS**

1. Requirements specified in BL2011-891 not specifically being amended under this application shall remain in effect.

## **Zone Changes**

### **6. 2014Z-020PR-001**

BL2014-706 \ TODD

Map 130-03, Parcel(s) 087, 089, 102-104, 107-112, 125 Map 130-04, Parcel(s) 006-012

Map 130-07, Parcel(s) 073-080, 082, 097-099, 143-145, 148

Map 130-08, Parcel(s) 001-002

Council District 34 (Carter Todd)

Staff Reviewer: Duane Cuthbertson

A request to rezone from R20 and RS20 to RS30 zoning for various properties located along Iroquois Avenue, Iroquois Court, and Sunnybrook Drive, west of Estes Road (approximately 40 acres), requested by Councilmember Carter Todd, applicant; various property owners.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Zone change from R20 and RS20 to RS30.**

#### Zone Change

A request to rezone from One and Two-Family Residential (R20) and Single-Family Residential (RS20) to Single-Family Residential (RS30) zoning for various properties located along Iroquois Avenue, Iroquois Court, and Sunnybrook Drive, west of Estes Road (40 acres).

#### **Existing Zoning**

One and Two-Family Residential (R20) requires a minimum 20,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 2.31 dwelling units per acre including 25 percent duplex lots. Nine of the properties are zoned R20.

Single-Family Residential (RS20) requires a minimum 20,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 1.85 dwelling units per acre. 27 of the properties are zoned RS20.

#### **Proposed Zoning**

Single-Family Residential (RS30) requires a minimum 30,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings at a density of 1.23 dwelling units per acre.

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

N/A

#### **MIDTOWN-GREEN HILLS COMMUNITY PLAN**

Residential Low (RL) is intended to conserve large areas of established, low density (one to two dwelling units per acre) residential development. The predominant development type is single-family homes.

#### Consistent with Policy?

Yes. RL policy generally recommends residential densities up to two dwelling units per acre. Within the zone change boundary, development is predominantly single-family with a density of less than two dwelling units per acre.

#### **ANALYSIS**

The current R20 and RS20 zoning district permits two-family and single-family detached residential with a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet. Nine of the lots are zoned R20 while the remaining 27 lots are zoned RS20. The proposed zone change to



RS30 would maintain the existing land use pattern, but require a minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet. All of the lots within the zone change boundary contain over 30,000 square feet of lot area. Under the current zoning, 29 of the existing lots could be subdivided such that the resulting lots would meet the minimum lot size. Under the proposed zoning district, four of the lots could be subdivided so as to meet the minimum lot size. As the area is previously subdivided and predominantly developed, any proposed subdivision would be subject to the current infill subdivision requirements and resulting lots would have to be compatible with the surrounding lots.

Because this zone change meets the minimum density of the RL policy, it is an appropriate zone change for this neighborhood. It is not located within proximity of a transit line and it is not an area that is intended to support higher density in the long term. The zone change will not have an impact on the required bulk standards of the Zoning Code, such as setbacks, impervious surface ratio or parking.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval. The proposed zone change is consistent with Residential Low land use policy of the Midtown - Green Hills Community Plan, will not impact the currently-required bulk standards of the Zoning Code and all subject lots comply with the proposed zoning district.

Approved (6-0), Consent Agenda

#### **Resolution No. RS2014-83**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014Z-020PR-001 is **Approved. (6-0)**

### **7. 2014Z-022PR-001**

Map 083-01, Parcel(s) 462  
Council District 05 (Scott Davis)  
Staff Reviewer: Duane Cuthbertson

A request to rezone from RS5 to RM20-A zoning for property located at 1041 W. Greenwood Avenue, at the northeast corner of W. Greenwood Avenue and Bailey Street (0.26 Acres), requested by Dale & Associates, applicant; D221, LLC, owner.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Zone change from RS5 to RM20-A.**

#### Zone Change

A request to rezone from Single-Family Residential (RS5) to Multi-Family Residential-A (RM20-A) zoning for property located at 1041 W. Greenwood Avenue, at the northeast corner of W. Greenwood Avenue and Bailey Street (0.26 acres).

#### **Existing Zoning**

Single-Family Residential (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. RS5 would permit a maximum of two units.

Multi-Family Residential-A (RM20-A) is intended for single-family, duplex, and multi-family dwellings at a density of 20 dwelling units per acre and is designed to create walkable neighborhoods through the use of appropriate building placement and bulk standards. RM20-A would permit a maximum of five units.

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

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

The proposed RM20-A district will encourage redevelopment of the property at a moderate residential intensity and permit a variety of housing types including multi-family. The RM20-A zoning district will encourage new development in a form that supports a strong pedestrian environment by locating and orienting new buildings toward the streets, managing the number of vehicular access points and minimizing the prominence of parking facilities.

The RM20-A zoning district encourages the development of healthy neighborhoods by supporting a stronger walking environment and supporting the development and viability of nearby commercial areas along the Gallatin Pike corridor as walking destinations.

The density permitted with the proposed RM20-A district increases the supply of housing within an already developed area of Nashville served by existing infrastructure, which allows additional development without burdening Metro with the cost of maintaining new infrastructure. The properties are located in an area served by a network of streets that provide multiple

options for access to nearby commerce, services, employment and recreation which helps mitigate traffic congestion along major arterials and expressways.

Further, the additional residential opportunity within a developed area of Nashville helps to mitigate urban sprawl by relieving the need to build additional housing on the periphery of the county in an existing green-field or in a bordering county.

**EAST NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN**

**Structure Plan Policy**

Community Center (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.

**Detailed Policy**

Mixed Use (MxU) is intended to encourage an integrated, diverse blend of compatible land uses ensuring unique opportunities for living, working, and shopping. Predominant uses include residential, commercial, recreational, cultural, and community facilities. Commercial uses appropriate to MU areas include offices and community, neighborhood, and convenience scale activities. Residential densities are comparable to medium, medium-high, or high density. An 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 RM20-A district is consistent with the Mixed Use in Community Center policy. The proposed zoning district will permit a variety of housing types up to 20 units per acre on the property in a manner that will establish continuity between the commercially zoned corridor to the north and east and the predominantly residential neighborhood to the south and west.

The subject property is currently vacant, but it most recently contained a duplex. This corner lot is surrounded by a variety of land uses included a public school to the west, a CL zoned (with PUD overlay) grocery store to the north, a single-family dwelling to the east and a mix of single and two-family dwellings to the south.

The RM20-A zoning district, while permitting a higher density than the surrounding RS5 zoning district, limits new buildings to a height and scale consistent with that which is permitted on the RS5 zoned lots. Redevelopment of the site will require improvements to the adjacent streetscape and pedestrian environment.

The RM20-A zoning district was established as a design- based zoning district intended to insure the design objectives of the mixed use in community center policy and intended to meet the requirement- in the policy- for a site plan.

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

A traffic study may be required at time of development.

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)	0.26	3.84 D	1 U	10	1	2

Maximum Uses in Proposed Zoning District: **RM20-A**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Multi-Family Residential (210)	0.26	20 D	5 U	48	4	6

Traffic changes between maximum: **RS5** and proposed **RM20-A**

Land Use (ITE Code)	Acres	FAR/Density	Total Floor Area/Lots/Units	Daily Trips (weekday)	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
-	-	-	+ 4	+38	+3	+4

## SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

The proposed RM20-A district would not generate any more students than what would be generated by the current RS5 district.

Any students would attend Hattie Cotton Elementary School, Gra-Mar Middle School, and Maplewood High School. This information is based upon data from the school board last updated September 2012.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as the proposed RM20-A zoning district is consistent with the Mixed Use in Community Center policy.

Approved (6-0), Consent Agenda

### Resolution No. RS2014-84

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014Z-022PR-001 is **Approved. (6-0)**

## Planned Unit Developments

### 8. 2005P-009-001

#### **AUTO MASTERS (AMENDMENT)**

Map 133-01, Parcel(s) 103

Council District 16 (Tony Tenpenny)

Staff Reviewer: Melissa Sajid

A request to amend the Commercial Planned Unit Development Overlay District for property located at 3101 Nolensville Pike, at the southwest corner of Nolensville Pike and McIver Street, zoned CS (1.1 acres), to remove a section of Amendment #1 in Council Bill BL2005-688 that states that "No signage shall be allowed other than that currently in existence and is located upon the brick building", requested by Sign Me Up, applicant; JMM, LLC et al, owners.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions and disapprove without all conditions.**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Amendment of the Automasters Commercial Planned Unit Development Overlay District.**

#### Amend PUD

A request to amend the Commercial Planned Unit Development Overlay District for property located at 3101 Nolensville Pike, at the southwest corner of Nolensville Pike and McIver Street, zoned Commercial Service (CS) (1.1 acres), to remove a section of Amendment #1 in Council Bill BL2005-688 that states that "no signage shall be allowed other than that currently in existence and is located upon the brick building."

#### **Existing Zoning**

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

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

N/A

#### **SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY PLAN**

Community Center (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 to the intent of the policy.

#### Consistent with Policy?

Yes. The base zoning for the subject property is CS, and the property is also subject to a Commercial Planned Unit Development Overlay that places strict limitations on wall signage. The Community Center policy encourages mixed use zoning districts and design principles that enhance the pedestrian landscape. The design principles related to Community Center policy state that "signage along Main Streets should be pedestrian-scaled" and that "signage may be located on the building façade, attached to the façade but overhanging the sidewalk, or may be part of an awning above the ground floor windows." The CC policy supports signage that is appropriate in scale and that is appropriate in form (building-mounted and not a pole sign).

**REQUEST DETAILS**

The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Nolensville Pike and McIver Street. Surrounding zoning includes CS and RS7.5. The zoning of the property is CS and PUD overlay.

History

The Automasters PUD was approved initially by Council in 2005. The PUD allowed vehicular and boat sales, but specifically prohibited the storage of wrecked vehicles as well as other automobile related uses and services. In addition to limiting use, the PUD established design standards that addressed parking, fencing, landscaping, lighting and signage and that aimed to mitigate negative impacts of the permitted uses on adjacent residential properties.

**ANALYSIS**

The applicant requests to remove a condition of the PUD regarding signage. The condition states that “no signage shall be allowed other than that currently in existence and is located upon the brick building.” This condition was added by Metro Council upon approval of the PUD in 2005. A new tenant has moved into the existing building and is requesting to permit two new wall signs. Staff supports removing the previous condition and adding a new condition that limits wall signs to MUL standards so that future wall signs are pedestrian-scaled as recommended by the Community Center policy. The CS zoning district permits wall signs on all façades up to 15% of the façade area upon which the sign is displayed, whereas the MUL zoning district includes the same 15% ratio, but limits the total number of wall signs to two. The applicant has submitted a sign permit application that proposes only two wall signs which both meet the 15% requirement.

Planning staff recommends approval of the request with two conditions.

**FIRE MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION**

- N/A

**STORMWATER RECOMMENDATION**

- N/A

**PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDATION**

- Approved with conditions.
- All other conditions of the PUD shall remain.

**TRAFFIC & PARKING RECOMMENDATION**

- No exception taken

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the PUD amendment with conditions and disapproval without all conditions.

**CONDITIONS**

1. All new signage shall meet the requirements of the MUL district.
2. All other conditions of the PUD included in BL2005-688 shall remain.

Approved with conditions and disapproved without all conditions (6-0), Consent Agenda

**Resolution No. RS2014-85**

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2005P-009-001 is Approved with conditions and disapproved without all conditions. (6-0)

**CONDITIONS**

1. All new signage shall meet the requirements of the MUL district.
2. All other conditions of the PUD included in BL2005-688 shall remain.

**9. 74-79P-009**

BL2012-302 / JOHNSON  
**NASHBORO VILLAGE (SITE 15)**  
Map 135, Parcel(s) 418  
Council District 29 (Karen Y. Johnson)  
Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to amend a portion of the Nashboro Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District for property located at Nashboro Boulevard (unnumbered), at the southwest corner of Nashboro Boulevard and Flintlock Court, zoned R10 (3.46 acres), to permit neighborhood retail uses not to exceed one story, where 23,375 square feet of commercial uses were previously approved, requested by Councilmember Karen Johnson, Thati, Yoga N. et ux & Reddy Chandrasekhar et ux, owner.

**Staff Recommendation: Disapprove as submitted; Approve with amendments in a Substitute Bill.**

**APPLICANT REQUEST**  
**Amend Site 15 of the Nashboro Village PUD**

PUD Amendment

A request to amend Ordinance No. O83-1230, to add conditions to a portion of the Nashboro Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District for property located at Nashboro Boulevard (unnumbered), at the southwest corner of Nashboro Boulevard and Flintlock Court, zoned One and Two Family Residential (R10) (3.46 acres), to permit neighborhood retail uses not to exceed one story, where 23,375 square feet of commercial uses were previously approved.

**Existing Zoning**

Site 15 is zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R10) with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay District. This portion of the PUD overlay allows neighborhood commercial uses. The PUD was approved under COMZO which defined Neighborhood commercial in a PUD as uses "intended to provide for unobtrusive, small convenience shopping in close proximity to or within residential areas."

**Proposed Zoning**

With the amendment to the PUD, the height of retail uses will be limited to one story, certain uses will be prohibited, buffering will be required from the adjacent residential development, and building orientation and parking location will be specified.

**CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

N/A

**ANTIOCH/PRIEST LAKE COMMUNITY PLAN**

T3 Suburban Neighborhood Center (T3 NC) policy is intended to enhance and create suburban neighborhood centers that are compatible with the general character of suburban neighborhoods as characterized by the service area, development pattern, building form, land use, and associated public realm. Where not present, enhance infrastructure and transportation networks to improve pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular connectivity. T3 Suburban Neighborhood Centers are pedestrian friendly areas, generally located at intersections of suburban streets that contain commercial, mixed use, civic and public benefit land uses, with residential present only in mixed use buildings. T3 Suburban Neighborhood Centers serve suburban neighborhoods within a 5 minute drive.

Special Policy 13-T3-NC-04

The existing zoning as applied to this property provides specific zoning entitlements. Any development of this property requires review and approval of a final development plan to ensure consistency with the existing entitlements and conditions prior to obtaining building permits. Development plans may be approved directly or as a revised plan if the proposed development plan is consistent with the approved general development concept and relevant conditions of the existing zoning. In cases where the development plan is not consistent with the approved general development concept and conditions of the existing zoning, an amendment requiring approval by the Metro Council is required. In cases requiring an amendment to the existing zoning conditions, the specific and special land use policies in the Antioch – Priest Lake Community Plan will provide guidance in the review of that amendment.

Below are the special policies that apply to this policy area. Where the Special Policy is silent, the guidance of the T3 Suburban Neighborhood Center policy applies.

Appropriate Land Uses:

Limit land uses to neighborhood retail.

Design Principles:

Building Form (Mass, Orientation, Placement)

- Buildings should not exceed 1 story in height.
- To encourage a pedestrian friendly streetscape, buildings should frame Nashboro Village or Flintlock Court. Where buildings cannot frame the street, other features such as courtyards, patio spaces, and out-door dining areas should frame the street.

Connectivity (Pedestrian and Bicycle)

- Sidewalks and crosswalks should be provided at the intersection of Flintlock Court and Nashboro Village Boulevard to help pedestrians travel safely to and from the center. Additional pedestrian connections may be warranted to facilitate convenient access to and from the commercial center.

Landscaping and Lighting

- A landscape buffer should be provided along the adjacent townhome development.
- Lighting should be pedestrian scaled and projected downward.

Parking

- With exceptional design, one row of parking may be located in front of the building. To create a traditional neighborhood center character, this parking is encouraged to be designed as parallel parking. The remainder of parking should be located behind or beside the building. Where appropriate, ample landscaping should be provided to buffer the view of parking from the street.

### Consistency with Policy

While the proposed amendment is generally consistent with the special policy, it does place restrictions on certain uses that would typically be found in a Neighborhood Center. In developing the special policy, staff worked with the Councilmember, the community and the property owners. The changes are consistent with the policy and are described below.

### **BACKGROUND**

Site 15 is part of the Nashboro Village PUD, which is located between Murfreesboro Pike and Bell Road south of Smith Springs Road in the Antioch area of Davidson County. The PUD was originally approved by the Metro Council in 1979 for a range of housing types, commercial uses, recreational facilities and a day care center. The PUD is divided into 28 development sites and these have been developed in phases over time. Portions of the PUD have been revised and the master plan has been updated a number of times. The main recreational facilities include a golf course, which is the central feature of the PUD, and a tennis facility. There are four sites, including this site that remains undeveloped.

Site 15 was originally approved for 40 stacked flat units and 21 townhouse units. In 1983, the PUD was revised. The commercial development originally proposed for Site 24 across Nashboro Village Boulevard from Site 15 was replaced with 64 stacked flat units. The 23,375 square feet of neighborhood commercial that was previously on Site 24 was moved to Site 15. The previous Zoning Code, COMZO which this PUD was approved under defined Neighborhood commercial in a PUD as uses "intended to provide for unobtrusive, small convenience shopping in close proximity to or within residential areas."

In March 2012, the Councilmember initiated a PUD review of this site and it was found to be inactive. The Planning Commission recommended that Site 15 remain as approved as it was consistent with the policy in place. Further, it was recommended that, when an application is received to develop this portion of the PUD, the Planning Commission direct staff to work with the applicant to ensure that the development will contribute to the overall PUD by providing neighborhood services at an appropriate scale and design that also contributes to the walkability of the area. In the recent update of the Antioch-Priest Lake Community Plan, the special policy for this site incorporated the Planning Commission recommendation.

### **PROPOSED PUD AMENDMENT**

The proposed text amendment is intended to prohibit certain uses on Site 15. It also would provide some design guidelines for new development. As proposed the bill would prohibit:

- a. Adult entertainment including adult bookstore, adult video store, and adult theater
- b. Pawn shop
- c. Flea market and auction house
- d. Transient lodging
- e. Warehousing and storage
- f. Automobile convenience
- g. Liquor store
- h. Bar
- i. Beer and cigarette market
- j. Grocery store
- k. Convenience drive-in market
- l. Automobile repair

Design guidelines in the bill relate to height, streetscape, sidewalks, parking, buffering and building materials.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDED REVISIONS**

As noted above, the proposed amendment is generally consistent with the special policy in place. With that said, *staff does not support prohibiting retail uses since retail is an appropriate neighborhood service.* As written, the amendment would prohibit retail uses. This is due to the fact that several of the uses listed in the bill are not defined in the Zoning Code. This includes "Beer and cigarette market", "Grocery Store" and "Convenience drive-in market" The Zoning Administrator has indicated that since these uses are considered retail, then it would be interpreted that all retail uses would be prohibited. Other uses in the bill that would be prohibited and are not defined in the Zoning Code include "Flea market and auction house" and Transient lodging."

Staff is recommending disapproval of the bill as written but approval with amendments. Following are sections of the bill where staff has recommended revisions. The staff recommended revisions to the bill are shown in **bold and underlined** for additions and ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions.

### **Caption**

It has been determined that the maximum floor area permitted on Site 15 is 23,375 square feet. An ordinance to amend Title 17 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws, the Zoning Ordinance of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, by amending a portion of the Nashboro Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District for a portion of property located at Nashboro Boulevard (unnumbered), at the southwest corner of Nashboro Boulevard and Flintlock Court, zoned R10 (3.46 acres), to permit neighborhood retail uses not to exceed one story, where ~~27,600~~ **23,375** square feet of commercial uses was previously approved, all of which is described herein (Proposal No. 74-79P-009).

### Section 3

1. Uses contained in the commercial development shall be those typically considered to be "neighborhood retail." The following uses shall be prohibited (strikethroughs should be removed from the Bill and bold and underlined should be added to the bill):

- a. Adult entertainment including adult bookstore, adult video store, and adult theater
- b. Pawn shop
- c. ~~Flea market and auction house~~
- d. ~~Transient lodging~~
- e. Warehousing and storage
- f. Automobile convenience
- g. ~~Liquor store~~
- h. **Bar or Nightclub**
- i. ~~Beer and cigarette market~~
- j. ~~Grocery store~~
- k. ~~Convenience drive-in market~~
- l. Automobile repair
- m. **Automobile parking**
- n. **Automobile sales, new**
- o. **Automobile sales, used**
- p. **Automobile services**
- q. **Carwash**

4. Where possible, parking should be located behind or adjacent to the buildings. **One row of parking may be permitted in front if it is demonstrated that the pedestrian-friendly streetscape is not impacted through appropriate, reasonable and properly-located pedestrian connections between the sidewalk and the building.**

5. The commercial center shall be buffered from the adjacent townhome development with ample landscaping **in the form of a Landscape Buffer Yard C.**

6. Buildings shall have accented entrance features and perimeter pedestrian ways **interconnected with existing pedestrian walkways where present. Walkways should be** improved with landscaping to enhance both the building and walking area.

7. Buildings shall be constructed of quality materials, **including brick, stone, cementitious siding,** for reduced maintenance and shall be designed to be compatible with surrounding development. **EIFS shall be prohibited.** Exterior finishes shall be in character with existing Nashboro Village finishes ~~or with other top quality commercial developments in the vicinity.~~

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends disapproval as submitted and approval with revisions in a new substitute bill.

---

### ORDINANCE NO. BL2012-302

An ordinance to amend Title 17 of the Metropolitan Code of Laws, the Zoning Ordinance of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, by amending a portion of the Nashboro Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District for a portion of property located at Nashboro Boulevard (unnumbered), at the southwest corner of Nashboro Boulevard and Flintlock Court, zoned R10 (3.46 acres), to permit neighborhood retail uses not to exceed one story, where 27,600 square feet of commercial uses was previously approved, all of which is described herein (Proposal No. 74-79P-009).

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

Section 1. That Title 17 of the Code of Laws of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, is hereby amended by changing the Official Zoning Map for Metropolitan Nashville and Davidson County, which is made a part of Title 17 by reference, as follows:

By amending a portion of the Nashboro Village Planned Unit Development Overlay District for a portion of property located at Nashboro Boulevard (unnumbered), at the southwest corner of Nashboro Boulevard and Flintlock Court, zoned R10 (3.46 acres), to permit neighborhood retail uses not to exceed one story, where 27,600 square feet of commercial uses was previously approved, being a portion of Property Parcel No. 418 as designated on Map 135-00 of the Official Property Identification Maps of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, all of which is described by lines, words and figures on the plan that was duly considered by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and which is on file with the Metropolitan Planning Department and made a part of this ordinance as though copied herein.

Section 2. Be it further enacted, that the Metropolitan Clerk is hereby authorized and directed, upon the enactment and approval of this Ordinance, to cause the change to be made on Map 135 of said Official Zoning Map for Metropolitan Nashville and Davidson County, as set out in Section 1 of this ordinance, and to make notation thereon of reference to the date of passage and approval of this amendatory Ordinance.

Section 3. Be it further enacted, that the following conditions shall be completed or satisfied, as specifically required:

1. Uses contained in the commercial development shall be those typically considered to be "neighborhood retail." The following uses shall be prohibited:

- a. Adult entertainment including adult bookstore, adult video store, and adult theater
- b. Pawn shop
- c. Flea market and auction house
- d. Transient lodging
- e. Warehousing and storage
- f. Automobile convenience
- g. Liquor store
- h. Bar
- i. Beer and cigarette market
- j. Grocery store
- k. Convenience drive-in market
- l. Automobile repair

2. Building heights shall not exceed one story.

3. The development shall create a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Buildings should either frame Nashboro Boulevard or Flintlock Court or, if not possible, other features such as courtyards, patios, outdoor dining or landscaping shall frame the street. Sidewalks and crosswalks should be provided at the intersection of Nashboro and Flintlock Court to encourage pedestrian access and safety with preferably no traffic signal at this location.

4. Where possible, parking should be located behind or adjacent to the buildings.

5. The commercial center shall be buffered from the adjacent townhome development with ample landscaping.

6. Buildings shall have accented entrance features and perimeter pedestrian ways improved with landscaping to enhance both the building and walking area.

7. Buildings shall be constructed of quality materials for reduced maintenance and shall be designed to be compatible with surrounding development. Exterior finishes shall be in character with existing Nashboro Village finishes or with top quality commercial developments in the vicinity.

Section 4. Be it further enacted, that this Ordinance take effect immediately after its passage and such change be published in a newspaper of general circulation, the welfare of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County requiring it.

Sponsored by: Karen Johnson

Mr. Swaggart presented the staff recommendation of disapproval as submitted; approval with amendments in a Substitute Bill.

Council Lady Johnson spoke in support of staff recommendation.

Gregory Pratchett, 2702 Nashboro Blvd, spoke in favor of the application.

David Kuhlman, 1000 Flintlock Court, stated that regardless of what happens with this property, he does not want liquor or beer purchased and allowed to be taken offsite.

Jamie Hollin, representing property owners, spoke in opposition, asked for disapproval or deferral, and noted that his clients have owned the property less than a year and have not decided what they are going to do with it yet. He stated that they do not want to lose their property rights based on unsubstantial fears of the community or the councilmember. He also noted that his clients have not seen the amendment that the councilmember wants to put on the bill at third reading.

**Vice Chair Clifton closed the Public Hearing.**

Mr. Gee inquired if there are any uses that the bill prohibits that the property owners are opposed to.

Mr. Hollin stated that the property owners were never a party to any discussions with the councilmember, but they would like to have the opportunity to have a conversation with the community as well as the councilmember.

Mr. Adkins noted that the property owners and the community need to have a discussion before the commission makes a recommendation.

Ms. LeQuire stated that the property owners should be allowed to see the bill ahead of time and be able to have discussions with the community.



Mr. Gee moved and Mr. Adkins seconded the motion to defer to the April 10, 2014 Planning Commission meeting with the public hearing remaining open.

**Resolution No. RS2014-86**

“BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 74-79P-009 is **Deferred to the April 10, 2014, Planning Commission meeting with the public hearing remaining open. (6-0)**

## **Neighborhood Conservation Overlays**

### **10. 2014NHC-002-001**

#### **EASTWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION OVERLAY EXPANSION**

Council District 06 (Peter Westerholm)

Staff Reviewer: Jason Swaggart

A request to apply the provisions of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District to various properties located along Benjamin Street, Early Avenue, Fall Street, Franklin Avenue, Granada Avenue, Gentry Avenue, Greenwood Avenue, Manchester Avenue, Matthews Place, N. 12th Street, N. 14th Street, N. 16th Street, Petway Avenue, Pontotoc Avenue, Porter Road, Scott Avenue, Setliff Place, Seymour Avenue, Sharpe Avenue and Sumner Avenue, east of Gallatin Avenue (approximately 120 acres), requested by Councilmember Peter Westerholm, applicant; various property owners.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Apply Neighborhood Historic Conservation Overlay.**

#### Neighborhood Conservation Historic Overlay

A request to apply the provisions of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District to various properties located along Benjamin Street, Early Avenue, Fall Street, Franklin Avenue, Granada Avenue, Gentry Avenue, Greenwood Avenue, Manchester Avenue, Matthews Place, N. 12th Street, N. 14th Street, N. 16th Street, Petway Avenue, Pontotoc Avenue, Porter Road, Scott Avenue, Setliff Place, Seymour Avenue, Sharpe Avenue and Sumner Avenue, east of Gallatin Avenue (approximately 120 acres).

#### **Existing Base Zoning**

Two-Family Residential (R6) requires a minimum 6,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 7.71 dwelling units per acre including 25 percent duplex lots.

Multi-Family Residential (RM20) is intended for single-family, duplex, and multi-family dwellings at a density of 20 dwelling units per acre.

Office/Residential (OR20) is intended for office and/or multi-family residential units at up to 20 dwelling units per acre.

Commercial Neighborhood (CN) is intended for very low intensity retail, office, and consumer service uses which provide for the recurring shopping needs of nearby residential areas.

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

#### **Proposed Overlay**

Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Districts (NHC) are geographical areas which possess a significant concentration, linkage or continuity of sites, buildings, structures or objects which are united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

##### **•Preserves Historic Resources**

The Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District is intended to preserve historic structures within the Eastwood neighborhood through the implementation of development and design guidelines by the Metro Historic Zoning Commission and staff.

#### **EAST NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN**

Neighborhood General (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.

Single-Family Detached (SFD in NG) is intended for single family housing that varies based on the size of the lot. Detached houses are single units on a single lot.

Neighborhood Center (NC) is intended for small, intense areas that may contain multiple functions and are intended to act as local centers of activity. Ideally, a neighborhood center is a "walk-to" area within a five minute walk of the surrounding neighborhood it serves. The key types of uses intended within NC areas are those that meet daily convenience needs and/or provide a place to gather and socialize. Appropriate uses include single- and multi-family residential, public benefit activities and small scale office and commercial uses. An Urban Design or Planned Unit Development overlay district or site plan should accompany proposals in these policy areas, to assure appropriate design and that the type of development conforms with the intent of the policy.

Consistent with Policy?

Yes. All three policies encourage the preservation and protection of historic features. The proposed Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District will aid implementation of the design principles provided for all three applicable land use policies.

**REQUEST DETAILS**

Properties included in the request are contiguous to the existing boundary of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. The properties included in the expansion are confined by Straightway to the north, Porter to the east, Eastland to the south and Gallatin to the west. The housing types included in this request are predominately single-family residential, however, there are other residential types including, but not limited to, two-family and multi-family. The area also includes some nonresidential zoning districts and structures. The Eastwood Conservation Overlay District was established by Metro Council in July of 2007.

***Metro Historical Commission staff recommendation***

**Applicable Ordinance:**

Article III. Historic Overlay Districts

17.36.120.A. Historic Districts Defined. Historic Preservation and Neighborhood Conservation Districts. These districts are defined as geographical areas which possess a significant concentration, linkage or continuity of sites, buildings, structures or objects which are united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development, and that meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. The district is associated with an event that has made a significant contribution to local, state or national history; or
2. It includes structures associated with the lives of persons significant in local, state or national history; or
3. It contains structures or groups of structures that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic value, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4. It has yielded or may be likely to yield archaeological information important in history or prehistory; or
5. It is listed or is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

**Background:**

The neighborhood hosted two general informational meetings on December 10, 2013, and January 27, 2014. These meetings were noticed by the neighborhood's email blast, newsletter, and blog and hand-delivered fliers. A "windshield" architectural resource survey was conducted by staff of the MHZC and PawPaw Partners, a professional consulting firm that donated its services.

**Analysis and Findings:**

The area, with just a few modern intrusions, includes buildings constructed at the turn-of-the-century and helps to tell the story of the Eastwood neighborhood. The majority of the homes were constructed between the 1890s and the 1930s, as were many of the historic homes in the current boundaries. The extension of the overlay continues the architectural diversity of the rest of the neighborhood with primarily bungalow, Queen Anne and Greek revival styles. The inclusion of these areas helps to match the neighborhood boundaries with the overlay boundaries. The properties now proposed to be added were not included at time of the initial designation of the neighborhood due to lack of support.

The properties meet standard 3 of section 17.26.120.A. of the design guidelines as embodying the distinctive characteristics of their individual types and the overall period of the neighborhood and meet standard 5 as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Approximately sixty-seven percent (67%) of the principle buildings are considered contributing, meaning they contribute to the historic character of the district.

Finding that the majority of the buildings meet the standards of the ordinance, staff suggests the Commission recommend to City Council that the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay be expanded and recommends that the

Commission adopt the current design guidelines to also apply to the expanded area.

**METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

On March 18, 2014, the Metro Historic Zoning Commission recommended approval and adoption of the existing design guidelines of the Eastwood Conservation Zoning Overlay expansion.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Planning staff recommends approval of the expansion of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay District.

Approved (6-0), Consent Agenda

### Resolution No. RS2014-87

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014NHC-002-001 is **Approved. (6-0)**

## Neighborhood Landmark Overlays

### 11. 2014NL-002-001

#### **SIMPKINS GROCERY**

Map 083-14, Parcel(s) 300  
Council District 06 (Peter Westerholm)  
Staff Reviewer: Melissa Sajid

A request to apply a Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District to property located at 1627 Shelby Avenue, at the northwest corner of Shelby Avenue and S. 17th Street, (0.11 acres), zoned R6, requested by Kris and Eliot Houser, owners.

**Staff Recommendation: Approve**

#### **APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Apply a Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District.**

#### Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District

A request to apply a Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District to property located at 1627 Shelby Avenue, at the northwest corner of Shelby Avenue and South 17<sup>th</sup> Street, (0.11 acres), zoned One and Two-Family Residential (R6).

#### **Existing Zoning**

One and Two-Family Residential (R6) requires a minimum 6,000 square foot lot and is intended for single-family dwellings and duplexes at an overall density of 7.71 dwelling units per acre including 25 percent duplex lots. *R6 would permit a maximum of 1 lot, permitting one duplex for a total of 2 units.*

#### **Proposed Overlay**

Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District (NLOD) is intended to preserve and protect landmark features whose demolition or destruction would constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of the neighborhood or community.

#### **CRITICAL PLANNING GOALS**

- Supports Infill Development
- Preserves Historic Resources

The Neighborhood Landmark Overlay designation supports adaptive reuse of historic residential structures within the district for uses the base zoning would not allow. Permitting mixed use as well as office and commercial uses creates an incentive to reuse existing historic structures in residential zones and helps to ensure that proposed uses and/or additions are compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

#### **PROPERTY HISTORY**

The property located at 1627 Shelby Avenue was purchased by Sallie W. Simpkins in March of 1922. As early as 1930 she was operating a grocery store on the property with her daughter Thelma working there as a clerk. Norman Robinson started to manage the store in 1931, and continued to do so throughout the 1940s into the 1950s, although the property stayed in Thelma's hands until she sold it in 1979. The building is unique in the predominantly residential area because it includes a residence attached to a traditional storefront. The structure is a historically significant element in the neighborhood. In addition, Historical Zoning Commission has identified the property as "worthy of conservation."

#### **CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION**

Under Section 17.36.420 of the Zoning Code, a neighborhood landmark is defined as a feature that "has historical, cultural, architectural, civic, neighborhood, or archaeological value and/or importance; whose demolition or destruction would constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of a neighborhood." Neighborhood features are defined as buildings, structures, objects, sites and areas of historic, cultural, civic, neighborhood, or architectural value and/or importance. To be eligible for application of the Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District, a property must meet one or more of the criteria set out in 17.36.420, which are as follows:

1. It is recognized as a significant element in the neighborhood and/or community;
2. It embodies characteristics that distinguish it from other features in the neighborhood and/or community.

3. Rezoning the property on which the feature exists to a general zoning district inconsistent with surrounding or adjacent properties such as, office, commercial, mixed-use, shopping center, or industrial zoning district would significantly impact the neighborhood and/or community;
4. Retaining the feature is important in maintaining the cohesive and traditional neighborhood fabric;
5. Retaining the feature will help to preserve the variety of buildings and structures historically present within the neighborhood recognizing such features may be differentiated by age, function and architectural style in the neighborhood and/or community;
6. Retaining the feature will help to reinforce the neighborhood and/or community's traditional and unique character.

As noted above, the area was originally developed in the 1920s and 1930s. Rezoning these properties to a district that would permit commercial uses would be inconsistent with the Neighborhood General land use policy. Retaining the buildings and the character of the area will preserve the historic fabric along this portion of the corridor.

Section 17.40.160 of the Zoning Code requires that Neighborhood Landmarks meet the following six criteria:

1. The feature is a critical component of the neighborhood context and structure.
2. Retention of the feature is necessary to preserve and enhance the character of the neighborhood.
3. The only reason to consider the application of the Neighborhood Landmark is to protect and preserve the identified feature.
4. There is acknowledgement on the part of the property owner that absent the retention of the feature, the base zoning district is proper and appropriate and destruction or removal of the feature is justification for and will remove the Neighborhood Landmark designation and return the district to the base zoning district prior to the application of the district.
5. It is in the community's and neighborhood's best interest to allow the consideration of an appropriate Neighborhood Landmark Plan as a means of preserving the designated feature.
6. All other provisions of this section have been followed.

#### **ANALYSIS**

The purpose of this Neighborhood Landmark is to preserve and protect neighborhood features that are important to maintain and enhance the neighborhood character. By placing a Neighborhood Landmark District Overlay on this property, the structure can be preserved. With the ability to adaptively reuse the site, improvements and maintenance to the structure can be made and any impacts a commercial use may have on the adjoining properties can be mitigated.

Based on the criteria outlined in the Zoning Code, this property meets the standards to be considered as a neighborhood landmark.

#### **HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION**

The Metropolitan Historical Commission recommends approval of the Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District proposed for 1627 Shelby Avenue.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Neighborhood Landmark District be approved. The proposed district meets the criteria for consideration found in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Sajid presented the staff recommendation of approval.

A brief recess was taken from 5:30p – 5:32p

Kris Houser, 5860 Eaton's Creek Road, spoke in favor of the application and stated that she would like to see this used to enhance the neighborhood as a low traffic retail space.

Sharon Emerson, 1610 Eastland Avenue, spoke in favor of the application and noted that this will preserve the character of the neighborhood.

Laura Citron, 1627 Shelby Avenue, spoke in favor of the application.

Lauren Davis, 1625 Shelby Avenue, spoke on behalf of twelve neighbors in opposition to the application and stated that this will not preserve the historic nature of the neighborhood as it was never the grocery store noted that was described. The neighbors are concerned will decreased rather than increased property values.

Edwin Wilmore, 1626 Shelby Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application and stated that this is not a critical component of the neighborhood.

Shannon Casey, 1622 Shelby Avenue, spoke in opposition to the application and expressed traffic concerns.

Kris Houser again spoke in favor of the application.

**Vice Chair Clifton closed the Public Hearing.**

Mr. Bernhardt clarified that a neighborhood landmark overlay does not guarantee anything. He also noted that rezoning at this location would be inappropriate.

Mr. Gee stated that he does think this structure is very much a part of the neighborhood fabric and is unique.

**Mr. Gee moved and Mr. Ponder seconded the motion to approve. (6-0)**

**Resolution No. RS2014-88**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that 2014NL-002-001 is **Approved. (6-0)**

---

## **L. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS**

---

The Planning Commission will make the final decision on the items below.

### **No Cases on this Agenda**

---

## **M. OTHER BUSINESS**

---

12. Contract between the Nashville-Davidson County Metropolitan Planning Commission on behalf of the Nashville Area MPO and Gresham, Smith and Partners for Professional Services related to the Conduct of the State Route 109 Access Management Study.

**Staff Recommendation: Defer to the April 10, 2014, Planning Commission meeting.**

**The Metropolitan Planning Commission Deferred the MPO contract to the April 10, 2014, Planning Commission meeting. (6-0)**

15. Historic Zoning Commission Report  
16. Board of Parks and Recreation Report  
17. Executive Committee Report  
18. Accept the Director's Report and Approve Administrative Items

Approved (6-0), Consent Agenda

**Resolution No. RS2014-89**

"BE IT RESOLVED by The Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Director's Report and Administrative Items are **Approved. (6-0)**

19. Legislative Update
- 

## **N. MPC CALENDAR OF UPCOMING MATTERS**

---

**April 2, 2014**

CCM Training

9:30am-11:30am, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center

**April 10, 2014**

MPC Meeting

4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center

**April 24, 2014**

MPC Meeting

5:30pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center

**May 8, 2014**

MPC Meeting

4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center

---

## **O. ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary



**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT  
OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

Planning Department  
Metro Office Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
800 Second Avenue South  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Date: March 27, 2014

To: Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County Planning Commissioners

From: Richard C. Bernhardt, FAICP, CNU-A

Re: Executive Director's Report

The following items are provided for your information.

---

**A. Planning Commission Projected Attendance (6 members are required for a quorum)**

1. Attending: Clifton (Acting Chair); LeQuire; Hunt; Ponder; Adkins
2. Leaving Early: Gee (6:15)
3. Absent: McLean; Dalton; Blackshear; Haynes

**B. March 27, 2014 MPC meeting NashvilleNext MPC Topic**

1. Resource Teams – Overview of Purpose, Makeup, and Work (Carlat)

**C. Planning Commission Meetings**

1. Due to a conflict with the Election Commission:
  - a. April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting will begin at 5:30 pm in order to keep it at the Sonny West Conference Center;
  - b. July 24, 2014 – Researching alternate locations but the Parks Board Room is likely choice (neither Sonny West Conference Center or Metro Southeast are available)
  - c. October 23, 2014 – Researching alternate locations but the Parks Board Room is likely choice (neither Sonny West Conference Center or Metro Southeast are available)

**D. Employee News**

1. We are still looking for the following:
  - a. New Employee
    - i. Community Plans Division - Stephanie McCullough will begin March 31, 2014
    - ii. Land Development Division - Latisha Birkeland will begin April 14, 2014
  - b. Vacant Positions
    - i. Planner 2 in Land Development
    - ii. Planner 3 for the Design Studio with an architectural and urban design background.

**E. Communications**

1. Designing a new brochure on the zoning process. We will make these available at the front desk... and a companion website, related links assembled in one place for easy access.

## F. Community Planning

## G. Land Development

## H. GIS

1. We are in continuing negotiations with ESRI for us to use City Engine. This will enable us to develop visual simulations of proposed development and we hope to first use it with the NashvilleNext scenarios.

## I. Executive Director Presentations

1. Tuesday, March 25, 2014, Vine Street Christian Church

## J. NashvilleNext

### 1. Presentations and Meetings

- a. Wednesday, March 26, 2014, Discover Nashville's Neighborhood Day, Magness Potter Community Center
- b. Saturday, March 29, 2014, Skyline Subdivision Neighborhood Watch, Skyline Hospital
- c. Tuesday, April 8, 2014, New Level Community Development Corporation, 1112 Jefferson Street

2. **Guiding Principles** – They have been vetted and in final Draft Stage. They will form the basis for next stages. **These are the second DRAFT version**

### **Be Nashville**

- Nashvillians lift one another up and help people help themselves.
- Our culture celebrates creativity, respect for history, and optimism for the future.
- Nashville's welcoming nature represents the best of Southern hospitality and celebrates our cultural and economic diversity, bringing new and old Nashvillians together.

### **Foster Strong Neighborhoods**

- Neighborhoods are the building blocks of our community: they are where we live, work, shop and gather as a community.
- Our neighborhoods are healthy, safe, and affordable – friendly to pedestrians, with vibrant parks, welcoming libraries, accessible shopping and employment, valued and protected natural and historic features, and strong schools.
- Our neighborhoods offer Nashvillians choice in where and how to live, including rural, suburban, urban, and downtown options. They grow with us as we move into the future.

### **Expand Accessibility**

- Nashville is accessible, allowing all Nashvillians to come together to work, to play, to learn, and to create community and contribute to civic life, regardless of background or ability.
- Nashville has a complete and efficient transportation system, adding transit, walking, and biking options to our existing road network.



- Nashvillians have genuine access to employment and educational opportunities, online capabilities, civic representation, nature and recreation, and government services.

### **Create Economic Prosperity**

- Nashville's economy is diverse, dynamic and open. It benefits from our culture of arts, creativity and entrepreneurialism.
- Our strong workforce and quality of life make Nashville competitive in the evolving international economy.
- Nashville's success is based on promoting opportunities for growth and success for individuals from all communities in all sizes and kinds of businesses.
- To provide a foundation for future growth and prosperity, Nashville meets its infrastructure needs in an environmentally responsible way.

### **Advance Education**

- Nashville recognizes that education is a lifelong endeavor; it is how we prepare our children for tomorrow's challenges, and how all Nashvillians remain able to successfully participate in the workforce and civic life. Life-long learning also benefits from the community's investment in continuing education, retraining opportunities and literacy.
- Nashvillians support children and families by ensuring quality PK-12 education for all through support from neighborhoods, businesses, institutions, non-profits, individuals, and governments.
- Nashville's excellent colleges and universities are community assets and tremendous resources for the community that add to its prestige.

### **Champion the Environment**

- Nashville has unique natural environments of breath-taking beauty, exceptional parks and greenways, abundant water and agricultural land that supports local food production. The natural landscapes of Nashville – from the Cumberland River to the steep slopes in the west and the lush tree canopy – are part of our identity.
- We protect these landscapes because they contribute to our health and quality of life and provide a competitive advantage to Nashville.
- Nashville enables sustainable living through transportation options, housing choices, economic and social diversity and thoughtful design of buildings and infrastructure.

### **Ensure Equity for All**

- Nashville is stronger because we value diversity in all its forms and welcome all Nashvillians, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, ability or limitation, income, gender, sexual orientation, where you were born or where you live.
- Ensuring equity has been and continues to be central to Nashville's culture. As Nashville changes, we remain committed to removing unjust differences.
- We are vigilant in protecting human rights for all to ensure that all are engaged in decision making and share in the city's growth, prosperity and quality of life.

### **3. NashvilleNext Overall Schedule**

- a. Mapping Future Growth and Preservation (Currently - Spring 2014)
  - i. Community Engagement on Growth Mapping
  - ii. Scenario Development
  - iii. Initial Policy Option Development
- b. Making Policy Decisions (Spring/Fall 2014)
  - i. Community Engagement on Scenario Options
  - ii. Resource Teams and Steering Committee develop policy options
  - iii. Community engagement on policy options
- c. Creating and Adopting the Plan (Fall 2014/Summer 2015)
  - i. Community Vision
  - ii. Policies and Actions
  - iii. Preferred Alternative
  - iv. Implementation Schedule
  - v. Planning Commission Adoption

### **4. NashvilleNext Key Activities:**

- a. Phase 3 (of 5) of the process is completed with over 10,000 participants.
- b. Developing the alternative development scenarios and policy implications based on community input through the priority and growth mapping exercises.
- c. Steering Committee has begun the review of the Resource Teams Goals and Policies.
- d. The launch of the 'Go To Meeting' component of the Scenario community engagement will begin this week.
- e. Scenarios are being processed in CommunityViz.
- f. Schedule is shifting to begin phase 4 in June, though we may unveil the scenarios at the Healthy Nashville summit on May 16.
- g. List of special projects underway include:
  - i. The Airport Employment Center Master Design
  - ii. Identification of Downtown open space network
  - iii. Examining the potential use for the Missing Middle housing typology
- h. Coordinating with MTA and Nashville GreenPrint (tree canopy master plan) as they begin their master planning efforts.

### **5. Resource Teams:**

- a. NashvilleNext Resource Teams have moved into Phase 2 (of 3) of their process. The purpose of this Phase is to develop goals and policies for each plan element and as impacted by the scenario alternatives. The scenarios and policies will be reviewed by the public starting in June.

b.

Resource Team - Phase 2	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Economic/Workforce Development	●	●	○	○
Arts, Culture, & Creativity	●	●	○	○
Natural Resources/Hazard Adaptation	●	●	○	○
Education & Youth	●	●	○	○
Housing	●	●	○	○
Health, Livability, & Built Environment	●	●	○	○
Land Use, Transportation, & Infrastructure (different schedule)	○	○	○	○

## 6. NashvilleNext Special Studies

- a. **Gentrification Analysis and Recommendations** – Work is underway with Ms. Amie Thurber, Ms. Jyoti Gupta, Dr. James C. Fraser and Dr. Doug Perkins of Vanderbilt University on issues and recommendations related to gentrification in Nashville. The recommendations will be considered in the NashvilleNext policy and action phase.
- b. **Suburban Retrofit** – In conjunction with the National Association of Realtors will provide real life retrofit examples to make suburban areas more sustainable. The study began with field visits in February 7-9, 2014. Study situations include:
- i. **Bellevue** – the south side of Highway 70S, across from the Bellevue Mall.
    - Make a There There: Overly deep retail parcel that has been subdivided and layered without parcels into a sprawling mess with fronts facing backs, no sense of place, reduced visibility, and likely run-off issues/Install an urban framework that enables parcels to be reinhabited and redeveloped with a sense of place that restores the social capital lost from the dead mall, connect to the green space, connect to the neighborhood.
  - ii. **Bellevue** – the “civic center” at Bellevue Middle School, the new library and Red Caboose Park.
    - Make a There There: Although adjacent to one another, the public facilities do not relate to each other spatially or invite synergistic sharing of parking or other facilities/create a civic center that is greater than the sum of its parts.
  - iii. **Bordeaux** – the Kroger on Clarksville Pike at West Hamilton Avenue.
    - Expand Affordability and Livability? Dead big box: failed/failing retail in a declining neighborhood/possible exploration of missing middle housing types, community-serving uses, linkage of affordable housing to affordable transportation?
  - iv. **Antioch** – The Crossings extension to Cane Ridge High School.
    - Driving Change on Corridors: Establishing a new Corridor? New Infill and Connectivity? Create a place from an employment center and older suburban independent mixed uses.

- v. South Nashville – the abandoned Kmart at Harding Place and Nolensville Road.
  - Driving Change on Corridors - Intersection quadrant: auto-oriented retail surrounding intersection, but disconnected from each other and from adjacent neighborhoods/new urban framework to improve connectivity around the intersection and into the neighborhoods
- vi. South Nashville – the abandoned Lowe’s on Nolensville at Cotton Lane.
  - Driving Change on Corridors – dead big box: deep retail parcels with limited visibility/urban framework to increase connectivity and establish better transitions from the residential areas to the corridor.
- vii. Old Hickory Village – the town center (This is an old factory town, project boundaries could be expanded further).
  - Make a There There: underperforming town center/ catalysts for revitalization.
- viii. North Nashville – West Trinity Lane at I-65 Highway.
  - Adjacent commercial/industrial: ad hoc uses, odd shaped lots with little relationship to adjacent corridors or neighborhoods/urban framework to support better connectivity and transitions.
- ix. Wedgewood Area - I-65 –properties east of I-65, and bordered by the RR tracks, from the Adventure Science Center south to the Craighead St. area.
  - Highway Adjacent Commercial/industrial: isolated wedge of diverse but disconnected uses/transitions from highway to neighborhoods
- x. The Nations - Centennial Blvd. and 51<sup>st</sup> Ave., industrial/warehousing properties.
  - Border Vacuum: underused industrial properties blighting abutting residential neighborhood/catalysts for reinhabitation, connection to waterfront?
- xi. Nashville State Community College – The school property on White Bridge Pike.
  - Make a There There: suburban campus w vast parking lots/urban framework for growth into a more walkable, urban, mixed-use campus? Also consider a complete redevelopment!
- xii. Woodbine Commercial Corridor –Nolensville Pike “Main St.” area abutting the Woodbine residential neighborhood, and industrial property along RR.
  - Make a There There: Main Street that's missing teeth/urban infill, possible introduction of "missing middle" housing types, identify catalysts for redevelopment
- xiii. If teams are available:
  - (1) Churches (large and small) - several locations and scales (also abandoned, in- use, re-purposed) examples Charlotte Ave, and White Bridge Pike area.
    - (a) Total redevelopment
    - (b) Diversification by adding additional uses inc. housing, social services, etc.
  - (2) Bellevue – Commercial frontage serving off highway multi-family pockets - several locations and scales
  - (3) mall retrofit

That grant, provided through the Greater Nashville Association of Realtors and matched by a similar contribution from the Metropolitan Planning Commission, will fund research by a key team of urban planners and strategists from Georgia Tech University, led by Professor Ellen Dunham-Jones, a nationally recognized expert in urban retrofitting. The University of Tennessee design studio, under the direction of T. K. Davis, will also be part of this effort.

- c. **Jefferson Street Economic Analysis** - Identification of inner-city commercial districts comparable to Jefferson Street in other cities that have achieved sustained economic revitalization. Analysis of public policies, private investments, and other public- private interventions that was instrumental to the successful revitalization. Focus of the study is to identify cases, interventions and factors that lead to revitalization without gentrification-related displacement of existing residents and small businesses. The case studies will include identification of programs beyond the typical public sector approaches of land acquisition, rezoning, and streetscape improvements. We have received a copy of the final draft for review. Vanderbilt (Dr. Doug Perkins and Karl Jones) and TSU (Dr. David Patchett)

K. **Planning Commission Workshops** (all include 1.5 hours Planning Commissioners Training credits)

L. **APA Training Opportunities**

1. Scheduled APA Webinars
2. Nashville Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor MOB.
3. All are scheduled from 3:00 – 4:30 pm
4. All have 1.5 hours AICP and Planning Commissioner training credit

Date	Topic (Live Program and Online Recording )
May 14, 2014	Jane Jacob's Legacy and New Urbanism
June 4, 2014	Introducing New Density to the Neighborhood
June 25, 2014	2014 Planning Law Review

---

**Administrative Items**

---

In accordance with the Rules and Procedures of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the following applications have been reviewed by staff and are ready to be approved by the Planning Commission through acceptance and approval of this report or otherwise approved on behalf of the Planning Commission **through 03/21/2014**.

APPROVALS	# of Applications	Total # of Applications 2014
Specific Plans	3	7
PUDs	0	1
UDOs	1	1
Subdivisions	5	38
Mandatory Referrals	10	39
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>86</b>

### SPECIFIC PLANS (finals only): MPC Approval

Date Submitted	Staff Determination		Case #	Project Name	Project Caption	Council District # (CM Name)
1/30/2014 10:32	3/14/2014	APADMIN	2013SP-024-002	NORTH 11TH & SCOVEL (FINAL)	A request for final site plan approval for property located at 1112 11th Avenue North, at the southeast corner of 11th Avenue North and Scovel Street and located within the Phillips-Jackson Street Redevelopment District (0.27 acres), to permit six residential dwelling units, requested by Dale & Associates, applicant; Danny Newman, owner.	19 (Erica S. Gilmore)
11/26/2013 11:56	3/17/2014	APADMIN	2013SP-006-002	DAD'S TOWING (FINAL)	A request for final site plan approval for properties located at 1119 Old Hickory Boulevard and Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 315 feet east of Larkin Springs Road (1.68 acres), to permit automobile repair and wrecker service, requested by Azimtech Engineering, applicant, Jimmy R. Mitchell, owner.	09 (Bill Pridemore)
10/3/2013 12:50	3/18/2014	APADMIN	2008SP-030-001	ABES GARDEN AT PARK MANOR (FINAL)	A request for final site plan approval for the Abes Garden at Park Manor Specific Plan District located at 115 Woodmont Boulevard, approximately 775 feet south of Harding Pike, zoned SP-MR (7.41 acres), to permit an assisted care living facility consisting of 131 units/beds, requested by Barge Caughen & Associates, applicant; Abes Garden, owner.	23 (Emily Evans); 24 (Jason Holleman)

### PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS (finals and variances only) : MPC Approval

Date Submitted	Staff Determination		Case #	Project Name	Project Caption	Council District # (CM Name)
NONE						

### URBAN DESIGN OVERLAYS (finals and variances only) : MPC Approval

Date Submitted	Staff Determination		Case #	Project Name	Project Caption	Council District # (CM Name)
2/13/2014 16:57	3/20/2014	APADMIN	2002UD-001-006	GREEN HILLS UDO (FINAL: 4000 HILLSBORO PIKE)	A request for final site plan approval for a portion of the Green Hills Urban Design Overlay District on properties located at 2033, 4000 and 4002 Hillsboro Pike and 2035 Richard Jones Road, at the southeast corner of Richard Jones Road and Hillsboro Pike, zoned SCR (approx. 2.67 Acres), to permit a mixed-use building of up to 17 stories containing multifamily, office, retail and restaurant uses, requested by Southern Land Company, applicant; Green Hills Mixed Use, LLC, owner.	25 (Sean McGuire)

## MANDATORY REFERRALS: MPC Approval

Date Submitted	Staff Determination		Case #	Project Name	Project Caption	Council District # (CM Name)
2/26/2014 10:02	3/7/2014	APADMIN	2014M-014ES-001	AEGIS SCIENCES CORPORATION	A request to abandon approximately 130 linear feet of existing public sanitary sewer and to construct approximately 15 linear feet of 8" D.I.P. water main and one fire hydrant assembly and approximately 108 linear feet of 8" PVC Sanitary Sewer on properties located at 336 and 345 Hill Avenue, (Project Nos. 14-WL-4 and 12-SL-86), requested by Metro Water Services, applicant; Ebon Falcon, LLC, property owner.	17 (Sandra Moore)
2/28/2014 11:14	3/7/2014	APADMIN	2014M-017ES-001	1406 HOLLY STREET	A request to abandon approximately 95 linear feet of an existing 36" combination sewer main and to accept approximately 114 linear feet of a 42" combination sewer main on property located at 1406 Holly Street, (Project No. 14-SL-14), requested by Metro Water Services, applicant; Pantheon Development, LLC, property owner.	06 (Peter Westerholm)
2/26/2014 11:33	3/7/2014	APADMIN	2014M-015ES-001	JOYCE LANE STORMWATER PROJECT	A request to negotiate and accept permanent and temporary easements for the Joyce Lane Stormwater Project on various properties located along Gra Mar Drive, Graycroft Avenue, Joyce Lane and Marswen Drive, (Project No. 14-SWC-154), requested by Metro Water Services, applicant; various property owners.	08 (Karen Bennett)
2/26/2014 15:32	3/7/2014	APADMIN	2014M-016ES-001	4TH AVENUE AT JACKSON COURT	A request to abandon approximately 420 linear feet of 8" water main, approximately 395 linear feet of 10" sewer main and approximately 330 linear feet of 8" sewer main on properties located at 4th Avenue North and Jackson Court, (Project Nos. 14-WL-11 and 14-SL-12), requested by Metro Water Services, applicant; Metro Government, property owner.	19 (Erica Gilmore)

## MANDATORY REFERRALS: MPC Approval (continued)

3/5/2014 13:55	3/12/2014	APADMIN	2014M-008PR-001	METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY QUITCLAIM DEED	A request to authorize the Director of Public Property, or his designee, to accept and record a quitclaim deed from the Metropolitan Transit Authority conveying to The Metropolitan Government any remaining interest it may still have in a certain parcel of property located within the old Thermal Transfer property site, requested by the Metro Finance Department, applicant.	
3/5/2014 15:47	3/12/2014	APADMIN	2014M-009PR-001	PETTUS ROAD PROPERTY ACQUISITION	A request to authorize the Director of Public Property, or his designee, to acquire certain real property by purchase and/or donation to The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County for use as park land, requested by the Metro Finance Department and the Metro Parks and Recreation Department, applicants.	31 (Fabian Bedne)

3/11/2014 11:01	3/17/2014	APADMIN	2014M-004EN-001	TIN ROOF OVERHEAD ENCROACHMENT	A request to allow an aerial encroachment for "Tin Roof" comprised of a 10' X 4' illuminated projecting sign at 316 Broadway, zoned DTC and located within the Lower Broadway Historic Preservation District and the Capitol Mall Redevelopment District, requested by LMP TR Real Estate, LLC, owner.	19 (Erica Gilmore)
3/10/2014 7:23	3/17/2014	APADMIN	2014M-003AB-001	ALLEY # 442 (PORTION OF)	A request to abandon a portion of Alley #442 (easements and utilities to be relocated) north of its intersection with an Unnumbered Alley and on the eastern property line of Tax Map Parcel # 10408025000, requested by Bradley, Arant, Boulton Cummings, LLP, applicant.	17 (Sandra Moore)
3/10/2014 7:56	3/17/2014	APADMIN	2014M-004AB-001	JACKSON COURT & ALLEY # 204	A request to abandon Alley #204 (easements and utilities to be abandoned and relocated) between 4th Avenue North and 5th Avenue North and Jackson Court between 4th Avenue North and 5th Avenue North (easements and utilities to be abandoned and relocated), requested by Littlejohn Engineering Associates, applicant.	19 (Erica Gilmore)
3/12/2014 13:34	3/19/2014	APADMIN	2014M-011PR-001	SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSITION	A request to declare surplus and approve the disposition of certain parcels of real property, requested by the Metropolitan Department of Finance, applicant.	

### SUBDIVISIONS: Administrative Approval

Date Submitted	Date Approved	Action	Case #	Project Name	Project Caption	Council District # (CM Name)
11/22/2013 12:36	3/11/2014	APADMIN	2012S-131-003	RIVERSIDE DRIVE, SEC 1 (DEVELOPMENT PLAN)	A request for development plan approval to create four lots on property located at Riverside Drive (unnumbered), opposite Huntleigh Drive, zoned R10, (2.11 acres), requested by Chandler Surveying, applicant; Riverside Development, LLC, owner.	06 (Peter Westerholm)
9/4/2013 14:53	3/12/2014	APADMIN	2013S-172-001	HAYNIES GROVE, RESUB LOTS 36 THRU 39	A request for final plat approval to consolidate four lots into three lots, located at 107 Fern Avenue, approximately 670 feet west of Brick Church Pike, zoned RS5 (0.62 acres), requested by Casey Huynh, owner; Delle Land Surveying, applicant.	02 (Frank R. Harrison)

### SUBDIVISIONS: Administrative Approval (continued)

1/2/2014 9:32	3/12/2014	APADMIN	2014S-018-001	THE CROSSINGS OF HICKORY HOLLOW, RESUB LOTS 1, 2 & 3	A request for final plat approval to create three lots within the Crossings Commercial Planned Unit Development Overlay District on properties located at 5501 Crossings Circle and Crossings Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 1,300 feet south of Mt. View Road, (20.90 acres), zoned AR2a, R10 and RM9, requested by Freeland Realty 3, LLC, owner; Ragan Smith Associates, surveyor.	32 (Jacobia Dowell)
------------------	-----------	---------	---------------	--	--	---------------------



2/4/2014 13:54	3/13/2014	APADMIN	2014S-039-001	NORTHVIEW	A request for final plat approval to create two lots on property located at 1714 Northview Avenue, approximately 360 feet north of Otay Street, zoned R6 (0.32 acres), requested by Tommy Walker, applicant; Equity Trust Co., Custodian, owner.	07 (Anthony Davis)
-------------------	-----------	---------	---------------	-----------	--	--------------------

<b>Performance Bonds: Administrative Approvals</b>			
<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Administrative Action</b>	<b>Bond #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>
3/07/2014	Approved Collected	2005B-014-003	WOODLAND FOREST, SECTION 2
3/10/2014	Approved Release	2012B-036-002	HAYNIE'S CENTRAL PARK PLAN, RESUB. LOT 86
3/10/2014	Approved Release	2007B-073-007	SPENCER HILL, SECTION 2
3/12/2014	Approved Release	2011B-021-003	HIGH POINT, PHASE 1, SECTION 3
3/13/2014	Approved Extension	2008B-031-004	ABBINGTON PARK, PHASE 2, SECTION 1
3/13/2014	Approved New	2014B-006-001	PARK PRESERVE, PHASE 1C
3/18/2014	Approved Extension/Reduction	2011B-002-004	VILLAGES OF RIVERWOOD, PHASE 2A, SECTION 1

---

## Calendar of Events

---

- A. **Thursday, March 27, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- B. **Thursday, April 10, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- C. **Tuesday; April 22, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- D. **Thursday, April 24, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); **5:30pm**, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- E. **Thursday, May 8, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- F. **Thursday, May 22, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- G. **Tuesday; May 27, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- H. **Thursday, June 12, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- I. **Tuesday; June 24, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- J. **Thursday, June 26, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- K. **Tuesday; July 22, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- L. **Thursday, July 24, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- M. **Thursday, August 14, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- N. **Tuesday; August 26, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- O. **Thursday, August 28, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- P. **Thursday, September 11, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- Q. **Tuesday; September 23, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- R. **Thursday, September 25, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- S. **Thursday, October 9, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- T. **Thursday, October 23, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- U. **Tuesday; October 28, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);

- V. **Thursday, November 13, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- W. **Tuesday; November 25, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- X. **Thursday, December 11, 2014** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- Y. **Tuesday; December 23, 2014** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);
- Z. **Thursday, January 8, 2015** - [MPC Meeting](#); 4pm, 700 Second Ave. South, Howard Office Building, Sonny West Conference Center
- AA. **Tuesday; January 27, 2015** - [NashvilleNext Steering Committee](#) (Jim McLean; Jeff Haynes; Andree LeQuire);