



**Project No.**  
**Associated Case**  
**Council Bill**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-075G-12**

None  
N/A

*Approve with conditions. If a council bill is filed, it should include the following conditions for road improvements to be completed prior to any final subdivision plat recordation:*

- 1) *Widening the pavement of Cane Ridge Road to Major Street Plan standards (currently U4) from the northern portion of parcel 168 on Tax Map 174 to the Cane Ridge Road/Preston Road intersection,*
- 2) *Upgrading the Cane Ridge Road/Preston Road intersection to a 90-degree intersection,*
- 3) *Widening Preston Road to Metro standards for a local road (23 feet of pavement) from that intersection to the southern border of parcel 001 on Tax Map 174, and*
- 4) *The new development shall tie into the stub street (Hickory Park Drive) to the north.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
AR2a zoning

**Rezone 145 acres from Agricultural (AR2a) to Single-family and Multi-family Residential (RS10 and RM15)**

AR2a zoning is intended for agricultural uses and residential uses with a minimum lot size of two (2) acres.

**Proposed Zoning**  
RS10 zoning

RS10 zoning is intended for single-family residential development with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet.

RM15 zoning

RM15 zoning is intended for moderately high intensity multi-family structures at a density of fifteen (15) units per acre.

**SUBAREA 12 PLAN**

**Policy**  
Residential Low Medium (RLM)

RLM is intended for residential areas with densities between two (2) and four (4) units per acre.

Residential Medium High (RMH)

RMH is intended for residential areas with densities between nine (9) and twenty (20) units per acre.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### Policy Conflict

No. The RS10 district allows 3.7 units per acre, while the RLM policy calls for two (2) to four (4) units per acre. The RS10 district is consistent with the Subarea 12 Plan's RLM policy. The RM15 district allows fifteen (15) units per acre, while the RMH policy is intended for densities between nine (9) and twenty (20) units per acre. The RM15 district is consistent with the Subarea 12 Plan's RMH policy.

### TRAFFIC

The proposed zone change would permit a total of 695 units, 210 multi-family and 485 single-family. This number of units would create approximately 6,025 vehicle trips per day (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. In 2001, Cane Ridge Road handled an average of 1,142 vehicle trips per day. Staff feels that due to the increase in traffic that would be generated by this zone change, several traffic-related requirements should be included in any Council bill filed to effect this zone change as conditions to be completed prior to any final subdivision plat recordation. Those conditions are:

1. Upgrade Cane Ridge Road to Major Street Plan standards (currently U4) from the northern portion of parcel 168 on Tax Map 174 to the Cane Ridge Road/Preston Road intersection.
2. The current intersection of Cane Ridge Road and Preston Road shall be upgraded to allow Preston Road to meet Cane Ridge Road at ninety degrees.
3. Upgrade Preston Road to Metro standards for a local road (23 feet of pavement) from its intersection with Cane Ridge Road to the southern border of parcel 001 on Tax Map 174.
4. The new development shall tie into the stub street (Hickory Park Drive) to the north. This street ties directly into a signalized intersection at Bell Road. There is also an existing fire station along Hickory Park Drive.

### Traffic Engineer's Findings

The Metro Traffic Engineer has indicated that no Traffic Impact Study has been submitted by the applicant, and has provided no recommendation to staff.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### SCHOOLS

#### Students Generated

**109 Elementary 77 Middle 63 High Schools**

#### Schools Over/Under Capacity

If the property were developed under the proposed zoning, 249 students would be generated. Students would attend Maxwell Elementary, Antioch Middle, and Antioch High School. Maxwell Elementary and Antioch High have not been identified as being overcrowded by the Metro School Board, but Antioch Middle School has been identified as being overcrowded.

### FUTURE SUBDIVISION

The Planning Department recommendation for this rezoning addresses only the questions of compliance with adopted land use policy and adequacy of infrastructure, given entitlements associated with the requested zoning district. Any future subdivision requested for this property must meet all of the specific requirements of the Metropolitan Zoning Code and the additional requirements of the Subdivision Regulations. Given that a significant portion of the property contains property encompassed by floodplain, and a portion of the property contains steep slopes [slopes 20% or greater], the following subdivision standards may materially affect the development yield and the form of development on the site.

- Zoning Ordinance Section 17.28.030 – Hillside development standards
- Zoning Ordinance Section 17.28.040 – Floodplain/floodway Development Standards
- Subdivision Regulation 2-3 – Suitability of the land
- Subdivision Regulation 2-7.5 – Open Space Conservation Easements
- Subdivision Regulation, Appendix C – Critical Lots (Plans and Procedures)

Included among those provisions are the following requirements:

- “The development of residentially zoned property shall minimize changes in grade, cleared area, and volume of cut or fill on those hillside portions of the property with twenty percent or greater natural slopes.” 17-28-030(A) (emphasis added).
- “For lots less than one acre, any natural slopes equal to or greater than twenty-five percent shall be platted outside of the building envelope and preserved to the greatest extent possible in a natural state.” i.e., grading of lots with twenty-five percent slopes to create a buildable lot is not permitted. 17.28.030(A)(1) (emphasis added).
- In areas with slopes of twenty percent or greater, subdivisions are encouraged to use the cluster lot option of 17.12.080. “In general, lots so created shall be clustered on those portions of the site that have natural slopes of less than twenty percent . . . . Large contiguous areas containing natural slopes in excess of twenty-five percent should be recorded as common open space and



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

permanently maintained in a natural state.” 17.28.030(A)(2) (emphasis added).

- “For lots of less than one acre, land area designated as natural floodplain or floodway . . . shall not be used to satisfy minimum lot size requirements of the district if manipulated.” 17.28.040(A)(1) (emphasis added).
- Use of the cluster lot option is also encouraged on property containing natural floodplain and floodway areas. “At a minimum, one-half of the natural floodplain area including all of the floodway area shall be designated as common open space and maintained in a natural state . . . .” 17.28.040(A)(2) (emphasis added).



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-076U-12**  
N/A  
None.  
*Disapprove. CL zoning will not implement the Subarea 12 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy, and would exceed the commercial development square footage standards for the unmapped commercial node.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
AR2a zoning

**Rezone 6.34 acres from Agricultural (AR2a) to Commercial Limited (CL)**

AR2a zoning is intended for agricultural uses and residential uses requiring 2 acres per lot.

**Proposed Zoning**  
CL zoning

CL zoning is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, and office uses.

---

**SUBAREA 12 PLAN**

**Policy**  
Residential Medium (RM)

RM policy permits 4 to 9 units per acre.

**Policy Conflict**

Yes. CL district is not consistent with the intent of the Subarea 12 Plan's RM policy. In 1998 the Planning Commission approved a zone change from AR2a to CL for parcel 178 just to the west of the proposed property. At the time of that rezoning, staff pointed out an unmapped commercial node at the intersection of Bell Road and Old Hickory Boulevard. Unmapped commercial nodes reflect the standards of the Retail Neighborhood (RN) policy area. The RN policy area allows for 30,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. of commercial development. Currently at this commercial node there is potential for more than 300,000 sq. ft. of commercial development, which exceeds the maximum of 100,000 sq. ft. In order to support the expansion of commercial zoning in this area the policy would have to be Retail Concentration Community (RCC) policy, which supports 100,000 to 500,000 sq. ft. of development.

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

Yes. MPC approved on 7/23/98 (98Z-128U) rezoning parcel 178 from AR2a to CL. Council approved on 10/22/98 (O98-1334).

---

**TRAFFIC**

Based on typical uses in CL zoning, with on site parking, 10,000 sq. ft. of development per acre is used



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### **Traffic Engineer's Findings**

to calculate traffic generation, such as discount store, hardware store, and restaurant approximately 3,374 to 8,264 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic.

The Metro Traffic Engineer has indicated no objections to this project if traffic improvements called for in Zone Change 2002Z-077G-12 are completed.



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-077U-12**  
N/A  
None.  
*Disapprove. SCR zoning does not implement the Subarea 12 Plan's residential (RM or RLM) policy, and would exceed the commercial development square footage standards for the unmapped commercial node.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
AR2a zoning

**Rezone 33 acres from Agricultural (AR2a) to Shopping Center Regional (SCR)**

AR2a zoning is intended for agricultural uses and residential uses requiring 2 acres per lot.

**Proposed Zoning**  
SCR zoning

SCR zoning is intended for high intensity retail, consumer service, and office uses for a regional market area.

---

**SUBAREA 12 PLAN**

**Policy**  
Residential Low Medium (RLM)  
Residential Medium (RM)

RLM policy permits 2 to 4 units per acre.  
RM policy permits 4 to 9 units per acre.

**Policy Conflict**

Yes. SCR district is not consistent with the intent of the Subarea 12 Plan's RLM or RM policy. In 1998 the Planning Commission approved a zone change from AR2a to CL for parcel 178 just to the west of the proposed property. At the time of that rezoning staff pointed out an unmapped commercial node at the intersection of Bell Road and Old Hickory Boulevard. Unmapped commercial nodes reflect the standards of the Retail Neighborhood (RN) policy area. The RN policy area allows for 30,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. of commercial development. Currently at this commercial node there is potential for more than 300,000 sq. ft. of commercial development, which exceeds the maximum of 100,000 sq. ft. In order to support the expansion of commercial zoning in this area the policy would have to be Retail Concentration Community (RCC) policy, which supports 100,000 to 500,000 sq. ft. of development.

---



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### RECENT REZONINGS

Yes. MPC approved on 7/23/98 (98Z-128U) rezoning parcel 178 from AR2a to CL. Council approved on 10/22/98 (O98-1334).

### TRAFFIC

Based on typical uses in SCR zoning, with on site parking, 10,000 sq. ft. of development per acre is used to calculate traffic generation, such as a superstore, shopping center, and supermarket approximately 14,164 to 36,798 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic.

### Traffic Engineer's Recommendation

Approve with conditions as follows:

1. Construct roadway improvements on Old Hickory Blvd. and Bell Rd. to include roadway widening and construction of additional lanes.
2. Conduct a traffic impact study for this proposal as soon as the Metro Public Schools academic year begins.
3. Implement any additional recommendations by the study and/or the Metro Traffic Engineer.





**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-078U-14**  
N/A  
None  
*Approve.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Rezone 9.46 acres from Commercial Limited (CL) to Residential (R10)**

**Existing Zoning**  
CL zoning

CL zoning is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, and office uses.

**Proposed Zoning**  
R10 zoning

R10 zoning is intended for single-family and duplexes at 3.7 dwelling units per acre.

---

**SUBAREA 12 PLAN**

**Policy**  
Commercial Mixed  
Concentration (CMC)

CMC policy is intended for major concentrations of retail, offices, and medium density residential.

**Policy Conflict**

None. R10 district is at the low end of medium density residential. These properties have come before the Planning Commission on several other occasions requesting CL zoning. Planning staff and the Planning Commission have consistently recommended disapproval of the CL zoning. Metro Council approved the change to CL in 2001. This change will return the properties to R10 zoning which is appropriate for this area and is consistent existing pattern in this area.

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

Yes. MPC disapproved on 4/26/01 (2001Z-042-14U) rezoning these parcels from R10 to CL. Council approved on 8/4/01 (BL2001-737).

---

**TRAFFIC**

Based on typical uses in R10 zoning such as single-family residences and duplexes approximately 70 to 140 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic.

**Traffic Engineer's Recommendation**

*Approve.*

---



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### SCHOOLS

Students Generated

6 Elementary 4 Middle 3 High School

Schools Over/Under Capacity

Students will attend McGavock Elementary School, Two Rivers Middle School, and McGavock High School. Two Rivers Middle and McGavock High have not been identified as being overcrowded by the Metro School Board, but McGavock Elementary School has been identified as being overcrowded.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 96S-382G**  
**Chase Creek Subdivision (2nd Revision)**  
*Approve the request to revise the preliminary and final plat to remove sidewalks throughout the subdivision.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

A request to revise the preliminary and final plat to remove sidewalks throughout the subdivision, where sidewalks are not required by the RS30 and R40 districts, requested by Patrick Malone, developer.

**PROJECT DETAILS**

***Background***

The preliminary and final subdivision did not originally show sidewalks on the plat, but they were shown on the construction plans. On October 20, 1997, the first revision to the subdivision plat showed sidewalks on one side of each of these roads: Chase View Road, West Chase Court, Chase View Court and East Chase Court. At the time these changes were made, the developer was not aware that he was exempt from constructing sidewalks because the subdivision lies within the RS30 and R40 zoning districts.

An adjoining subdivision, Templegate, was faced with a similar situation. Templegate was also in the RS30 zoning district and sidewalks were shown on the construction plans, but the plat did not show the sidewalks. The Legal Department advised staff that no action was needed by the Planning Commission and authorized Public Works to release the bond without the sidewalks being constructed. Two years ago, staff verbally advised the developer of Chase Creek that he was not required to construct sidewalks. This decision was based upon the earlier decision by Legal and the Subdivision Regulations did not requiring sidewalks in these zoning districts. Since the plat for Chase Creek had been revised to show the sidewalks, something that did not happen in the Templegate case, it was considered appropriate to bring the matter before the Planning Commission.

When the Chase Creek developer began meeting with Public Works staff concerning the construction of these sidewalks, he found that more stringent sidewalk standards made construction costs exceed the amount originally estimated. The original estimate for the



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

roads and sidewalks in Chase Creek was \$635,000. The reduced Public Works estimate in the amount of \$135,000 covers the amount needed for final paving and does not reflect the cost of sidewalks. Out of the 39 lots located within Davidson County, 14 are considered critical lots. Five of these lots are along the sidewalk path. Because of the topography, retrofitting could be problematic.

---

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request for revision to preliminary and final plats because sidewalks are not required under present zoning in the RS30 and R40 districts.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Associated Cases**

**Subdivision 2002S-154G-12**  
**Cane Ridge Estates**  
Zone Change 2001Z-075G-12  
Council Bill BL2001-805

**Staff Recommendation**

*Approve with conditions subject to a revised preliminary plat prior to the planning commission meeting and bonds for the extension of streets, sidewalks, public utilities and landscape buffer yards.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary Plat       Preliminary & Final Plat       Final Plat

Subdivide 30.63 acres into 68 lots using the cluster lot option, at a proposed density of 2.19 units per acre.

**ZONING**

RS15 district requiring a minimum lot size of 15,000 sq. ft.

**CLUSTER LOT**

Applicant proposes to reduce lots two (2) base zoning districts, from RS15 (minimum 15,000 sq. ft. lot) to RS 7.5 (minimum 7,500 sq. ft. lot). The proposed lots range in size from 7,520 sq. ft. to 11,840 sq. ft.

**SUBDIVISION DETAILS**

The strip of land that abuts the south side of Cane Springs Road and runs approximately 580 feet starting at the project entrance on Cane Ridge Road and extending east is being dedicated by the plat as right-of-way. This dedication will make possible future access or utility connections for property to the south. It is not a "spite strip."

**Sycamore Tree**

A very large, mature sycamore tree, with a caliper of over 30 inches exists in the vicinity of the rear of lot 2. This tree has been located on the plat but needs to be delineated that it is to be protected and retained through the grading and building process.

**Blue Line Stream**

A blue line stream begins in the vicinity of lot 22. A blue line stream is a stream that has been determined by the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) to have water in it all year. These streams are depicted on the United States Geological Survey Quadrangle (USGS Quad) maps with a blue line, hence the name, "blue line." The state has jurisdiction over blue line streams. When 40 acres or more of land are draining into a stream, Metro's



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### Spring House

Stormwater Management Ordinance requires a 25-foot buffer yard perpendicular from each side of the stream bank. Concerns were raised by Water Services (Stormwater Management) in reviewing this plat as to where the point began that 40 acres of land were draining to the stream. The applicant provided a “40-acre buffer yard” around the stream based on the blue line shown on USGS Quad maps. TDEC has conducted a preliminary field inspection to determine if this is accurate or if there is more water on site that is under its jurisdiction. TDEC has indicated there is evidence that more of the stream may be considered a blue line and that there are two springs. If TDEC concludes that these features are under their jurisdiction the applicant may lose some lots and need to redesign this site.

A natural spring is located in the vicinity of the Cane Springs Road/Springhouse Way intersection, adjacent to lot 27. This plat notes this spring is to be used as an amenity and preserved. However, no details have been presented at this time, other than a note that temporary fencing will protect the spring during construction and that the crossing of the spring bed will be approved by the State of Tennessee before construction begins. There is great concern about this spring as it feeds a well and a pond on the adjacent neighbor’s property (Mark W. and Carol A. Dugger).

Until more details have been presented about the spring’s preservation and the treatment of the blue-line stream, **staff recommends that no grading, blasting or building construction permits be issued until after TDEC conducts its final investigation and the Planning Commission approves a final plat.**

---

### SUBDIVISION VARIANCES

None

---

### TRAFFIC ENGINEER’S FINDINGS

The Planning Commission conditioned this property’s rezoning, to provide a left-turn lane on Cane Ridge Road between Blairfield Drive and the project entrance (Cane Springs Road). This improvement is near completion.

Cane Ridge Road is narrow and winding. It is not feasible for the developer to improve Cane Ridge Road between Bell Road and the property. Although the



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

construction of 68 homes will impact Cane Ridge Road, there are large amounts of vacant land yet to be developed in the vicinity (Planning and Public Works staffs are continuing to review a method of proportional responsibility for road improvements). One intersection has been identified that will be greatly impacted by this subdivision, Preston Road and Cane Ridge Road. With the increased traffic from this development, there is concern for the safety of motorists at this intersection. As a condition of this approval, the developer will provide additional pavement width on Cane Ridge Road south of Preston Road. This is to be the continuation of the southbound, right side edge of pavement from north of Preston Road to south of Preston Road and then a smooth transition back to the existing alignment. This will alleviate to some degree the change in alignment that occurs just past the Preston Road intersection as motorists head southbound that is hidden by a hill profile. In addition, the developer will smooth the transition on Cane Ridge Road through the intersection by attempting to shave the top of the hill and create a less severe drop in the roadway. A plan will need to be submitted to and approved by the Traffic Engineer prior to the approval of any final plats.

---

### CONDITIONS

The following conditions need to be satisfied prior to the planning commission meeting:

1. Further graphically clarify that the land between Cane Springs Road and the south property line is being **dedicated** as right-of-way.
2. A standard "C" type landscape buffer yard must be clearly delineated as running the entire western boundary of the perimeter of the subdivision.
3. Due to the issues involved with this site and the lack of information that is available at the preliminary plat stage, a note must be added across the plat's lot layout in large, bold font: "No grading, blasting, or building permits shall be issued for any portion of this property prior to the approval of the final plat."
4. The developer must submit a plan to the Metro Traffic Engineer for the improvement of the Cane Ridge Road in the vicinity of Preston Road prior to the approval of any final plats.



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

5. With the final plat, bonds must be submitted and approved for the extension of streets and sidewalks, public utilities and landscape buffer yards.





**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 2002S-206G-03**  
**Prestwick Place**  
None.  
Approved with conditions subject to a revised plat being submitted prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary Plat       Preliminary & Final Plat       Final Plat

Subdivide 13.31 acres into 49 lots using the cluster lot option, at a proposed density of 3.68 units per acre.

**ZONING**

RS10 district requiring minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet.

**SUBDIVISION VARIANCES**

None

**TRAFFIC ENGINEERS**

**Findings**

Approve.

**CONDITIONS**

Staff recommends conditional approval of this plat subject to a revised plat being submitted prior to the Planning Commission meeting, showing the following:

- 1. Add the note "The buffer along waterways will be an area where the surface is left in a natural state, and is not disturbed by construction activity. This is in accordance with the Stormwater Management Manual Volume 1 – Regulations."**



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Planned Unit Development 14-82-U-11**  
**Red Roof Inn (Sign Variance)**

N/A  
N/A

*Disapprove variance since the Zoning Code already gives more flexibility for sign height along interstates, and since there is no property hardship that justifies the additional 10 feet in height.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary PUD    Revised Preliminary    Revised Preliminary & Final PUD (Variance)  
 Final PUD    Amend PUD    Cancel PUD

Request for a variance to Section 17.32.130 (D) of the Zoning Code (sign regulations) to permit a 60-foot tall, 190.5 square foot sign, replacing a 50-foot tall, 216 square foot sign. The new sign requires a variance for height since the maximum allowable height is 50 feet tall.

Since this is a variance within a PUD, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) on the sign variance. The BZA will make the final determination on the variance.

**Existing Zoning**  
Commercial Limited (CL)

In a CL district next to an interstate, a maximum sign of 50-feet in height is permitted. If this property were not next to the interstate, the maximum allowable height would be 40-feet tall.

---

**VARIANCE REQUEST**

The applicant has indicated that a new sign is proposed as an upgrade to the 50-foot tall sign that exists at approximately the same location. The new sign is part of a nationwide renovation of Red Roof Inn locations and image.

Staff recommends disapproval of the variance since there are no property hardships (topography, grade, etc.) making this site different than other sites along the interstate.



**Project No.**  
**Associated Case**  
**Council Bill**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-079U-10**  
None  
N/A  
*Disapproval, ORI district allows uses that are incompatible with residential uses across 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue, North. Staff would recommend approval of OG zoning, however, since it is a more appropriate zoning district near a residential area.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
RM20 zoning

**Rezone 0.14 acres from Residential Multi-Family (RM20) to Office/Residential Intensive (ORI)**

RM20 is intended for multi-family residential at 20 units per acre.

**Proposed Zoning**  
ORI zoning

ORI is intended for office and multi-family residential with limited retail.

---

**SUBAREA 10 PLAN**

**Policy**  
Office Concentration (OC)

OC policy is intended for large concentrations of office uses.

**Policy Conflict**

None. Although the ORI district is consistent with the intent of the Subarea 10 Plan's OC policy, ORI zoning allows uses such as bars and nightclubs. With this property being located across the street from and adjacent to residentially zoned property, this zoning classification is inappropriate for this location. Staff recommends OG zoning for this area of the Subarea 10 Plan's OC policy area. OG zoning is intended for moderately high intensity office development. This property is situated at the edge of the OC policy and is adjacent to a residential high-density policy (RMH), which calls for 9 to 20 residential units per acre.

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

Yes. The Planning Commission approved a request to rezone parcels 59 and 60 (98Z-109U) to OR20 on June 25, 1998 and parcels 232 and 233 (98Z-115U) to ORI on July 9, 1998. The Council approved both of these zone changes also.

---

**TRAFFIC**

Based on typical uses in ORI zoning, with on site parking allowing 10,000 sq. ft. of development per acre,



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### Traffic Engineer's Findings

such as an office building or medical-dental office approximately 5 to 43 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic.

Approve.



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-080U-12**  
None.  
None.  
*Approve. OL zoning implements Subarea 12 Plan's office concentration (OC) policy.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
R6 zoning

**Rezone 2.4 acres from Residential (R6) to Office Limited (OL).**

R6 is intended for single-family homes and duplexes at 6.2 units per acre.

**Proposed Zoning**  
OL zoning

OL zoning is intended for moderately intense office uses.

---

**SUBAREA 12 PLAN**  
**Policy**  
Office Concentration (OC)

OC policy is intended for large concentrations of office uses.

**Policy Conflict**

None. OL district is consistent with the intent of the Subarea 12 Plan's OC policy. This property is situated between an apartment complex to the west and other OL zoned property to the south and east.

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

Yes. The Planning Commission approved a request to rezone parcels 17 and 182 (2002Z-074U-12) to OL on July 25, 2002.

---

**TRAFFIC**

Based on typical uses in CS zoning, with on site parking allowing 10,000 sq. ft. of development per acre, such as medical-dental office, office park, and general office, approximately 264 to 864 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic.

**Metro Traffic Engineer's Findings**

Approve.



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-081G-13**

None.

None.

*Approve. The proposed AR2a district is consistent with the Subarea 13 Plan's Interim Non-urban policy calling for low-density uses such as agricultural until appropriate infrastructure is in place to support higher density development.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Request to rezone 42 acres from residential single-family (RS15) to agricultural (AR2a). The applicant has indicated that this request is being made to allow for a horse farm.**

**Existing Zoning**  
RS15 zoning

RS15 zoning is intended for single-family residential allowing 3.7 dwelling units per acre. The current zoning would allow for 105 single-family lots.

**Proposed Zoning**  
AR2a zoning

AR2a zoning is intended for residential dwellings requiring a minimum lot size of 2 acres and intended for uses that generally occur in rural areas, including single-family, two family, and mobile homes. AR2a also allows for horse stables as a Special Exception (SE), requiring Board of Zoning Appeals approval.

---

**SUBAREA 13 PLAN**  
**Policy**  
Interim Non-urban (IN)

Interim Non-urban (IN): A policy category designed for areas that are generally suitable for urban development in the future, but should remain non-urban in character for the next twenty years. "IN policy is applied to this area of low-intensity residential development because it is remote from services necessary to support urbanization, particularly sewers, and is expected to remain that way during the planning period." (Page 49, Subarea 13 Plan, 1996).

**Policy Conflict**

No. The AR2a district is consistent with the Subarea 13 Plan's IN policy calling for very low-density residential development. The low-density is necessary to maintain the semi-rural and rural character with large tracts of land until urbanization of this area is appropriate.

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

No



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

---

### TRAFFIC

#### Metro Traffic Engineer's Findings

Approve.

---

### SCHOOLS

#### Students Generated

3 Elementary 2 Middle 2 High School

#### Schools Over/Under Capacity

Students will attend Ruby Major Elementary School when built, Donelson Middle School, and McGavock High School. Currently, Ruby Major Elementary School is not built. Donelson Middle School is another new school where the Metro School Board has not provided information regarding current capacity, while McGavock High School has not been identified as being overcrowded by the Metro School Board.

The current RS15 zoning would generate approximately 17 elementary students, 11 middle school students, and 9 high school students.



**Project No.**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Zone Change 2002Z-082U-05**  
N/A  
None.  
*Disapprove. The RM9 district is not consistent with the single-family zoning pattern in the area.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

**Existing Zoning**  
RS5 district

**Rezone 0.37 acres from residential single-family (RS5) to multi-family residential (RM9)**

RS5 is intended for single-family residential at 7.4 dwelling units per acre.

**Proposed Zoning**  
RM9 district

RM9 is intended for multi-family residential development at a maximum of 9 dwelling units per acre. RM9 would permit 3 multi-family units on 0.37 acres. It also permits nursing homes and assisted-living uses.

---

**SUBAREA 5 PLAN**  
**Policy**

Residential Medium (RM) allows 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre

**Policy Conflict**

Yes. Although the proposed RM9 district falls within the Subarea 5 Plan's RM policy calling for 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre, it is within an area of predominately single-family homes. The plan states: "Conservation of the established neighborhoods and nodes of neighborhood commercial development is intended for these RM areas" (page 83, Subarea 5 Plan).

Multi-family residential zoning is inconsistent with the single-family pattern in the area along Lischey Avenue

---

**RECENT REZONINGS**

No

---

**TRAFFIC**  
**Traffic Engineer's**  
**Findings**

Approve.

---





## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### SCHOOLS

Students Generated

Schools Over/Under Capacity

1 Elementary 0 Middle 0 High

Students will attend Shwab Elementary, Jere Baxter Middle, and Maplewood High School. None of these schools have been identified as being overcrowded by the School Board.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 2002S-152U-03**  
**Thelma Hardy Subdivision**  
None  
*Approved with conditions subject to a variance for construction of a sidewalk along the frontage of Lot 3.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary Plat       Preliminary & Final Plat       Final Plat

**ZONING**

Subdivide a 3.52-acre parcel into three (3) lots.  
RS7.5 district requiring minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet

**SUBDIVISION VARIANCES**

**Sidewalks**  
(Section 2-6.1)

Sidewalk required along the frontage of lot 3 on Lincoln Street. No new development rights are being created on Lots 1 and 2.

Currently Lincoln Street is a substandard Metro road. There is an existing 40-foot right-of-way, with approximately a 15 foot paved section of road. The applicant has agreed to dedicate six (6) feet of property along the property's frontage. Lincoln Street already has several homes that use this road for access.

**Recommendation**

A section of sidewalk 104 feet long in length would require major reconstruction of the roadway by the required widening and construction of the curb and gutter system for a relatively short section of sidewalk, which is inconsistent with good planning and design principles. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the request for a sidewalk variance for lot 3. Future larger scale development is expected on this applicant's property along Lincoln Street that will upgrade the road and also construct the sidewalks.

**TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS**

Approve

**CONDITIONS**

Staff recommends conditional approval of this plat subject to variance for construction of a sidewalk along the frontage of Lot 3.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Subdivision 2002S-207G-14**  
**Village of Old Hickory, Section A**  
None  
*Approved with conditions subject to variances for construction of a sidewalk along the frontage of Lot 189B and lot comparability for Lot 189B.*

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary Plat       Preliminary & Final Plat       Final Plat

Subdivide a 1.13-acre lot into two (2) lots.

**ZONING**

R15 district requiring minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet

**SUBDIVISION VARIANCES**

**Sidewalks**  
(Section 2-6.1)

A sidewalk is required along the frontage of Lot 189B on Riverside Road. Currently, on Riverside Road there are sidewalks on the western margin of the road and no sidewalks on the east margin. Lot 189A is improved and not planned for demolition. Because no new development rights are being created for the lot, staff has interpreted the Subdivision Regulations as not requiring a sidewalk for Lot 189A. Sidewalks however are required for Lot 189B. Public Works has indicated that in order to construct sidewalks along Riverside Road the road would have to be widened one and a half (1 ½) feet and include the addition of curb and gutter along the portion of the road where the sidewalks are to be constructed.

Recommendation

Approve. A section of sidewalk 30 feet in length will require a major reconstruction of the roadway by the required widening and construction of the curb and gutter system for a relatively short section of sidewalk, which is inconsistent with good planning and design principles.

**Lot Comparability**  
(Section 2-4.7)

Lot frontage for the new proposed lot is not consistent with the average of lots in the comparability study. The minimum lot frontage allowed by comparability study



## Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 8/8/02

### Recommendation

is 46 feet. The applicant has provided 30 feet of frontage for lot 189B.

Approve variance for lot comparability. At the present time the area zoned R15 is mostly undeveloped. The properties used in this study are predominantly R6 district properties. The R15 zoned property that is included in the study exceeds the minimum standards applied to R15 zoned property.

---

### TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS

Approve

---

### CONDITIONS

Staff recommends conditional approval of this plat subject to variance for construction of a sidewalk along the frontage of lot 189B and lot comparability for lot 189B.



**Project No.**  
**Project Name**  
**Council Bill**  
**Associated Cases**  
**Staff Recommendation**

**Planned Unit Development**  
**Nashboro Village, Tract 13**  
N/A  
N/A  
*Approve with conditions.*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Preliminary PUD     Revised Preliminary     Revised Preliminary & Final PUD  
 Final PUD     Amend PUD     Cancel PUD

Request for final PUD approval to allow 48 townhomes in Tract 13, where the Planning Commission approved the same number on April 11, 2002 on the preliminary PUD plan. This plan is consistent with the approved preliminary PUD plan.

A final plat must be recorded as a horizontal property regime and bonds must be posted for the construction of public sidewalks along Nashboro Boulevard.

**Existing Zoning**  
**R10/Res. PUD**

**Preliminary PUD was approved in 1979 for 95 apartment units, and revised by the Planning Commission on April 11, 2002 to reduce the number of units to 48 townhomes in this phase. Plan is grandfathered to permit multi-family units within the R10 district, a single-family and duplex district.**



**Project Name**

**Close Winstead Av. and Alley #1039**

**Project No.**

**Mandatory Referral 2002M-070U-03**

**Council Bill**

None

**Associated Case**

2002S-201U-03

**Staff Recommendation**

*Approve*

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Close a 290-foot portion (east half) of Winstead Avenue, between Monticello Street and Old Matthews Road, and close all of Alley #1039. (Easements are to be retained)

---

**APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

**Signatures of All Abutting & Affected Property Owners**

Yes – and they match tax assessor information.

---

**DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS**

All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval.



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Vanderbilt Fiber Optic Encroachment</b>
<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Mandatory Referral 2002M-080U-10</b>
<b>Council Bill</b>	None
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

---

**APPLICANT REQUEST**

Aerial encroachment to hang approximately 4,700 feet of fiber optic cable, at a minimum height of 18 feet over the public right-of-way, from 115 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 3319 West End Avenue. Cable will hang from existing NES (Nashville Electric Service) poles and lines. Affected rights-of-way will be Vanderbilt Place, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, Alley #912 between 32<sup>nd</sup> & 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenues, 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, and Orleans Drive.

---

**APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

<b>License to Encroach Agreement</b>	Yes – one was submitted in correct form.
<b>Insurance Certificate</b>	Yes – one was submitted providing general liability of \$1,000,000 for each occurrence and \$3,000,000 for aggregate coverage, as required by Metro Legal.
<b>Property Owner Sign Application</b>	Yes – Vice-Chancellor for Administration and Chief Financial Officer for Vanderbilt University.
<b>Tenant Sign Application</b>	N/A

---

**DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS**

All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval.



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Nicholson's Hi-Fi Sign Encroachment</b>
<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Mandatory Referral 2002M-082U-10</b>
<b>Council Bill</b>	None
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<i>Approve</i>

---

<b>APPLICANT REQUEST</b>	Install a banner-style sign, measuring 12 feet in height and 33 inches wide, with a 10-foot clearance above the public right-of-way (sidewalk).
--------------------------	---

---

<b>APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>License to Encroach Agreement</b>	Yes – one was submitted in correct form.
<b>Insurance Certificate</b>	Yes – one was submitted providing general liability of \$1,000,000 for each occurrence and \$2,000,000 for aggregate coverage, as required by Metro Legal.
<b>Property Owner Sign Application</b>	Yes
<b>Tenant Sign Application</b>	Tenant and owner same.

---

<b>DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval.
--	--